

**CALIFORNIA CITRUS PEST AND DISEASE PREVENTION PROGRAM
COMMITTEE MEETING**

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 19, 2016

Opening:

The strategic planning meeting of the California Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee (CPDPC) was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on April 19, 2016 in Valencia, California by Committee Chairman Nick Hill.

CPDPC Members Present:

Craig Armstrong	Gus Gunderson	James McFarlane
Richard Bennett	Nick Hill	Kevin Olsen
Franco Bernardi	Link Leavens	Etienne Rabe
Bob Felts, Jr.	Mark McBroom	Kevin Severns
Jim Gorden	George McEwen	

CPDPC Members Absent:

John Gless	Scott Mabs	Brian Specht
------------	------------	--------------

CDFA Staff:

Nick Condos	Victoria Hornbaker	Bob Wynn
Tina Galindo		

Guests:

Chris Boisseranc	Keith Watkins	Jack Williams
Brett Kirkpatrick		

*** Participated via Webinar**

Opening Comments

Chairman Nick Hill welcomed the Committee, staff, and members of the public and stated there is a quorum for the meeting.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Strategic Planning Session

To set the stage for strategic planning, Chairman Nick Hill solicited input from the representatives of the three citrus growing regions (desert, coast and valley). Nick asked the Committee members to comment on issues facing the different regions.

Desert Region

Mark McBroom began the report for the desert region, noting that impacts of ACP are financial and cultural; ACP management has interrupted normal integrated pest management. Mark stated that this has been a tough year, noting challenges with PCD mandated treatments, timing of treatments, chemicals being used, growers not versed in the impacts, changing chemistries, how and what to spray, spray to harvest and red scale and mite population increases. He is concerned that if changes are not made, then California will see the same results as Florida. Mark was concerned about the threat from residential properties and brought forward the idea that residential properties should be viewed as trees per square mile rather than trees per property. He was also concerned that PCA's are making ACP specific recommendations and feels that this could be detrimental, he said treatments for ACP should be combined with treatments for other pests to prevent over use of pesticides and potential resistance.

Chris Boisseranc agreed with Mark about the weakest link in the program being the residentially encroached areas and organic groves. He felt that the commercial growers are doing the right thing, which includes the commercial organic growers, but he was concerned about the organic growers that are not managing ACP. He was also concerned that in some counties, the Commissioners were not willing to use their abatement authority to take care of nuisance issues and abandoned groves.

Craig Armstrong also agreed with Mark that the commercial growers are doing a lot of spraying, he noted that the ACP are relatively easy to kill on contact, but they are either very prolific or move quickly back into the area. Craig wants the Committee to look long term and bigger picture. He feels that the program should increase HLB sampling in groves and residential areas. He feels that the growers, PCA's and agronomists are working toward doing the right thing, but sees the UC and CDFG as impeding the progress. He would like to see higher throughput and longer efficacy and feels that the UC is too slow in moving forward with new pesticide chemistries.

There was consensus from the desert representatives present, that the focus needs to be on looking for HLB in groves and to scale back on the outlying ACP finds in areas without commercial citrus. ACP are everywhere in Southern California, we have a weak trap and we are relying too much on biocontrol. They would encourage the formations of PCD's in other counties and would support a statewide PCD. They feel that funds should be focused on EDT's, establishing additional laboratory capacity (private) and surveying for HLB, but they urged that the Committee needs to be careful where the money is spent.

Coast Region

Gus Gunderson noted that the Ventura County growers looked into the idea of forming a PCD, but decided not to do it because it becomes an entity that can be sued and in Ventura they could not get backing from the County Board of Supervisors. Gus was concerned that the activities of the Program will be able to suppress ACP and HLB long enough for science to come up with a solution to overcome HLB.

