

**Citrus Research Board Office**  
CRB/CPDPC Joint Operations Committee Meeting  
CRB Conference Room  
217 N. Encina Street  
Visalia, Ca 93291  
Minutes of Meeting  
**March 6, 2013 1:30 P.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  
Dan Dreyer  
Dan Galbraith  
Kevin Severns\*  
Etienne Rabe  
Kevin Olsen  
Joe Barcinas\*

C DFA Staff:

Robert Leavitt  
Susan McCarthy  
Art Gilbert  
Debbie Tanouye  
Tina Galindo  
Duane Schnabel\*  
Bob Wynn  
Austin Webster  
Noel Sherman\*

Interested Parties:

Nick Hill  
Leslie Leavens, Ventura Co. \*  
Gavin Iacono, Tulare Cty Ag Com\*  
Judy Zaninovich (Kern Co. GL)  
Dave Machlitt, Ventura Co.\*  
Bob Wagner (Tulare Co. GL)\*  
Paul Story, CCM  
John Krist, Ventura Co.\*  
Greg Simmons (USDA)\*  
Mark Nyberg, San Diego Co.  
Nancy Holland, Kern Co.\*  
Tom Roberts\*

CRB Staff:

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

\*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 February 13, 2013. Olsen asked for clarification from Fisher on year-to-date expenses of \$288,000 and year-to-date we are at \$500,000. Fisher stated the \$288,000 was as of December 31<sup>st</sup> for December expenses and year-to-date at \$500,000 is as of February 13, 2013 meeting date. Martin noted clarification and minutes will reflect said dates. Galbraith stated minutes do not reflect meeting being held at Tulare Ag Commissioner's Office. Martin noted correction and said minutes will reflect correct location.

**03.06.2013. 1** Galbraith moved and Rabe seconded to approve Minutes from the February 13, 2013 Joint Operations Meeting, with said changes.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

## **Review of financial reports and approval of CRB action**

### **a. Financial Report for CRB Operations**

**Louise Fisher\***

Fisher reviewed the January 31, 2013 financials. Louise informed committee that contract has been written and approved and is in place. The year-to-date total of \$416,953 has been billed to CDFA for reimbursement. Regarding the January numbers, most everything is in line. Under Field Vehicles there have been a lot of repairs to vehicles this year, so that line item may run out of money before the end of the year. Everything else is on track and overall we are on track to be below budget or on budget for the year.

Rabe asked what the repair issues were. Fisher stated one vehicle went through water and froze the engine and was almost \$5,000. Gilbert stated there was one that slid off the road and into the orchard. Taylor stated that is currently being repaired and will be between \$2,500 and \$5,000. Rabe asked if these are insurance issues. Taylor stated the frozen engine is not; the other is being partially covered with our deductible of \$2,500. Fisher stated those figures are not reflected in these numbers.

When the budget came through there was a little bit of tweaking to do. The January annual budget will be very close to \$1,975,688.

Fisher let the committee know that the CRB audit has been completed and for 2011-2012, we have a \$1,400 to \$1,500 bill we need to submit to CDFA for reimbursement. Everything else for Operations looks good.

### **b. CDFA Expenses vs. Budget Report**

**Susan McCarthy/Staff**

McCarthy reviewed the Treatment Expenditures handout that was broken down by county. The numbers reflect a history of where we're at up through the end of February. The far right figures reflected in a box were the original projections. McCarthy reviewed figures for monthly expenditures at bottom of the handout and stated the monthly treatment budget for the remainder of the year would have to be cut down to a little under \$500,000 per month to stay within the budget.

Gorden commented on where we're way under budget, i.e. Orange County and San Bernardino County. Galindo stated there has only been a couple repeat grove finds they had to treat, so it isn't costing for repeat treatments. Gorden stated San Bernardino had originally budgeted \$600,000 but it was decided shortly after this budget was made, to discontinue most of the treatment in that area. McCarthy stated less than one percent of the budget, to date, has been expended for San Bernardino. McCarthy told the committee that we are at 19% of treatment budget but are also at 53% of expenditures for treatment budget at five months into the budget. We are expending well ahead of the budget.

Rabe asked if there is a proposal from management for staying within the \$500,000 expenditures for the remaining budget period. Gorden stated Dr. Leavitt will talk about overall funding and budgeting issues.

