

CPDPC Executive Committee Conference Call

June 9, 2014 Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Nick Hill at 1:00 p.m. on June 9, 2013. The following were in attendance:

Committee Members

Nick Hill*
Kevin Severns*

Other Attendees

Bob Atkins*
Stephen Brown
Nick Condos
Victoria Hornbaker
Cressida Silvers*
Debby Tanouye
Don Willey*
Bob Wynn*

*Participated via telephone

Review Outcomes of Strategic Planning

Nick Hill discussed the strategic planning session that occurred on March 12th and the Strategic Planning Session Discussion Summary document that was provided at the May 14th meeting. He stated that the Summary was very well written and inquired if the Committee reviewed the Summary at the May 14th meeting. Kevin Severns noted that the Summary was not discussed in detail at the Committee meeting, but that several Committee members commented that they thought that additional planning sessions would be held. Victoria stated that the consensus of the Committee is that CDFA should provide reports to the Executive Committee for review prior to sharing with the full Committee.

SAP Recommendations & Implementation

Victoria provided the Executive Committee with a summary of the SAP recommendations with CDFA's planned implementation for each item within CDFA's jurisdiction/responsibility. Victoria listed each item and the Executive Committee members made recommendations for moving ahead or placing the items on the July 9th Committee meeting agenda for additional discussion. The following is a list of the items discussed:

- Appropriate size of treatment areas – **Place on July 9th Agenda**
- Minimal width of trapping buffer on the international border – Existing 2-mile buffer is appropriate, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Are early detection technologies appropriate for use now – Additional data is required before a decision can be made, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Is it beneficial to freeze dry leaves – CDFA already does this for the UC and CRB scientists and will continue doing so, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Beyond what level of HLB survey will the Committee see demising returns – CDFA recommends continuing HLB survey work without, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- What role should tree nutrition play in ACP/HLB management – SAP rejects the idea of allowing CLAs infected trees to stay in the ground, while treating them with nutritional supplements, **Executive Committee would like this on the Agenda.**
- What methods should growers use to facilitate the establishment of *Tamarixia radiata* – CDFA will use outreach subcommittee and outreach contractor to message about acceptance of biocontrol agents and include message on ant control, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- What should the length of the ACP and HLB quarantines be, **Place on July 9th Agenda**
- In lieu of the field cleaning process, chemical treatments are now considered sufficient to mitigate risk of spreading ACP on bulk fruit, stems, and leaves from commercial groves in areas of low ACP prevalence – SAP does not feel that the chemical treatments provide sufficient control, **Place on July 9th Agenda**
- Are there other efficacious alternatives for control or eradication of ACP in commercial organic groves and residential areas – CDFA is working with UC Extension to optimize treatments, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.

- With most of the ACP detections in Tulare County being on traps placed on poles rather than within the canopy, should we change trap placement for the ACP program – Decision pending the outcome of those trials, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Complete High Risk HLB Survey twice a year – CDFA plans to complete the survey twice a year, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Facilitate rapid exchange of information with USDA on the High Risk Survey - CDFA will share data in a timely manner and provide monthly Situation Report, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Re-train HLB inspectors – CDFA has a proposal for training, **Place on July 9th Agenda**
- Share results (may be preliminary) of Hacienda Heights Experimental CLas survey, **Ask CRB to report at July 9th Meeting.**
- The SAP suggests that a high priority of the CPDPC is sampling and testing for CLas in psyllids in commercial citrus groves – Ongoing CDFA activity, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Expanding capacity for CLas sampling – Between the two labs there is ample capacity, but there might be room for developing efficiencies. The labs will meet to review protocols and report out at a later date, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- A CLas positive Asian citrus psyllid nymph would indicate that the tree the nymph was collected from was Huanglongbing (HLB) positive - CDFA vetted this recommendation through the primary plant pathologist and the primary entomologist on April 7, 2014. Both primary scientists concur with the SAP recommendation. The recommendation was also presented through the incident command system and met with concurrence from USDA; **this will be placed on the July 9th meeting Agenda.**
- Voluntarily remove presumptive positive Hacienda Heights citrus trees – CDFA defers to CRB, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Develop optimal size of areawide treatment programs – Liaison have begun to develop areawide treatment areas and Dr. Tim Gottwald will also be providing recommendations on this issue, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.
- Urban treatments around commercial citrus. The current CDFA protocol is to treat urban areas 400 m around commercial citrus, **This item will already be on the July 9th Agenda.**
- Management of abandoned or poorly managed groves, this is ongoing work, Executive Committee agrees, no need to agendize.

CASS Contract (path forward for grower liaisons)

Victoria reported on the existing CASS contract and proposed a path forward. She indicated that the current CASS contract is in place until June 2015. It contains position for the Statewide Coordinator (CASS Employee) and Grower Liaison (GL) contract positions for San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, Fresno, Kern, Santa Barbara/San Luis Obispo and Tulare 1 and 2.

San Diego County has hired a GL under their trapping contract and Imperial County is seeking to use the \$50,000 from the CPDPC to fund a liaison position.

An RFP was issued on June 5th for positions in Fresno, Tulare 1, Kern, Riverside and Ventura due to either the need to fill vacancies or because the current liaison is getting close to the \$50,000 cap. Tulare 2 and Santa Barbara positions are ongoing as they both were recently hired. San Bernardino is seeking to become a CASS employee as there is an issue with the liaison providing the additional insurance.