Link Leavens stated that the Sunkist packers are currently assessing their industry wash capability. Additionally, Beth Grafton-Cardwell would like to see videos of industry wash

facilities to see if they are sufficient to comply with insect reduction protocols. Link noted that citrus growers should wash and tarp or pack in the region where the citrus is produced and he was very clear that growers need to collaborate to make this work.

Valley Region

Kevin Severns stated that so far in the Valley there has been good luck in knocking back ACP and he is concerned about changing the tactic in the Valley, noting that the areas may need to handle things differently based on the level of infestation.

Nick Hill agreed that there are different problems facing the three regions and that each district should be treated differently depending on where they are with ACP infestations.

Bob Felts, Jr. stated that it's just not the washing and tarping of the bulk citrus, but the crews and contractors that are associated with harvest and moving citrus that need to be educated about not moving ACP and HLB host material from location to location.

Etienne Rabe noted that the program needs to be more scalpel like in what we do, needing more coordination and management. He was concerned that the spray and move is a messy deal that requires spraying just for the sake of spraying. Etienne questioned the response treatments in remote locations that do not have commercial citrus nearby, such as Santa Clara or San Benito; he wants the group to consider testing for HLB in these areas and only treating if there is an indication that bacteria might be present. Etienne was adamant that the program must be nimble to act quickly without the bureaucracy.

Kevin Olsen asked about the distribution of nursery trees to residences and how it is handled and what policies guide it. Mark McBroom asked if CDFA or the selling nursery collects addresses where the trees will be planted to monitor and do trace forwards if something turns up positive at the nursery.

Program Goal

Teresa Siles, meeting facilitator asked the Committee to develop a goal that would be used to guide the strategic planning.

Richard Bennett recommended that the goal be to use all available methods, conventional and early detection technologies to find HLB infection. Jim Gorden refined Richard's goal to be to keep California citrus generally free of known HLB. The Committee reached a consensus that the goal should be:

Keep California Free from HLB

Teresa Siles directed the group to the outline that was provided by Kevin Olsen, titled HLB Discussion Points. She noted that the outline is fairly comprehensive containing topics on residential, commercial, nursery, transportation, data, laboratory, and other. Teresa asked the Committee if there were any topics that they wanted added to the discussion and they responded with biocontrol, quarantine enforcement, program management, timeliness of activities and communication.

Teresa led the Committee on a point by point discussion of the HLB Discussion Points, keeping in mind the goal that was identified, she reminded the Committee that we will be capturing big picture items and we will follow up at the next meeting.

Residential

- **Early detection technologies** – need to get the EDT’s tested so the growers have access to them. Look at how to use proven/well-vetted EDT’s as inputs into the program. Not for regulatory purposes to remove trees, but to potential being used to focus regulatory survey residential areas. Need to review current science to determine which EDTs are worth watching.
- **Psyllid trapping** – Need to be more effective, is there a better trap? To make a difference within the next two years then the program needs to get a better way to trap and collect ACP so we can be testing more in residential and commercial settings.
Action Item: Put together a proposal for the Committee meeting.
- **Psyllid collection and testing with PCR** – Testing of ACP as much as possible and if you see inconclusive then you go to the plant tissue. There is a lot of money being spent on collection and sampling of plant tissue, but we should only do this if we are seeing ACP with a Ct Value less than 40 (negative). Need a better way to trap ACP for so they can also be tested for HLB.
- **Urban outreach and education** – There seems to be a disconnect with the homeowners they don’t want CDFA to do anything to their tree; we need to do better at reaching the urban population.
- **Increase biocontrol** – Need to get more production so we can release in more areas, how much does it cost to get more production. The ACP biocontrol agents are expensive to rear; approximately \$0.51 per insect, thus the program is focusing on classical biocontrol and is conducting releases throughout Southern California. Residential should be the focus for biocontrol, it is an important part of the program’s control strategy in urban areas. This will be discussed in more detail at the May 11th meeting where the release strategy will be presented to the Committee.
- **Urban treatment protocol** - Program spends a lot of time trapping and monitoring outlying areas, like Santa Clara or San Benito and then treating when we find something, this should be looked at and maybe not spend as much resources. The protocol has been revised to 100 meter survey and treatment if only one ACP not near commercial citrus or 400 meters for multiple ACP detections or detections near commercial citrus. **Action Item: need to develop a revised response protocol for outlying areas, using a variety of factors to determine procedures (proximity to commercial groves; single or multiple find; etc.).** Not every find in an outlying area should elicit the same response; there should be a policy that allows flexibility. Is there commercial citrus in the area? What is the risk? How many ACP? Any additional ACP on visual survey? Then do we treat?
- **Regulatory removal of HLB positive trees** - Continue to focus on quick removal of these trees.
- **Non-regulatory removal of trees (PCR negative)** - What is the cost associated with the activities in the HLB hot spots and could people be enticed to sell their trees? Getting CCM and/or CRB to have a pilot project to get trees voluntarily removed. Emphasize