Tanouye had two handouts for the committee. The first was what was prepared by for USDA last October based on a \$10 million budget and reflects current CHRP fund allocations. This reflects how we've been operating from October 1, 2012 to the present, based on amount of funding and is for residential trapping only. The second budget sheet reflects cost to maintain current level of activities and respond to new detections, we would need a bottom line of \$13 million, instead of \$10million. Tanouye stated to continue what they're doing plus with the new detections in Tulare, Santa Barbara and other areas, it includes the response to that as well.

Rabe stated it looked like the two variable costs when comparing the two worksheets is the trapping and HLB survey, where the figures really go up. He's not sure we have the background here to recommend how to change this. Rabe suggests we get Beth Grafton-Cardwell, Joe Morse and one or two CDFA people to advise and come up with a recommendation on prioritization of funds and where to expend them.

Leavitt responded to Rabe's suggestion stating that the Secretary is working with him, Bob and others in forming a scientific advisory panel, just like they have in all their other programs. The panel will be six or eight people, whose names are still being worked out. Most of this committee will recognize all of them. They expect to have in place very soon to take questions like what this committee is talking about and get answers from a science point of view. Rabe expressed concern if it is going to be soon enough with all the constraints we have. Wynn stated he saw the proposed names yesterday and he is happy with every one of them. The Secretary hasn't seen them yet but will very soon and will get it out to Hill and the committee to make sure there aren't any issues with those selected. Wynn stated it should be done by the end of this week.

### **Regional ACP Management Update**

**Judy Zaninovich/Dave Machlitt**

**Bob Wagner/Susan McCarthy**

Wagner reported they had the two organic blocks that they were dealing with, a 30 acre block with Granite Hills Ranch and that was treated with a conventional pesticide on February 25, Danitol at 21.33 ounces to the acre. Gorden asked if the other block was waiting to be treated. Wagner stated there was one more that was treated; it was a ten acre operated by Mitman and Denny and was bifutated. It was partly in the 800 meters; the southeast 4 acres laid within the 800 meters, so they were treated also on February 26<sup>th</sup> with Danitol at 21.33 ounces. All of the blocks have been treated with conventional pesticides now.

Machlitt reported they've had three recent finds in Ventura County; two of them were in Santa Paula. The first one was a residential find and Galindo reported it was three adults in one yellow panel trap. That residential find does encompass some acreage on the east side of town. There is a commercial find also with one single adult. These two separate finds overlap about 20% and the second find involves quite a bit of acreage on the east side of town. He is working on the databases now and will send out the announcement of the find later today. There was a third find in Fillmore and was a single adult on a yellow panel trap. It looks to be a ranch residence on the highway with an abandoned grove.

Nyberg from San Diego County reported that they've divided the county up into eight areas for treatment. They've just completed the first one last Friday; Pala/Pauma with 2 outliers of significance and about two acres that were untreated. Once they get the stragglers done, it will be their first area wide treatment completed. They need to start scheduling for the remaining seven areas. Right now they don't have all the acreage encompassed by the ACP recent finds; but they do expect that to come later this year. They are going to begin to implement this area wide approach now as opposed to waiting.

Zaninovich reported that several of the treatment coordinators got together last Friday down in Southern California with Beth Grafton-Cardwell to talk about issues that they're all facing and treatment protocols. It was a good meeting and plan on having this type meeting on a more regular basis. She met with Dr. Havaar from USDA on the CHRP program; they toured around the ACP eradication area around Strathmore and Lindsay this morning.

Gorden stated he felt encouraged by this report. This is probably for many of the commercial growers, the future of our program in many respects, that we are starting to see emerge here.

### **Bio Control Program Report**

**Jim Gorden/Ted Batkin**

Gorden asked Pitcairn to give a brief report of what is going on with CDFA's part in this. Pitcairn has been assigned to work on the Biological Control Program portion of the projects. Pitcairn reviewed his handout. On page 2 he reviewed the Biocontrol Budget Request, stating the **initial request** was for \$500,000 and was based on estimates for setting up facilities at CSU Pomona at around \$200,000; upgrading Mt. Rubidoux at \$50,000 and updating CDFA facilities at Arvin would be \$150,000, totaling \$400,000. Another \$100,000 was added on for benches, soil, cages, irrigation supplies.

