

Citrus Research Board Office
CRB/CPDPC Joint Operations Committee Meeting
CRB Conference Room
217 N. Encina Street
Visalia, Ca 93291
Minutes of Meeting
October 3, 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 Jim Gorden at the Citrus Research Board Office, Conference Room, Visalia, California. A quorum was established with the following in attendance:

Joint Committee Members

Jim Gorden, Chairman CRB Ops
Link Leavens, V-Chairman CRB Ops*
Dan Dreyer
Dan Galbraith
Kevin Severns
Kevin Olsen
Etienne Rabe
Mark McBroom*
Joe Barcinas*

CRB Staff:

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

CDFA Staff:

Susan McCarthy
Art Gilbert
Debbie Tanouye
Tina Galindo*

Interested Parties

Linda Haque, Ventura County
Helene Wright, USDA
Bob Blakely, CM
Dave Machlitt*
Stephen Birdsall*
John Gless

*Participated by phone and/or Webex

Call to Order

Chairman Gorden welcomed all in attendance. Roll call was taken to establish a quorum and to confirm who was attending.

Review of Minutes

Chairman Gorden asked if anyone had any comments, questions or edits to the Joint Operations Committee meeting minutes of September 5, 2012. There were none.

10.03.2012. 1 Dreyer moved and Galbraith seconded to approve Minutes from the September 5, 2012 Joint Operations Meeting.

Motion passed unanimously.

Review of financial reports and approval of CRB action

a. Financial Report for CRB Operations

Louise Fisher

There were no questions regarding the financial report Fisher prepared and provided the committee.

Regional ACP Management Programs

Brian Taylor, Debby Tanouye

Taylor stated they are looking for regional coordinators and they're working through Susan McCarthy at CDFA. McCarthy said they are only working with Alan Washburn at this time; with an emergency start-up date of October 1st for eight months. That gives them time to go through the RFP (request for proposal) process.

McCarthy stated they originally did an emergency contract in Riverside County because there was nothing in place, though they can't make that same argument in Ventura County because there has been someone in place for awhile. Leavens stated the task force in Ventura County is getting funding from the Hansen Trust and Farm Bureau and will be reimbursed from this committee down the line sometime. McCarthy said they couldn't reimburse for what is going on right now, but could put a contract in place and either do the RFP which takes about six months and the committee funds would pay for that; or, we can see about working through the County with CHRP funds (as outreach) and could be done sooner. McCarthy said she would get in touch with Leslie Leavens-Crowe and see what they would prefer we do with the task force. Chairman Gorden stated he wants to make sure there are no misunderstandings about whether or not those funds can be reimbursed or not. Tanouye said if the Farm Bureau was non-profit they may be able to contract directly with them and not go through the ag commissioner. Batkin said it was a 501C corporation. Chairman Gorden said the idea they had at the last CPDPC meeting was that these coordinators could all be organized locally through the same mechanism and he offered to help McCarthy with anything he can do.

Taylor stated in East Riverside (Coachella), they will probably have to work through the Pest Control District through Riverside County, to come up with some sort of RFP with them. Taylor said we can either go through the ag commissioner or through the Pest Control District. McCarthy said she will have to talk with them to see how to set it up.

Taylor reported in San Diego County they've had two organizing meetings in the last two weeks for their task force; so they're in the early stages of understanding all the communications. Through this task force, hopefully they will be able to identify candidates for the regional coordinator for that county. There hasn't been anyone identified at this point.

Taylor stated Imperial County is fairly self-sufficient, with only 8 growers. Taylor stated Hill sent out an announcement to Kern, Tulare and Fresno counties' growers with the job description for regional coordinators. McCarthy suggested, since there isn't ACP in those three counties yet, to do a standby contract; where it will be a six month process, go out with a request for proposal (RFP) in those three counties and then people would respond to that and they would put them on standby. If and when ACP gets there they would have people ready to go.

Taylor stated he is meeting with San Bernardino County next Monday and that will involve a number of items.