voluntary tree removal to the best extent possible. **Action Item: What is the cost associated with the monitoring and treatment activities per tree in an area, would it be more cost effective to compensate the resident and remove their tree?**

- **Residential program in general** - Look into re-classifying residential properties with a significant number of citrus trees as “commercial” properties, trees per square feet so the residential citrus owners have a stake in protecting citrus trees.

Commercial

- **Pest management areas** - Focus on getting more grower participation in Pest Management Areas. Implementation and acquisition of grower participation. In Southern California moved to PMA and PMA buffer treatments
- **Grove traps** – in Southern California, mostly moving away from trapping in groves to collection of ACP for HLB analysis, in the valley maintaining grove traps.
- **Grove Survey for positive ACP** – Currently the protocol is to conduct 800 meter survey and if goes into a commercial grove, then the protocol is to conduct hierarchical survey by pooling samples from 4 trees throughout the 800 meter area.
- **Abandoned groves** - These are a nuisance and the program needs to work to get trees removed. We need to work to get support of abatement authority from Ag commissioners. CDFA is working on a list of abandoned groves, with the help of liaisons. Is the Committee going to get involved into tree removal, recommending and funding? **Action Item: Develop official recommendations/policy from the CPDPP; use these recommendations as a foundation for outreach.**
- **Working with PCA’s** – Would like to see in-house grower PCA’s involved more with the program, they already do work with the Grower Liaisons and making sure that the Grower Liaisons are getting information from CDFA. CDFA does work very closely with the Grower Liaisons and makes sure they get the most current information.
- **Lab capacity for grower samples** -Build capacity for private labs to run grower samples. CCTEA received a SBG for about \$300,000 to develop a lab that can test grower samples; CDFA is working on the guidance document for private labs. With San Gabriel and Hacienda Heights samples, we exceeded the capacity for the CDFA lab creating a brief backlog. There are 3 additional private labs that are interested in grower service samples.

Residential Nursery Stock

- **Focus on enforcement** - Consider re-allocating resources to this area, this can be a potential hole here as HLB becomes more widely spread, We need to close this gap, by looking at opportunities with county, state and even private enforcers.
- **Outreach and education** - Production nurseries are working with their retail customers to make sure that they are educating retailers; NST and UC Extension are developing a distribution of educational materials for the retail staff. Master gardeners are working with nurseries in some areas as well.
- **Voluntary Compliance Program** - Amplify existing voluntary compliance programs via communication
- **Tree tagging** - Consider/look into tagging trees with additional information. Can we gather information to track where the tree is going? Can we put a tag on the trees to tell them where to go to get information to keep the trees healthy?

Commercial Nursery Stock

- Many have moved under screen and are following the USDA protocols.
- Commercial production nurseries are doing a good job
- Nurseries are pretesting their nursery stock that is under screen to make sure they are free from HLB at their own expense.