Pitcairn stated that at CDFA, they decided to split the \$400,000 out and provide \$100,000 that goes directly to the CRB and the \$400,000 was retained and that money is being used to develop facilities. They proceeded

then with having approval for the funding to go ahead and start on that. For Mt. Rubidoux they are hoping to develop 8,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse space which is another 5,000 that they're adding in square footage of greenhouse space; plus the laboratory space. At CSU Pomona they were going to add 5,400 sq. ft. of greenhouse space and then add some laboratory space. In Arvin they were going to retrofit some existing greenhouses that aren't functional right now, so then they have an additional 8,000 sq. ft. That was the goal and how the money was being directed.

Pitcairn stated they have an actual quote from CSU Pomona and it came back at \$275,000, which is \$75,000 more than what was estimated. Mt. Rubidoux they are expecting to be within budget and the Arvin facility will be a little higher because the wages estimated were low, making it \$35,000 higher. The total was underestimated by \$110,000. The initial plan was to have CHRP funds offset additional costs, however, future CHRP funds are uncertain. The best way to secure the rapid development of these facilities is to approve an additional \$110,000 for the project.

Chairman Gorden stated this committee doesn't have the authority to make that kind of commitment, but we can discuss it and send an indication of our views about it to the CPDPC meeting next week. It is a little more expense than what was originally anticipated for Cal Poly.

Hill asked how likely is it to have a start date of May 1, 2013. Pitcairn stated that Valerie from Cal Poly reported this week they are beginning demolition of the old greenhouse and shed that is there. Once it's out and the gravel is prepared then everything can go up in a month.

Gorden asked if we're still waiting for construction to start at Rubidoux. Pitcairn said Rubidoux is owned by the USDA National Resources Conservation District and is managed by the local Resources Conservation District in Riverside County. They have a board of directors that oversee all construction. It's their land and they have to do the upgrades and we would reimburse their costs. With the lease that we have, it is through the Department of General Services, which is another department within the State of California, and they were contacted about 14 days ago and started negotiation on what upgrades we want done, the cost and how they would get reimbursed. The reimbursement would go through the lease also. The conversations have been done with emails going both ways and it all looks very positive. There needs to be a vote by the board, which will happen in 2 to 3 weeks, then once that is done construction can begin.

Rabe asked how the funds from the CRB budget of \$100,000, will be used for the rearing program. Batkin responded for irrigation supplies, benches, whatever supplies will be needed.

Pitcairn went to page 3 of his report which reflects an estimate of how much it might cost to run each of the three facilities. Personnel is split between CDFA permanent employees and those contracted through CASS and are lumped together; salary and benefits are one number. The operating expenses for all three locations total \$598,360 annually. We get about \$350,000 from CHRP, which leaves \$248,360 for the requested amount.

Rabe asked if the \$350,000 CHRP funds to the CDFA were "tagged" for this program and that is what is allocated on the revised budget?

Dr. Leavitt stated there is a lot of uncertainty on budgets because of what is going on in D.C. right now. With the sequester order in effect, what we are being told right now is that it will affect all of our programs, all of our federally funded programs, approximately 5.1% across the board. On March 27<sup>th</sup> the current resolution expires, and some are saying there will be a new resolution; nonetheless, they are expecting more budget cuts. Since the beginning of the year, USDA APHIS has been holding back 25% on all contracts and all grants in order to account for this uncertainty. These CHRP funds are what is called a "Specialty Crop Line Item." There are several programs managed under the same appropriation, including Citrus Health and Response Plan, European Grapevine Moth, Light Brown Apple Moth and several others. There is some flexibility moving money from one program to the next, though not much since everybody is in the same boat.

Dr. Leavitt went on to say that CHRP funds are used primarily for ACP, HLB Survey and regulatory safeguarding functions, some laboratory support and biocontrol. What they had in federal fiscal 2011 was about \$11.5 million and what they have in federal fiscal 2012 was \$10.8 million and what they were *expecting* in federal fiscal 2013 was about \$10.1 million. With the 25% holdback, it cuts that down to \$7.8 million, while we're still spending at the \$10 million level. So far this year, we have received \$1.95 million from USDA, for the federal first quarter (Oct., Nov., Dec.) They're hoping to receive another \$1.95 million under the continuing resolution for federal second quarter (Jan., Feb., March). It has not yet been confirmed. For the first half of this fiscal year, they know they are getting \$3.9 million and have spent quite a bit more than that. They need to look at a couple different paths forward. This industry can talk to their representatives and talk to the USDA. Leavitt stated they have made their case and USDA is fully in agreement, but it's a tight situation.