Leavens stated they've just had an incident in Santa Paula and having Machlitt on board has been very helpful. Tanouye said they can do it through the ag commissioner who has to go through the normal process but there shouldn't be a big delay. Chairman Gorden stated the ag commissioners in the valley have experience doing that also, so there shouldn't be a problem.

Dunn reminded the committee about Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey and Madera Counties also; they are also threatened even though the acreage is small. Tanouye stated they do the trapping for Santa Barbara County and have ACP trapping contracts for the others Dunn mentioned. Tanouye stated she could add language in the contract for outreach, which would include having a coordinator or a “grower liaison” and that would be CHRP funds.

Chairman Gorden stated this is a good overview of where we’re going but we’re going to need to tie-in some of the organization of these management programs with our treatment regimes and exactly what we’re going to do.

a. Trapping Program Report

Tina Galindo

Galindo reviewed her powerpoint that listed the current areas that they are treating in. They did start implementing the reduction of treatment areas in Riverside which freed them up to put more trucks in Ventura and the San Fernando Valley. There have been a lot more finds in San Diego and Imperial. In Orange County they’re finishing up and Tustin and should be done early next week. In San Diego County they had meetings in Pauma and Fallbrook and they’re working there. Pauma will be done next week along with Fallbrook and Rainbow. Galindo stated there are two new areas, Borrego Springs and Oceanside. They treated the find site for Oceanside and surveyed it and found more psyllids there. At the Borrego Springs find, they haven’t been able to make contact with the resident to treat.

In Imperial there are a lot of new finds; will need meetings and treatments.

In Los Angeles County, they’re currently treating in Canoga Park and Arleta. When the trucks free up in Orange County they will bring more into the Valley. They have new find sites and adjacents in Los Angeles County and are setting up meetings now. In Riverside County they’ve reduced and are done; having just some follow-up appointments that they’re trying to get treated this week. Galindo stated they should be done next week with Redlands and Mentone area. In Ventura, they are getting more detections. They just had their second detection confirmed in Simi Valley, within the core of the first find. There was also a find in Santa Paula; three in Thousand Oaks and there is a fourth suspect on the way to the lab right now. Galindo stated they are getting those finds treated. Galindo said the first Thousand Oaks treatment that they had the meeting for should be done early next week because they just put more trucks out there.

Barcinas asked if there has been anybody that is evaluating the efficacy of what we’re doing; we make recommendations as to what we’re going to do but we have no assessment of how effective it is with what we’re doing. Barcinas stated there is a coordinated spraying down in Riverside this year and he would like to see an evaluation on how effective these treatments are that we’re putting out in the commercial groves.

Galindo reviewed the San Diego County map which showed the Borrego Springs find and the Oceanside detection. The Borrego Springs find is residential on a golf course, about 5 to 6 miles from the closest commercial citrus. Galindo stated that in Oceanside, they found a colony, but she doesn’t know the count of nymphs.

Rabe expressed concern with treating where there are high find populations that are away from commercial groves and going down the same route as L.A. County, not being money well spent.

Galindo reviewed the Los Angeles County map and recent area finds. There have been more detections in the San Fernando Valley in the past few weeks; both in traps and visual survey. Crews are still going to the list of new sites that still need to be tested and they are also doing the new Gottwald survey.

Galindo reviewed the Orange County map which reflected a detection from a grove in San Juan Capistrano. Galindo reported that Taylor told her the grower is going to treat; we need to decide if we're going to do any treatments around that grove. There is also a residential find where there were more than 25 trees and a decision has to be made on what to do there also.

In reviewing Imperial County, Galindo showed the finds they've been getting up by Salton City, Desert Shore, Salton Sea Beach; Northern Niland and other areas scattered throughout the county. They will need meetings for some of them.

Galindo reviewed the Riverside County map and stated they've started the reduction in the treatment areas around the groves and they're done with most of it. The meeting for Hemet is next week and will be treating around those groves only next week.

Galindo stated they reduced the treatment boundary in San Bernardino County. They are just treating around the groves and should be done with that area next week.