For July 2015 there are several options:

1. Pursue new CASS contract with Liaisons as employees – due to recent DGS interpretations of existing and pending CASS contract language, highly unlikely that DGS will approve and new contract and there would be a 30 percent increase in costs to cover benefits and overhead.
2. Pursue new CASS contract with liaisons remaining contract employees. CASS will not enter into agreement as there is an issue on the contracting manual that limits their administrative overhead to 8 percent of the first \$25,000 dollars of a contract, basically eliminating their profit.
3. Begin CDFA RFP process in December 2014 to insure that there is not a lapse in coverage.

Committee and Subcommittee Vacancies

Victoria discussed the CPDPC Member Terms spreadsheet that was presented, noting that Members, Gorden and McFarlane's terms expire on September 30, 2014. Chairman Hill asked Victoria to reach out to Members Gorden and McFarlane to determine if they would like to extend their terms for an additional 4 years.

Victoria also discussed the recent vacancy that was created by Member Birdsall's resignation from the Committee. She reviewed the Food and Ag Code section 5914 that describes filling vacancies, which states that the Secretary will immediately fill vacancies based on the recommendation of the Committee. Victoria provided a draft press release that can be posted on the CDFA website and circulated to trade publications. The Executive Committee agreed that the press release would be an appropriate way to reach out to interested parties. It was further explained that resumes will be gathered and reviewed at the Committee level, with a recommendation for placement coming from the Committee to the Secretary for review and action.

Treatment and Trapping Cost Comparison (efficiencies)

Debby Tanouye provided a summary of a treatment and trapping cost analysis that she provided to the Executive Committee. She noted that CDFA continues to maintain a contract with a pesticide applicator that can be used if the program needs rapid, large scale pesticide applications, but she noted that the contractor is more expensive than the CDFA crews. The contractor charges approximately \$1500 per truck per day, whereas the CDFA crews cost approximately \$800 per truck per day. The CDFA rapid response teams and equipment are located throughout the state and are able to respond within 24-48 hours. In order to avoid a new State mandate, our eradication authority is for the State to perform the eradication activities. Legal supports this approach as it keeps the Counties from using our State eradication authority in a manner inconsistent with the Department's goals. For the counties to be involved in eradication activities they would have to be under contract and CDFA would be the lead agency and they would be restricted to work within their own county. Stephen Brown noted that there may be additional issues with Counties engaging in pesticide treatments and Victoria noted that of the counties she contacted on the issue none had trained staff or equipment.

Debby also presented a cost analysis of trapping activities noting that 11 Counties are currently under contract to conduct urban ACP trapping. She stated that although costs may be higher for county personnel than for CDFA staff, it is not a cost savings for CDFA to conduct the trapping in many areas, because we do not have local staff. Additionally, this is efficient because most of the counties have other pest detection trapping contracts which allows for piggy-backing the ACP traps with other traps in the urban setting. She noted that some counties choose not to enter into a contract with CDFA to perform trapping functions.

For commercial grove trapping CDFA staff does all of the trapping as the location and inspection data for the traps is electronically maintained using Nomads. Additional Nomads would need to be purchased or the data will not be maintained. The Citrus Research Board would have to work with multiple county staff versus one employee from CDFA. With CDFA performing the grove trapping, staff is able to cross county lines. If counties performed the grove trapping, more personnel and vehicles would be needed as county staff would be restricted to their county and cannot cross county boundaries. Each county would need trappers and vehicles. There would be an increase in personnel, vehicles and all of the other items involved with the trapping.

Kevin Severns asked why this information was generated for the meeting and Victoria explained that she was contacted several months ago by multiple Counties inquiring about additional money for trapping and treatment activities that had been discussed at a CCM meeting. Victoria and Debby wanted to make sure that the Committee had a full understanding of the current division of work and costs associated with program activities.

Chairman Hill stated that he wanted Debby to present the analysis at the Committee meeting on July 9th.

Regulatory Staffing Shortfall (specifically retail nurseries)

The topic of retail nursery inspections was brought up at the May 14th CPDPC meeting. There was concern from several Committee members about the lack of retail nursery inspection in Southern California. Nawal Sharma presented a brief timeline of retail nursery inspection activities. In 2011, Pest Detection and Emergency Projects

(PDEP) completed a survey of Southern California nurseries and found ACP to be present in 2-3% of all retail nurseries within the quarantine area. At that time ACP was known to be present at very few retail nurseries. With escalating pest pressure from the surrounding environment and the surge in ACP presence in Southern California, the number of retail and production nurseries becoming infested with ACP was increased. As of October 11, 2012, approximately 13-16% of all retail nurseries in the Counties of Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino were infested with ACP. Just before all CASS field staff were laid off in June 2013, data was reviewed which showed 20-25% of nurseries were found to have adult ACP on host plants in Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. All nursery inspections ceased after that date because of lack of resources. Nawal presented a budget of what it would cost to bring the program back to the previous level of inspection work, approximately \$1.1 million and \$1.3 million to meet expanding quarantine needs.

Victoria also noted that the Nursery industry is proposing self-regulation at the retail nursery locations. Arron Dillon will be presenting the proposal at the July 9th CPDPC and CDFA is hopeful that working with Nursery industry there may be a new path forward for preventing ACP movement out of retail nurseries.

Chairman Hill would like the retail nursery issue on the July 9th CPDPC agenda.

CDFA Staff Performance Appraisal/Expectations

Chairman Hill discussed his desire to have an annual review of the Committee and CDFA program staff to insure that standard participation levels are met and that the CDFA program staff is meeting Committee needs. Victoria recommended having monthly Executive Committee meetings in the short term to make sure information was flowing appropriately to the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee agreed to meet monthly if there were items to discuss.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next meeting will be announced at a later date.