Dr. Leavitt stated the other solution is to re-strategize and reprioritize what we're getting. He is facing a shortfall in his budget right now of approximately \$1 million from CHRP. Not sure exact amount because it does go through the end of March. He does have some funds that he thinks he can find to cover most of that. However, going forward, unless they have some assurance from USDA of additional funds, they will have to readjust all the CHRP expenses down to the realistic amount of another \$3.9 million; that would be until September 30<sup>th</sup>. It will require significant changes in the survey program. Dr. Leavitt stated from his point of view, the Secretary is going to say that the biocontrol effort is number one along with the HLB survey.

Wynn stated a couple things about the CHRP funding; he, along with Batkin negotiated this, the industry did this, they negotiated each of these amounts for a particular purpose, which doesn't mean that at that stage that is all you can use the money for, assuming you have money in that category that is leftover. But the mechanism which the USDA conveys this funding to CDFA is on the contract called a "Cooperative Agreement." Those cooperative agreements have attached work plans and those work plans state exactly what those funds are going to be used for. That can be changed, however, so we're not held to \$350,000 assuming you cut back measurably in another category, you could probably move funds over to the biocontrol. Leavitt concurred with Wynn and stated with USDA's permission and agreement, they can move funds around. The only way to avoid this is to find other revenue.

Olsen asked who was the final arbitrator and Leavitt answered it's USDA's money and they are the final arbitrator. Wynn stated they want to see our input as well because the CHRP funds are just a part of the funding for this whole program combined with industry assessment dollars as well.

Leavitt stated what he would like to recommend that we all work together to jointly decide what CDFA's recommendation is and then we give that to USDA. He can't say we'll get more revenue, but at least the way the money is being spent, he thinks they will agree to.

Rabe asked when the budget Pitcairn gave starts. McCarthy stated for when the facilities are up and running. Gorden stated you won't have all those people on the ground immediately to go. Rabe stated the \$350,000 is only for this fiscal year, so would you prorate the total budget since we may not need any money for this budget but will need everything for the next financial year. Leavitt said we could ask Batkin and Pitcairn for a timeline over the next 18 months on all the monies we will be taking in. Rabe stated we need to know a cash flow requirement for the next 18 months. Hill stated we need a better budgeting and understanding of where CHRP funds are going so the committee can make a decision on how we want to recommend if we have to re-file for those CHRP funds.

Gorden stated when they put together the budget, it was an estimated CHRP budget of \$10.09 million, and as Dr. Leavitt indicated, that cut back by 25% holdback, so all these numbers would have to be backed off by 25%; the lab was going to get \$1.69 million; Pest Exclusion was getting \$2.75 million; HLB Survey was getting \$4.23 million; and the county and state trapping was getting \$2.8 million for a total of \$11.57 million, which resulted in a shortfall of \$1.5 million.

Olsen asked if that would include the \$110,000 for the facilities; Leavitt stated it doesn't include that.

Dr. Leavitt stated the only thing he can say with a reasonable amount of certainty is the \$1.55 million per quarter. APHIS's budget in 2010 was roughly \$340 million; the president's budget for 2013 is approximately \$285 million, a 15% cut. APHIS PPQ has, from their point of view cut all the costs they can cut. If there are any additional cuts it will come out of support for safety programs.

Tanouye stated we need to start thinking about areas we would like to protect; i.e. production areas. Maybe we need to think about do we really need to treat in some of the urban areas that are miles and miles away from commercial citrus production. Do we really need to treat 800 meters in the heart of the city of Santa Barbara. They are treating in the city of San Diego. Treating in urban areas where they are killing psyllids, is it going to impact the commercial citrus grower? The original goal was to kill as many psyllids as possible; but with resources running out, we need to reprioritize what our goals are going to be. Protecting the commercial citrus in production areas, regardless of where it is, needs to be our goal.

Leavitt agreed with Tanouye and stated depending on the goals of this committee and recommendations as we move forward jointly, regulatory costs can be adjusted downward but that means there would be less regulation, less safeguarding; the HLB survey could be adjusted, though he doesn't recommend that. All of these numbers could be massaged downward from one category to another, depending on the goals of this committee.

Tanouye stated she didn't tinker with regulatory or the lab because those aren't really her purview. Obviously, if you have less HLB survey and less trapping there would be less costs to the lab. There are adjustments that can be made in the other categories as well.

