

**CALIFORNIA CITRUS PEST AND DISEASE PREVENTION PROGRAM  
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

Meeting Minutes  
Monday, July 11, 2016

**Opening:**

The regular meeting of the Operations Subcommittee was called to order at 2:00 p.m. on July 11, 2016 via webinar by Subcommittee Chair Etienne Rabe.

**Committee Members Present:**

Ed Civerolo*	Beth Grafton-Cardwell*	Etienne Rabe*
Jim Gorden*	Jason Leathers*	

**Committee Members Absent:**

Tom Avinelis	George McEwen
--------------	---------------

**Interested Parties:**

Jill Barnier*	Colleen Murphy-Vierra*	Cressida Silvers*
Victoria Hornbaker*	Karen Overstreet*	Keith Watkins*
Leslie Leavens*	Sylvie Robillard*	Bob Wynn*

**\* Participated via telephone/WebEx**

**Opening Comments**

Subcommittee Chairman Etienne Rabe welcomed staff and the members of the public participating in person and online.

**EDT Texas II Results**

Etienne shared some slides that were provided by Neil McRoberts at the EDT task force and the CRB meeting. The first slide showed how the various EDT's did in detecting HLB in a single limb known to be previously PCR positive and in a 3 other limbs evenly spaced around the tree. The Slupsky and Leveau labs both indicated all 4 samples to be suspect with a rate that was 80 percent or better. The PCR labs did well, better than 70 percent on the limbs known to be previously PCR positive, but fell below 40 percent for the other limbs from the tree and the other EDTs were less consistent on all limbs from the tree. Similarly, the second slide compared the results from the known negative trees. Slupsky, Leveau and the majority of the PCR labs did a good job of indicating that all samples from a tree were negative. The other EDT's didn't do as well in indicating that the known negatives were negative. The third and fourth slides dealt with the unknown trees (field trees, PCR negative and asymptomatic), the Slupsky and Leveau labs indicated that the majority of the unknown trees were suspect positive and the PCR labs indicated that all were negative. The other labs indicated suspect positives and suspect negatives. Etienne mentioned that CRB is in discussion about doing another test in Texas and also perhaps beginning to gather baseline data from California trees/varieties. The group discussed the results they stated that the study did a good job of providing data for each EDT that could be compared

against the other EDTs. They also felt that the Texas II study may only be showing the difference between indoor and outdoor grown trees and other environmental stressors including diseases should be included in any test going forward.

### **Regional Quarantine Proposal**

Victoria Hornbaker provided information on the status of the Regional Quarantine Proposal. She discussed the 4 scoping meetings that were conducted in May and June. The meetings were put together to collect stakeholder comments. The comment period ended on June 30, 2016. The comments are being compiled. Once the comments are compiled the proposal will be amended and shared back out to the CPDPC, most likely in August. She showed the proposed quarantine maps and discussed the regions. In the proposal as presented to stakeholders the only mitigation that could be used to move bulk citrus would be a wet wash, either in the field or in a packinghouse. She noted that the proposal didn't have too much detail, as to allow industry to come to the table with multiple wet was scenarios. She referred to a study completed by Spencer Walse conducted using various wash techniques and that most of them would be acceptable for disinfecting the fruit of ACP.

Beth Grafton-Cardwell presented information on the preharvest sprays, noting that some sprays are not as good as others and that industry should work on that. The concern is that growers are moving ACP from areas of high ACP populations. She talked about Spencer Walse work and noted that maybe a fumigation or bin drench would be effective to disinfest the fruit of ACP. She noted that growers need options and choices for mitigating the movement of ACP.

Etienne asked about a timeframe for the process. He mentioned that spray and move is still in place and will remain in place until the new regulations are approved and in place. Victoria mentioned that 6-9 months would be a very optimistic time frame; a more realistic timeframe may be a year or more. Etienne requested that CDFA provide industry with a "not before date" for implementation of the recommendations to prevent unnecessary intermediate costs.

### **Update on Results of Dog Visit**

Victoria explained that the Detector Dogs visited California on the week on June 6<sup>th</sup>. The dog team is funded by a MAC grant and they are seeing great results in Florida and Texas, with experimental suspect detection rates over 99 percent . The dogs visited Los Angeles (residential trees Hacienda Heights and San Gabriel), Kern (residential trees in Bakersfield and commercial trees Maricopa) and San Bernardino (commercial trees in Redlands and residential trees in Mentone) Counties. The dogs alerted on multiple locations (29 trees total) and every tree that the dogs alerted on was sampled and qPCR was conducted by CDFA and USDA labs. The samples were tested on multiple primers by USDA and all of the results were consistent. All results were negative except on tree in San Gabriel. The tree was removed on June 18. There is ongoing sampling being done on these trees. The CDFA and USDA are in discussions about looking at other diseases that may impact the trees health. This was good information that gives a starting point for future dog team visits. There was a question about sending samples from these trees to other EDT's and CDFA and USDA are working on developing a protocol for this. Beth feels that this is a great opportunity to get samples to other EDT's to see if they pick something up prior to PCR.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.