Birdsall asked Galindo about the two psyllids they found at In-ko-pah, if a known host and if it was significant. Galindo stated it was a known host and that was why they were asked to trap there; doesn't think they can treat that area because it is considered a sensitive area. Would have to consult with fish and wildlife to see what animals or plants that they would need to stay away from. Haque stated in cases like that where you can treat in sensitive areas, they thought about seeing if they can release *Tamarixia*. Batkin stated we don't have *Tamarixia* for release in those areas; there is just enough to do the localized releases, that they can build-up and test colonies right now. Tanouye stated they would have to have their staff determine if it is a sensitive area and if it is, then they usually consult with fish and game to determine what can be done to mitigate that. In some cases they aren't even allowed to walk in the area; they may just have to use a mechanical removal or vacuum.

Severns asked Tanouye if there were enough of these sensitive-type areas to be a hindrance to our efforts to mitigate this pest. Tanouye said that usually they're able to work with Fish and Game to mitigate it.

Rabe asked Chairman Gorden what the authority is for this committee; are we making recommendations or are we making decisions? Chairman Gorden responded that it was his impression that the CPDPC authorized this committee to make decisions on tactical movement as we see fit. McCarthy concurred. Taylor reminded the committee that part of the drive of this plan was to come in within the budget that has been approved.

Rabe asked if this committee has a list or do we know whether all the packing houses have signed-up to not take any grower that is not abiding by the protocol. Do we have that list, or do we know whether all the packinghouses in California signed up? Is it possible for us to get a list of that to see who is not “playing ball?” Chairman Gorden stated he thinks a lot of areas in Riverside and San Bernardino are a real problem, especially with the 25 tree definition arena. Rabe said we need to know if all the packinghouses have signed up to this gentlemen’s agreement. Severns stated it would be pretty easy to get a list together of who has done that; what would be more difficult to know is, who has not. Would it be out of line for us, as a committee or the AB-281, to be proactive about contacting those organizations and strongly suggest that they adopt such a resolution. Chairman Gorden said he thinks that is what the regional area task force can probably work on; it is definitely a regional matter. Getting these regional groups working together in their areas is a big step forward.

Rabe stated it wouldn’t hurt to get a list together of those who have signed and compare it with the list that Batkin has of who pays assessment, so that we have a feel for where we are. Severns asked Blakely if he knows or has access to know who the associations and packers are that have put out resolutions, as far as agreements to treat before any fruit is transferred? Blakely wasn’t sure if they’ve received all of them yet. Severns thought maybe, as a committee, we could approach them. Chairman Gorden thought it would be within our purview to approve some sort of a resolution to the effect that we’re encouraging this because we aren’t recommending treatment in these urban areas adjacent to commercial citrus unless the growers are going along with it. It is in their best interest to put together these sorts of agreements. Chairman Gorden stated to the committee if that was the way this committee wants to go, he would entertain a motion to do something.

10.03.2012.1 Rabe moved and Dreyer 2nd to get list of packing houses that have signed the treatment resolution and get a list of those packing houses that have adopted that resolution and compare it with Batkin’s list of packing houses paying assessments on growers and see where we are relative to compliance and non-compliance.

Motion approved unanimously.

Olsen stated this committee should encourage the packinghouses that are shown not to have done this to do it. Batkin recommended taking proactive action to encourage houses that do not have resolutions to add those resolutions to their system. Olsen concurred and stated we could give them sample language on how they can do it. Batkin said to make it a strong recommendation that they become part of that process. Gorden stated that we could add something in to applaud those that do have this sort of thing in place and to urgently request any that don’t have it in place on an ongoing basis. Olsen further stated to that point, if there is a packing house and they’re mealy mouthing around and don’t want to do it for whatever reason, we want to be able to stay on them until they do it.

Chairman Gorden stated the resolution would say, “We’re recommending to all handlers in California that they adopt a requirement for fruit to be handled by their packinghouse, it would be treated for psyllids if their grove falls within a required treatment area.” Some of the treatment area definitions will have to be tightened up a little more also. If we are going to require this, we are going to need some definite treatment areas in the various regions. Olsen asked what defines a

treatment. We need to define that so as we move forward that doesn't become an issue.

