

## CPDPC Budget Task Force Meeting

February 14, 2017 Minutes

The meeting was called to order by James McFarlane at 1:00 p.m. on February 14, 2017. The following were in attendance:

### **Budget Task Force Members**

Gus Gunderson\*  
James McFarlane\*

Kevin Olsen\*  
Keith Watkins\*

Bob Wynn\*

### **Other Attendees\***

Craig Armstrong\*  
Jason Chan\*

Victoria Hornbaker\*  
Melinda Klein\*

Paul Martinez\*  
Kevin Severns\*

\*Participated via webinar

James McFarlane welcomed the Task Force members and attendees to the meeting and gave a brief description to the need for the Budget Task Force. He noted that the Committee approved a budget of over \$25 million, which will leave a reserve balance of about \$4 million. The Finance Subcommittee discussed this issue and would like to decrease that budget to bring the projected reserve back to about \$8 million. To do this the budget would need to be cut by about \$4 million.

Gus Gunderson commented that he has heard several times that the Committee should try to keep a reserve of about 50 percent of the budget to be used in the event that the Committee would be defunded. James noted that he had heard from the Secretary that this is a guideline, not a requirement. Kevin Olsen noted that the Task Force should look for the most efficient way to fund the program, through a triage of the program activities and the budgets, rather than setting a dollar amount and working to fit that. He was very clear that CDFA has not met their duty to provide funding level details to the Committee. He recommends picking the few items that the Program can do and do well and funding them and forgoing the items that might be lower on the priority list. James agreed that the goal is to make sure that the program spends the right money on the right activities. Craig noted that the Program needs to get the growers more engaged to get their groves treated and participating in area-wide, or not spend the money to treat in those areas. Keith agreed with Kevin O. that the priorities should be set and then see what funding would be appropriate for the activities.

### **Review 2016/2017 Budget and Expenditures**

The state 16/17 fiscal year spending authority is \$16,039,000 and the program has, as of December 2016, spent 54 percent of the authority. Bob Wynn talked about the activities that CDFA is doing to make sure that the program will have the excess authority, including spring finance letter and a legislative bill to get the additional authority for program. James said that the projection for the program through the end of June is \$21 million. James and Jason Chan reviewed the CPDPC and the CHRP budgets, describing the limitations for the CHRP budget with certain activities like treatment not being allowable under the CHRP budget. James reviewed each of the current CPDPC budgets and the CHRP budgets. He also showed an example of a detailed sub-budget.

James mentioned that he would like to see an analysis of the program activities by the science and operations subcommittees to see what they think are the program activities that are most important and to look at the return on investment for the program activities. Kevin O. agreed, adding that the urban

treatments should be discussed locally to get input from growers in the local areas, as they will be able to help set local priorities.

The group discussed several of the specific budgets including the HLB risk survey, biocontrol and urban treatments. There was consensus that finding and eradicating HLB remains the ultimate goal of the Committee, HLB detection, diagnostics and response activities should be the core of the program. There was discussion about biocontrol, both the parasitic wasp rearing and the efficacy of other native predators, including lace wings and lady beetles. The group felt that it would be helpful to have an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of the biocontrol program to ensure that the program is using the most efficacious and cost effective biocontrol agents. Urban treatment was discussed in more detail, Gus indicated that the program needs to have a good description of the urban treatment activities in the urban buffer areas and in the core areas. Craig mentioned that they are seeing reinfestation in some areas really quickly after treatment, around 10 days post treatments. Bob mentioned developing questions for the Science Advisory Panel on the items that the Task Force wants reviewed, like the biocontrol program.

The group began discussing what activities are core “keeps” and what activities should be reviewed further. The group decided that HLB detection and diagnostics, enforcement and outreach are all core activities that the program wants to keep, but that there might be some minor changes that would make the programs more effective. The urban treatment, trapping and biocontrol activities are items that the Task Force members would like to see reviewed further to look for efficiencies. They all agreed that they would like to see what the cost savings is for moving from 400 meters to 50 meters in the non-core growing areas. They want to see what is being spent and where they can save and/or become more efficient.

The next meeting was set for March 6<sup>th</sup> at 1:00pm. The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.