Batkin stated what we're seeing already on the time sliders that come out of statistical analysis and the input from the Science Advisory Panel start overlaying and the answer is going to be extremely clear. These numbers are how the CHRP allocation dollars go. What the final answers are going to have to be is how do you merge what is real from CHRP with what you have within the CPDPC budget to accomplish your endgame. Batkin told the committee not to think losing a few CHRP dollars means everything will collapse. There is plenty of room to manage and adjust to get the endgame done without losing any capacity or capability. The endgame is preventing HLB from reaching commercial citrus.

Wynn asked Tanouye if she could prepare to date expenditures of CHRP funds for the CPDPC meeting next week.

Severns stated it seems we're spending where we're really shooting in the dark at a moving target. While we need to prepare for the scenarios, it is next to impossible to know what is going to happen in the near term.

Hill suggested that it would be prudent if staff put together some projections reflecting a 5% to 15% cut and if it is going to cut trapping or surveying. We need to know how much money CPDPP has along with CHRP funds.

Galbraith stated it appears there are harder numbers on the bio control part of the program; are we going to try and move forward on that part of it. Gorden stated the secretary of agriculture is strongly in favor of pushing ahead with that. Most everyone agrees on needing to push forward with bio control efforts.

Batkin suggested that we forward a recommendation to the CPDPC for the additional \$110,000; they are hard numbers that are accurate and Pitcairn has done a good job getting us to that point with this program. There is \$515,000 that we are getting from USDA that is not subject to sequestering or any of these budget changes because that is 2012 fiscal year dollars. If we don't solve the initial \$110,000 then we will have to take it from something else that needs to occur because the \$110,000 that Pitcairn is asking for is a solid number.

**03.06.2013.1** Galbraith moved and Olsen seconded to recommend to CPDPC the expenditure of an additional \$110,000 for the biocontrol program.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Rabe stated there is probably some very obvious places where Tanouye would be suggesting that we cut; if she could come up with those for next Wednesday for the full CPDPC. We need to see if we can get down to the next level before the next month starts. Tanouye stated they are still doing 800 meters in Ventura County and that takes up a lot of the crew and a lot of the money. Tanouye suggested looking at Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks because they are still treating the 800 meters and the commercial production is to the north.

McCarthy asked if Tanouye had a projection for Santa Barbara County. Tanouye stated she did but it doesn't include any treatments in Santa Barbara County at all. Santa Maria and San Luis Obispo there is commercial citrus nearby so maybe we should try to protect that area but if we go 800 meters in the city of Santa Barbara, that is another 3700 properties it involves and she is not sure what they're protecting there. Rabe stated we have a bad track record of doing that type of stuff. Gorden stated he would like the panel to take a look at what we have to show, if we've gotten anywhere with urban treatment. We need to look at taking the whole thing off the board. It is a difficult position to take but that would be the extreme. The end game is HLB. Anything that we can do to increase the speed and the accuracy to find HLB is getting closer to where we need to be.

Olsen stated that every dollar we spend on those treatments that don't have any affect is one less dollar that we spend on finding HLB.

Mulholland stated he agreed. History points out that no one has every stopped the psyllid once they got there; all we can do is fight it at the front and the movement here as best we can. It is economically impossible to stop the psyllid and is the owner's responsibility to spray. He is for building up the population of biological pest control. He is not an advocate for spending money for treatment in heavily infested areas, but feels we can do more with putting a border control up.

Hill stated the faster we get the Science Advisory Committee up to ask these questions, the faster we can make pertinent decisions based on economic and scientific facts. If it means abandoning the urban treatments, then so be it. We need some real hard recommendations from the scientists and move forward quickly.

Rabe stated the science committees have, in the past, recommended that science is the way to go. We've always told them to not look at the money but we cannot do that anymore. There has got to be some economics to their recommendations. We've always voted for the ideal but that isn't possible anymore; we need to be realistic.

## **Detection Updates**

### **Trapping Program Report**

**Art Gilbert**

Tulare County continues to be negative; they're still running 900+ transect traps; 800 in the Lindsay area; 400 in the Terra Bella area and are being checked every week.

Polek stated she has been out in the field and asked when trappers are in the field, are they looking at flush or are they just grabbing the traps or looking at the flush. Gilbert stated they are just grabbing the traps and bringing them in. Polek is concerned if people aren't looking at the actual flush. LeVesque stated maybe they should do that instead of the trapping if they're not getting any on the traps after this length of time. Gorden stated he looks at the flush when he is out there and he's not seeing anything either. Polek stated she hopes that the PCA's are looking.