There was further talk about user reports and how to know of, or enforce treatment. Gless stated each packing house should ask each grower for a copy of their user report; is that what we're recommending? Severns answered, if it comes to an enforcement issue, yes; although he isn't going to run out and ask all his growers for their user reports right now because they don't have any sales. Gless stated all the Riverside houses are going through this problem and they're all saying they sprayed, but we don't know that.

Batkin suggested to the committee that procedurally, this committee needs to craft this resolution to get it passed and we need to put in how you are going to get there through some sort of a policy statement.

Chairman Gorden stated they just started picking olives a few days ago and the olive handlers require that you submit a list of treatments with user reports before you can deliver any olives to them, so they know what you have done; so this would be the same sort of thing. It is done pretty routinely and is done by a lot of commodity handlers.

10.03.2012.2 Olsen moved and Galbraith 2nd that this committee recommends to all packinghouses, in the state of California, to adopt a policy of not packing fruit that has not been treated for Asian Citrus Psyllid. If a psyllid has been found within your treatment area, you have to treat it before we pack it and those that are not in compliance we will go after them.

Motion approved unanimously.

Treatment Update

Debby Tanouye

Buffer Zone Area Discussion

There was further committee discussion on treatment plans and non-compliant neighbors and treatment protocols. Olsen suggested this committee conduct the business at hand, do the overview and as exceptions pop-up, we will have to address them and deal with them. Chairman Gorden concurred stating, we understand this bad neighbor is going to be a problem, in some instances, and we hope will be able to work past it.

Treatment Protocols for Discussion

In all areas:

- Treat urban area only if the grower is treating.

San Diego and Imperial Counties

Urban Areas

- Treat 200 meters around all detection sites.
- Increase trap density surrounding square miles to monitor ACP population.

Commercial Groves

- Treat 400 meters around any detection sites.

Orange County

Urban Areas

- Stop treating
- **Commercial Groves**
- Treat 400 meters around detection sites.

Riverside and San Bernardino Counties

Urban Areas

- Stop treatment

Commercial Groves

- 400 meters or as per discussion with treatment coordinator.

Coachella Valley

Urban Areas

- Stop treatment north of Indio.

South of Indio

- 200 meters around detection sites.
- Increase trap density around detections.

Commercial Groves

- Treat 400 meters or as per their discussion with treatment coordinator. (Indio south, inclusive of Indio).

Northern Los Angeles County

Urban Areas

- 400 meters around detection sites (mainly due to proximity to Ventura County).

Need to define Northern LA County

Ventura County and All Other Counties Without ACP Detections

- Treat 800 meters around all detection sites.
- Place 25 traps per square mile in the surrounding square miles to determine status of the ACP population.
- Commercial growers are treating 800 meters.

Properties with more than 25 trees.

Treatment Coordination

- Formalize so that CDFA knows which groves are being treated and when they will be treated.
- When grower makes the application, CDFA needs to be there right there with them making that same application in the urban area.

Rabe asked Tanouye if these treatment protocols have been run past the regional groups for their sign-off. Tanouye stated it was discussed last week in Riverside County; Rabe asked about Indio, if that group was on board with what she was saying and Tanouye stated yes. Gorden asked about San Diego, if they were on board. Tanouye stated no, that San Diego just formed their task force and she gave them an idea of where she was going with this treatment plan and they want an update following this meeting. They really want the full 800 meter treatment but we can't afford it.

Dunn suggested setting up a buffer adjacent to Ventura County since that is the area they're trying to protect. Tanouye stated Galindo is increasing trap density along the county line between L.A. County and Ventura County line border

Gless asked if 25 trees was considered a commercial grove and treated the 400 meters around it. Chairman Gorden stated that is one of those items that this committee needs to discuss.

Tanouye stated this committee needs to define what is considered northern L.A. County. In using the blue line, there is a detection in Beverly Hills which they will have to do the treatment around. Gorden stated the idea was to draw the line through the ridge. Batkin stated the purpose of the line was to get the top of that ridge which essentially is Mulholland Drive. Batkin suggested drawing a concept line where to treat and not to treat as opposed to a physical street that you could be on one side or the other. If the concept line is you treat everything north of that ridge then that Beverly Hills find wouldn't be treated. You are boxing yourself in if you are trying to define the blue line or the treat/non-treat by a street. Gorden stated the blue line was originally drawn going down the Santa Monica. It could probably be moved up to Malibu and run along the hills there and that would get Beverly Hills out of the mix. Chairman Gorden suggested putting this on the staff to draw a more refined outlined area in reconfiguring these treatment parameters.