Transportation

- **Enforcement** - Need to follow up with our enforcement on tarped loads. All tarps are not created equal and all tarps are not applied in the same way. The program should collect compliance agreement from trucker. Need to do more spot checks for tarping and compliance... GWSS does a better job, but they pay the county. Can Counties take on the inspection at the Packinghouses, if so how much money would it cost, would all counties with packinghouses be willing to take this on? Consider developing a voluntary agreement within the industry, e.g. Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement (LGMA). Would require additional funding to get additional enforcement. Need to get to a practical aspect of how to prevent the movement of ACP. More spot inspections at all of the packers, small to large.
- **Outreach and education** – Need to focus on picking crew education to prevent hitchhikers on harvesting equipment.

Data Modeling and Analysis

- **Data Management** - Look for ways to improve and integrate data; consider a manager to do this. Integrate CDFA and industry get a clearinghouse.
- **Ct hot spot data** - Get a list of CT values from CT inconclusives and show them side by side.
- **Risk-based survey and modeling of urban demographics (Gottwald)** - CDFA waiting for the information from Dr. Gottwald.
- Doing a better job of getting data to Rick, but could do a better job in moving information from one level to another and integrating it

Laboratory Capacity

- **Build lab capacity** - Need to increase the capacity 10x. There is a need for commercial and private labs
- **Regulatory lab capacity** – CRB has voted to move ahead with seeking NPPLAP recertification and the Vidalakis lab at UCR is talking to the NPPLAP folks at USDA to see what he would need to seek accreditation. University of Arizona has entered into a grant with CDFA to handle ACP samples to assist with analysis.
- **Non-regulatory lab capability** - Testing of psyllids and tree tissue with PCR, CDFA is working on a guidance document that if a private lab is willing to operate under that can obtain a permit to do non-regulatory diagnostics grower service samples.
- **Canine Detection** - Canine detection teams for grove and backyard screening. Hopefully we will get a visit from the canine's here in CA this summer.

General

- **Program management** – Possibility of having a private entity assist with program management. Consider regular strategic plan discussions; updates on strategic plan at regular committee meetings.
- **Outreach and education** – we touched on this in earlier sections.

Motion: To explore what the structure of a public private partnership would look like, specifically for items that are outside the realm of CDFA.

First: Kevin Olsen

Second: George McEwen

Motion Passes: All in favor

Update and Discussion on Proposed Regional Quarantines

Draft Regional Quarantine regulation has been developed and CDFA will be having scoping meetings in May in Tulare, Ventura and Riverside area. This may take up to 6 months from the end of the scoping meetings to work through the regular rule making process to get to a point of implementation and it may not look the same as the proposal.

Review Committee and Subcommittees

Chairman Nick Hill discussed the Committee and Subcommittee attendance and asked for a motion to reaffirm the attendance records for the Committee and the by-laws, which stipulate that 3 consecutive absences can be a basis for removing an individual from the Committee.

Motion: To reaffirm the Committee attendance records and the by-laws which allow removal of members that fail to attend 3 consecutive meetings.

First: Jim Gorden

Second: Richard Bennett

Motion Passes: All in favor

Chairman Nick Hill also asked for a motion to make the recommendation to place Dave Tomlinson in the vacant Finance Subcommittee spot.

Motion: To recommend placing Dave Tomlinson in the vacant Finance Subcommittee spot.

First: Bob Felts' Jr.

Second: Jim Gorden

Motion Passes: All in favor

Kevin Olsen discussed empowering the Subcommittees; Outreach, Operations and the Science to move motions forward from the Subcommittees. He feels that the Subcommittees as they are operating now are very redundant; the Subcommittees just regurgitate their meetings at the Committee meeting, which is a waste of time. Kevin proed using a modified consent agenda, actions that the Subcommittee makes with the votes on the Committee meeting agenda. Committee members can pull the consent items for full discussion or they can make a motion to

accept the consent items as presented from the Subcommittees. There was a consensus that this was a very good idea.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held in Ventura, California on May 11, 2016 at 10:00am.