

## CPDPC Executive Committee Webinar

March 30, 2015 Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Nick Hill at 10:00 a.m. on March 30, 2015. The following were in attendance:

### Committee Members

Nick Hill\*  
Kevin Severns\*  
Craig Armstrong\*

### CDFA Staff

Nick Condos \*  
Victoria Hornbaker\*  
Debby Tanouye\*  
Scosha Wright\*

### Other Attendees

Bob Atkins\*  
Cressida Silvers\*  
Sylvie Robillard\*  
Judy Zaninovich\*  
Sandra Zwaal\*

\*Participated via webinar

### Discussion on Psyllid Management Area Buffer Treatments

Victoria Hornbaker reviewed maps that CDFA staff had developed showing areawide treatment areas in Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego and Ventura Counties. It was noted that CDFA was conducting the buffer treatments in some areas, where the Pesticide Use Reports (PUR) had been collected. It has been a challenge for the grower liaisons and CDFA staff to collect use reports in a timely fashion. The CDFA relies on these reports to determine that growers have engaged in the areawide treatments, once the PUR's are collected, the CDFA can conduct the buffer treatments. The problem is that the reports are submitted inconsistently and some counties are behind on entering the reports into their system which causes a lag for CDFA. The goal is to have treatments completed within two to four weeks. Imperial County and Coachella Valley both have active pest control districts and Ventura and San Diego have taskforces, which should help facilitate timely participation and PUR reporting. There was a suggestion to elect a grower for each area that will be in charge of other growers to ensure treatments are being done and pesticide use reports are being submitted. A few options were presented to the Committee and they were in favor of the fourth option presented.

Conduct the initial buffer treatments in conjunction with PMA treatments and verify participation after the treatments are completed. Based on participation rate (some number, 70 percent or higher for example). If a PMA meets the assigned threshold, the buffer treatments will be conducted for the next round, repeating the verification after completion. If the threshold is not met, the PMA will forfeit the next buffer treatment, but may get back in the program if they can meet the threshold for a later treatment. This will allow the program to participate in a significant fashion, but it will be expensive to treat all of the PMA's in Southern California.

There was also discussion about developing a smartphone application that growers can use to quickly let CDFA know that a parcel was treated. Nick Condos stated that the most important goal is not only grower participation rate, but suppressing the ACP population. The Committee decided that 75 to 85 percent of acreage treated in an area would allow participation in the buffer treatments.

### Develop CPDPC Communication Protocol

Victoria Hornbaker presented a draft flow chart for the communications associated with ACP detections. She presented this as a sample of a communication plan that might be amendable to meet the committee's needs. There have been some issues with communications being missed or delayed and from entities to unauthorized recipients. One such instance involves the CRB lab and an accidental communication outside of the memorandum of understanding. CDFA has taken steps to help guide the CRB on appropriate communication protocols. CRB has a permit to work with HLB which is being amended to require the notification of CDFA within 24 hours of a presumptive positive or anything found that is out of the ordinary. If CRB does not follow the communication protocol, their permit can be revoked. There has also been an issue with some of the scientists working on the early detection technologies (EDT) and discussing positive finds. The Committee stated that any information released should be coming from one source to eliminate confusion. Chairman Nick Hill suggested Nuffer, Smith, Tucker (NST) draft a brief statement direction CPDPC members and others on the correct communication protocol. He also mentioned that there should be one source where information be released from, Victoria's office. Victoria stated she would present the plan at the next Outreach Subcommittee meeting being held on April 15, 2015 and hope to have a

solution to present to the full Committee in May. Chairman The Committee also suggested having a similar document like the ACP detection notification protocol for an HLB find since the steps for the two finds would not be the same.

### **HLB Early Detection Technologies**

Bob Atkins stated that there was an EDT task force meeting held a few weeks ago where the Texas sampling was reviewed and the results seem very promising. The next EDT meeting is scheduled for April 16, 2015 at CRB. There should be a statistical analysis presented at that meeting which was suggested by Charla Hollingsworth from USDA. Bob went over each EDT and the progress each detection technology has made as well as discussed David Bartels cluster analysis. The EDT task force has recommended the Committee and CDFA focus on where the clusters seem to be, which CDFA has already implemented. Chairman Hill insisted that the EDT task force work quickly to discover which EDT will work best.

### **Enhanced Risk-Based HLB Survey**

Victoria presented a map that USDA has provided showing data from David Bartels hot cluster analysis and combined it with CDFA's trapping grid. The map shows CT-values that range from slightly below 37 to 40. CDFA staff resampled the sites where the ACP was originally collected from by gathering plant tissue and psyllids where they were available. Since March 27, 2015, the CDFA lab has tested 102 of 142 plant samples and all came back negative for HLB. Victoria presented a document with two options, one to incorporate Dr. Bartels data into the Gottwald Risk-Based survey as another layer of risk or two, conduct a separate based on Dr. Bartels analysis. The additional survey would sample the highest risk grids at a higher density than the lower risk grids. There was a question about what would be tested, nymphs or plant tissue and what part of the plant would be sampled. Victoria stated that there is no current work plan for testing flush, the work plan is for mature leaves, but CDFA can work with USDA to request a work plan for testing flush tissue. The separate survey that was presented for the cluster analysis would include sampling psyllids and symptomatic tissue. There was further discussion about the pros and cons of separating the two surveys versus combining them into one. Chairman Nick Hill suggested incorporating the two surveys for funding reasons, with the idea that there would not be a loss of specificity. Debby will work on a protocol to act as a hybrid of the two models and present it at the full Committee meeting in May for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33am.