Leavens asked Galindo how far east are the traps from the Ventura County line. Galindo stated the traps are all the way to the county line; they're just working on increasing the density. They don't have the manpower to get them increased quickly. Haque asked how far into L.A. County or how far from Ventura County line are they trapping and the density. Tanouye answered, anything north of the blue line they still have traps in that area and what they're doing at the moment is increasing the density because they know the current level was 5 and that probably wasn't enough to detect them soon enough so they're increasing the density to 25, which seems to be the number where they detect them sooner. Hague asked how far in from Ventura County are they trapping. Tanouye answered all the way to the blue line. Dunn showed the blue line and the Ventura County line. Gorden stated they are increasing their trapping from 5 to 25; probably 50% of the area has been increased to 25 traps.

Leavens asked if this includes Taylor's recommendation of 800 meters in the commercial areas and Gorden stated no, it includes only urban interface, we will deal with the commercial growers separately.

Dreyer asked with this being adopted, is there some type of matrix for clarification. Chairman Gorden recommended giving this back to staff to work together to put a solid plan together so we can ratify at our next meeting and take to the CPDPC at their following meeting and then it could go to the department for ratification, if the committee sees fit to do that. McCarthy said in the meantime, this will be the course of action from here out. Tanouye stated they have a lot of areas to treat 200 meters in, and all the other work that needs to get done by others can.

Leavens stated from previous discussion, we have authorization to give Tanouye direction. The big committee has given us operating direction. Batkin stated we will pull all these together in a clearly defined document, adopt it now and move forward.

10.03.2012.3 Rabe moved and Severn's 2nd, to adopting Tanouye's recommendations for changing the treatment parameters.

Motion passed unanimously.

Tanouye brought up the issue of properties with more than 25 trees. Batkin stated it is the definition used in *Tristeza* to determine a commercial grove vs. a urban grove population; it is in the ag code. McCarthy stated it wouldn't impact the department's ability to remove a tree because they've gone out in a residential area with an only tree and took that one; they have authority to take a tree wherever. Batkin stated the HLB tree removal does not define commercial vs. urban – it's anything. If the tree is in the middle of a commercial grove, it has got to go. Gless stated that they have 25 trees all over Riverside and if you start doing 400 meters on every 25 trees, where are they going to get the funding; there isn't enough funding. There was further committee discussion regarding the 25 tree issue.

Batkin stated that in the marketing orders and also, he believes, in the AB281, there is a threshold of what is considered commercial venture. That is 750 40 lb. field boxes delivered to a packing house. That is a commercial entity and qualifies for paying assessments. If you have an entity that has that volume then they become a commercial entity. If they're not in that, then they're not considered a commercial entity and you don't treat. Somebody that is delivering 750 40 lb. boxes to a packinghouse; that is somebody that is in the business, they're not just a hobby farmer. You have to get up to about 100 to 125 trees to get up to 750 40 lb. boxes. Batkin and Gorden both stated that is in our marketing order. McCarthy stated that where she thought Tanouye was coming from on this is, when we're going out, we're **not** treating properties that have 25 or more trees and running into a lot of homeowners that have 25 or more trees that aren't going to be treated. What do you do with these homeowners that have 25 or more trees that are within a treatment area, and they're saying wait a minute, they're not commercial, they don't want to treat.

Taylor stated homeowners are willing to participate, but want us to treat the 25 and they will treat the remainder. Chairman Gorden stated we aren't going to solve this problem. We need to get a draft policy put together and suggested a small group to get together; such as John Gless, Ted Batkin, Susan McCarthy and Debby Tanouye, and anyone else that wants to be included, to draft a proposal. Tanouye stated not only for Riverside but also there is a lot of that in San Diego County.