Gilbert stated the transect traps are the same way. San Luis Obispo County they beefed up the trapping in both the county and in the groves. The citrus nurseries in the SLO County and commercial groves are being double checked continually also and nothing is showing up on them.

Gilbert stated at the last meeting there was talk about discontinuing the trapping in some areas of Riverside and Orange County and San Bernardino. In Hemet and Temecula where there have been a large amount of multiple finds, nobody wants to take those traps out yet.

Gilbert reviewed other maps in Southern California that represented traps that are just continuing to trap psyllids after every servicing. There are large amounts of multiple finds for the past 12+ trap servicing.

In the Yorba Linda area, where there is one of our field cage sites, it has large amounts of ACP finds. Repeat amounts continue.

In Hemet area, there was a treatment on January 29-30<sup>th</sup>. Prior to that there were multiple finds of psyllids. It has been inspected twice since treatment, on February 12/13 and 25/26 and they've only found 4 psyllids. Gorden stated that was an area wide treatment that treated all the commercial citrus in that area.

Olsen asked what the repeated collection of psyllids is telling us. It is just spending money that we could spend elsewhere. Batkin stated that is what the statistical analysis survey they're working on will tell us. From all the data collected and purged, we should be able to get an understanding of are we doing any good with any of it (trapping/treating) and a clear picture of where we need to go and what we need to do. Olsen stated it may even, with the commercial treatments not being effective, get into our whole tactic of dealing with organic growers and our tactic for area wide treatments. Batkin stated we may see that with some of the applications our timing has been off and not effective.

LeVesque suggested when collecting psyllids to make sure they are able to get nymphs because if nymphs test positive then you know you have a tree. Gorden stated when examining they could put that into the equation.

### **Treatment Update**

**Tina Galindo**

Galindo stated since February 1<sup>st</sup> they've had 99 detections in San Diego County, with 9 trucks working in the current areas listed on her handout and they're working in 10 different areas; some with multiple and overlapping treatment areas within that city. They had a meeting in Borrego Springs last night and have a pending meeting in El Cajon.

In Imperial County they're working in six different areas; again some have multiple overlapping treatment areas that they're currently working in. They have 5 trucks working in Imperial. Most areas just began treatment this week. Since February 1<sup>st</sup> they've had 48 detections in Imperial County.

In Riverside County they're working in four different areas with a total of 334 detections since February 1st in Mecca, Thermal, Coachella and North Shore, with eight trucks in those areas.

In Ventura they've had 14 detections; two recent new growth detections; one in Santa Paula and one in Fillmore. They are currently working in Thousand Oaks with 5 large overlapping treatment areas that they're in. They had a new detection in Oxnard as well, and have a pending meeting. They are working in Santa Paula with new detections and treatments beginning March 4<sup>th</sup> and two meetings are still needed. They are currently working Thousand Oaks with five large areas of overlapping treatment areas.

They have 5 trucks working in the new area in Santa Maria which were two overlapping detections. They just had a third detection confirmed and began treating February 28 and have one new find and pending meeting.

In Santa Barbara they have a pending meeting and have five detections right now.

Rabe asked the cost per day for a truck? TruGreen takes out about 200 gallons per day, per truck which adds up to about \$1500 per truck per day. Gorden stated he ran numbers on some of the treatments reported for the number of sites and area; it was running about \$60 per site to \$150 per site on average. There are a lot of

variables involved. Gorden asked what refusal rate to treat they are getting. Galindo stated it ranges 1 to 3 out of 100 refuse treatment.

They are treating 400 meters in Borrego Springs around groves and 200 meters around residential. When there is a find site that has been confirmed, they go out and treat the find and then set up the meetings for the areas to be treated adjacent to the find.

### **ACP Detections in Retail Nurseries**

**Susan McCarthy**

We've had pretty good reports from nurseries, it has been encouraging the last couple of reports.

### **HLB Survey**

**Debby Tanouye**

#### **Risk Based HLB Survey (Gottwald)**

Tanouye reported that in Imperial County they are complete and everything is negative so far. Currently they are focusing in Riverside County in Blythe to get that done and in Coachella Valley before it starts getting hot down there.