Severns stressed the urgency of needing to deal with this definition issue. We have been struggling with this issue for a long time. Tanouye stated it may also become a public relations issue also; we want everyone to be proactive and treat and yet we won't treat if they have 25 trees.

HLB Survey

1) Risk Based HLB Survey (Gottwald)

Debby Tanouye

Tanouye reviewed the top map of Dr. Gottwald's square miles, the areas his risk based survey where we should be doing our surveying. The dark red indicates is where we should be focusing our surveys. The next map reflected the Hacienda Heights HLB where Tanouye said they've started surveying. The yellow areas reflected area that were surveyed but plant tissue or psyllids were not found. The last map reflected the statewide citrus commodities survey and it reflects all the areas where they've been doing HLB surveys, ACP surveys or where they've submitted

samples to the lab for HLB determination throughout the state. Gorden informed the committee the map reflects a four year period from 2008 through 2012.

Rabe asked regarding the McRoberts study that was just approved; if we have someone feeding them information, being the liaison. McCarthy said she suggested that; and Rabe asked McCarthy if she was that liaison person because he doesn't want to see it fall apart. Batkin responded that he doesn't have an answer for that but will get one.

Tanouye further stated that every two weeks they send the data up to Wright's office and they coordinate with Dr. Gottwald on the work they've been doing. McRobert's links it directly to Wright's office. Gorden stated McRoberts and Gottwald are working together and the information flows from Tanouye to Wright to Gottwald. Rabe asked if McRoberts knows that and Batkin stated yes.

Chairman Gorden asked if there were any questions regarding these handouts and maps. He further stated this is a starting effort to keep this committee informed as to what is being done in the HLB sampling program. There will be questions arise as time goes forward and we'll work our way through them.

Bio Control Program Report and Action Item Approvals

Jim Gorden/Ted Batkin

Batkin reported that the CRB now has a cooperative agreement with USDA APHIS for \$515,000 to work on field rearing the bio-control agent and that is teamed-up with the \$500,000 that was put through into the operations contract with the CRB for improving bio-control in Los Angeles. Batkin stated there is a joint plan with CDFA where they have offered up the use of the Arvin facility for rearing plants, so there is some renovation work that will go on in Arvin, about \$150,000 of that \$500,000 to be used in Arvin. About \$50,000 will be used in Rubidoux to retrofit and advance the Rubidoux project, providing the resources agency gives a minimum 5 year agreement. In addition to that, the development of the program at Cal Poly Pomona will include the construction of a plant development greenhouse at Cal Poly and a mobile laboratory for laboratory rearing and methods development on that site. They have also talked to Cal Poly about rearing plants as a student project in their horticulture division. Batkin further stated Mike Pitcairn from CDFA will be taking the lead on the insectary rearing in the plant development; David Morgan is his assistant associate on that project. Greg Simmons will be the lead advisor from APHIS on the field rearing and on the overall bio-control project. UC Riverside will be continuing to rear *Tamarixia* that will be fed into these systems and be used as the starting colonies for both the field rearing and insectary rearing programs, as well as continuing to evaluate the *Tamarixia* in the field. Batkin stated the Bio Control Task Force Committees will be meeting next week on October 12 in Riverside to start putting the details together on how all of these different moving parts will come together. The target is to get up to 400,000 per month on average. The process will take about 18 to 24 months to ramp up and reach those levels just because of the time it takes to get plants, to get rearing and get the processes ramped up and fully running. That is the estimated target from all the various different scientists that are part of it.

Batkin went on to say in terms of funding needs: \$500,000 asked for from CPDPC was starting point; will be asking for additional funds to ramp up necessary facilities to get to the levels we need. CHRP council members meeting with APHIS yesterday and today to work on additional \$5

million investment from USDA to be added into this process and how that gets allocated, we don't know yet. Batkin stated the plan now is to rent and lease rearing space and will build on rented space if necessary.

Chairman Gorden added that they continue to get reports from the researchers at UCR. They've had a number of sites where they've found *Tamarixia* has moved out from early summer releases, at least 2/10 of a mile and finding parasitized psyllids out that far, but haven't looked out any further than that. Very encouraging information on the establishment of the *Tamarixia*.

Laboratory Activities

a. Riverside Laboratory Activities

Cynthia LeVesque

LeVesque reviewed her powerpoint. They did 2,382 pooled CDFA ACP samples; All samples were negative for HLB. Current staff is 3 permanent, full-time; one lead trap reader, 5 part-time trap readers. LeVesque reviewed the lab time frame for goals September 6 - October 3, 2012.

LeVesque reviewed the Summary of the USDA APHIS visit; everything was favorable.

LeVesque stated USDA APHIS will be sending a report by end of next week summarizing their visit. They didn't say anything in their evaluation or discussions that would lead her to believe there was any concern the CRB lab would not be re-certified. Chairman Gorden confirmed that the lab is just waiting for written re-certification notice. LeVesque concurred. Rabe asked how many labs USDA APHIS looked at. LeVesque responded that they went from the CRB lab to the Sacramento CDFA lab. Chairman Gorden asked McCarthy if she had anything to report on how their lab inspection went and McCarthy stated no, their report is usually put together at the end of the month and since it is only the 3rd of October, they don't have it yet. She will be sending out to everybody the report that shows how many samples taken, etc. when she receives it.

Severns stated on behalf of executive committee, they are concerned and disappointed that there were aspects of the lab being shut down and the fact that we had to go through a re-certification process; we would have preferred to have been in a much better situation as far as understanding the details of what lead up to this. Batkin responded that there were reasons and he would have to explain to him why it was done the way it was done, they weren't our reasons. Rabe asked if the CDFA lab lost its certification. McCarthy said no. LeVesque said she didn't believe we lost certification, they simply wanted to re-evaluate the lab. They are going to make this an ongoing process for all the labs that are certified. Batkin concurred and stated, it was a suspension because of the report that went through both our lab and the CDFA lab; they questioned in Beltsville so they suspended our operation until their team came out and looked at our lab and the Sacramento lab and now we're getting back on track.

Data Management Report

Rick Dunn

Dunn gave a brief update on the citrus layer project, reviewing the map with complete attribute information for Ventura County which reflects 28% complete. Dunn also reviewed the citrus mapping attribution status table that showed the different counties in California. Dunn stated that these projects will be completed once he gets his new person on board. Dunn reviewed the September detections and redetections. Dunn informed the committee they are now entirely using

CPDPC Report

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy reported that Texas Citrus Mutual invited her to come down to Texas and paid for her trip, to participate in their nursery workshop that they had last Thursday. McCarthy stated they are now looking at getting their industry organized and she shared with them some of the activities we have been doing in California. On Friday she visited a grove with positive finds. McCarthy showed photos she had from the positive groves of both fruit and trees.

The next CPDPC meeting is in November.

Batkin reported that we have two of the VOC sensor systems working in Texas; they started on Monday. They're taking samples of all of the trees that are still in the ground that tested positive and then they will be working out from that into trees that are not identified by PCR's positive; so they're going to be trying to get a range and array. The growers reported that they are going to remove the trees or prune them down to stumps and we wanted to get the trees sampled before that occurred. All of the positive trees are scheduled to come up within two weeks. Mamoudou Setamou and his SRA are on site working on the project and John DeGraca is overseeing it. EZNose Diagnostix has two technicians down there from Austin, as well as Christina Davis' technician, Alex Aksenov, is down leading the sniffing process. We wanted to get a baseline of the trees that were known positive. They will leave the machines down there and the process will continue.

Batkin informed the committee of a webinar being held by Christina Davis on October 19th at noon on the sniffer. Included in the webinar they are hoping will be some preliminary results from this testing in Texas. It is mostly a follow-up on the technology and will go into some good depth on how this is working and where we're taking it with this next era of research funding.

Chairman Report

Jim Gorden

Chairman Gorden didn't have anything more to report on. Gorden felt it was a productive meeting and hopes to keep this pace up.

Adjournment

The next meeting will be held at the CRB Conference Room in Visalia on Wednesday, November 7, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.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 October 3, 2012.

Date

Ted A. Batkin, President