There was further discussion regarding Los Angeles County and under the current program it will take more than a year to complete Los Angeles County. Gorden stated our original goal was to get through the whole thing in the first cycle in a year. Gottwald had directed to go to other areas first to have balance in the areas that were being sampled so he could feedback into the program. Tanouye stated they haven't had any negative feedback from Gottwald and he gives them recommendations. He looks at the data and studies the hot areas and wants them to sample some of those lower in priority areas, so they send crews there. Wherever he wants them to go that is where they go. Tanouye stated Gottwald wanted them to go and look for a site, not target known areas of psyllid populations; he wanted them to look for citrus and collect psyllids from the citrus. They aren't using historical data. He said that is all built into his plan.

Polek stated at the Science Committee meeting in Orlando, it was discussed to collect root samples from the potential VOC positive tree in Hacienda Heights. Polek asked if that had been done.

Leavitt stated in the tree in Hacienda Heights when it was removed, the crews did remove the roots and they did take samples at that time. He believes there were ten samples taken and they were all negative. The plant protocol they have from USDA is a leaf protocol. They do not have a root protocol. Polek stated Magally got a root protocol from the Research team. Leavitt said that Magally can write whatever she wants and they're going to test it, but they cannot use anything for regulatory purposes that has not been approved by the USDA. Right now there is a leaf protocol. Polek stated you don't have to take regulatory action. Leavitt stated they tested the roots and they were all negative. They have a protocol for what they are going to test.

### **Hacienda Heights**

**Tina Galindo**

Galindo stated they just completed round 6 in zone 1 and they're just about to complete round 4 in zone 2 and they're still currently working on the second round (indecipherable).

Gorden asked who is taking the data from that, reviewing it and assimilating it. Tanouye said they've been collecting it but she hasn't been sending it to Rocky though, but she can. Then from Rocky it will go to Gottwald. Gorden confirmed that Gottwald ultimately gets that data? Tanouye said they can make that arrangement; no one specified where they wanted the data to go.

Gorden stated his concern is that it is just sitting on a shelf somewhere. We want to know that someone is getting the data and analyzing it and is capable of knowing what it means.

### **Laboratory Activities**

#### **a. Riverside Laboratory**

LeVesque reviewed her powerpoint. The Riverside lab is supposed to resume sampling on March 11<sup>th</sup>. They

resolved communication and chain of custody documents with CDFA and APHIS-CHPST. They did 656 Florida ACP samples processed for the pooling experiment. They read 9,201 traps. Current staff is the same. LeVesque reviewed time frame for goals. Everything is into Sample Ware. Everybody is certified and everybody passed. They all visited the CDFA lab in Sacramento to finalize resumption of testing. They visited the UC Davis containment facility to discuss lab involvement and time course experiments.

#### **b. Sacramento Laboratory**

Schnabel reported for the month of February. They had 1,525 plant samples tested; they were all negative. They had 1,920 ACP samples; all negative. They had 1,342 nursery service samples that tested all negative. Total was 4,787 samples that were all negative. Of those, 587 were quarantine samples and for the risk survey the number has jumped up to 597 high risk survey samples. Everything is negative for the month of February. They met with CRB and USDA APHIS about the communication protocols and they believe they are finalized. They have been collecting samples this week. To date they have 200 vials and it looks like the process is going to work so they can move ahead. They have a couple more days to collect samples and then they plan on making their first shipment to CRB on Monday.

Batkin thanked Schnabel and his staff for the outstanding lab tour and cooperative meeting.

#### **Data Management Report**

**Rick Dunn**

Dunn reported on the citrus layer project, they continue to have the interns at UC Kearney working on making calls to growers. In the month of February they contacted 37 growers successfully. They are primarily working on groves in Tulare County. Dun has been doing work on updating some old information from San Diego and Santa Barbara Counties. The Santa Barbara layer was in bad need of some revisions so he has been focusing primarily on that.

The attribution status is improving. He just received an updated layer from Fresno County Ag Commissioner and will be incorporating that information. He has been working on compiling the statistics from the basic specifics from the CPDPP trapping program. He doesn't have any results to share at this time. He is working with Greg Simmons on that.

#### **CPDPC Report**

**Susan McCarthy**

McCarthy stated the meeting is next week at the Double Tree hotel in Ontario at 10:00 a.m.

#### **Adjournment**

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 3, 2013 at 10:00 a.m., in the CRB conference room. The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 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 March 6, 2013.

---

Date

---

Ted A. Batkin, President