

**CALIFORNIA CITRUS PEST AND DISEASE PREVENTION PROGRAM
REGULATORY TASKFORCE MEETING**

Meeting Minutes
Friday October 12, 2018

The Regulatory Taskforce meeting was called to order at 1:11 pm on October 12, 2018 by the Taskforce Chair Etienne Rabe.

Taskforce Members Present:

Aaron Dillon*	Link Leavens*	Dr. Etienne Rabe*
Dr. Beth Grafton-Cardwell*	Mark McBroom*	Nawal Sharma*
Victoria Hornbaker	Joel Nelsen*	Keith Watkins*

Taskforce Members Absent:

Angela McMillen-Brannigan

Interested Parties:

Bob Atkins*	Brett Kirkpatrick*	Neil McRoberts
Dr. Kyle Beucke	John Krist*	Keith Okasaki
Holly Denniston-Sheets	Dr. Jason Leathers	Tracy Moehnke*
Rick Dunn*	Leslie Leavens*	Bob Wynn*
Sara Garcia Figuera	Raymond Leclerc	Sandra Zwaal*
Sara Khalid		

*** Participated via Webinar**

Opening Comments

Dr. Etienne Rabe welcomed the Taskforce, staff, and members of the public participating in person and online. It was noted that there was a quorum for the meeting.

Revised Qualitative Risk Model for Bulk Citrus Movement between Regional Zones

Sara Garcia Figuera described the objective of the qualitative risk model as estimating the risk of introducing *Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus* (CLas) infected Asian citrus psyllid (ACP) when moving bulk citrus between the regional quarantine zones in California. She reviewed the methodology for developing the risk model, noting that the original ratings were developed by staff in the McRoberts Lab. This included defining risk as the likelihood of an adverse event and magnitude of the consequences, developing a tree structure to estimate risk based on United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) guidelines for Pest Risk Assessment (PRA) and establishing risk factors on the lowest branches of the tree structure. She then described how she selected the risk factors that were used to define the quarantine zones and the USDA guidelines for PRA and assigned a qualitative rating of “negligible”, “low”, “medium” or “high” based on available data and expert opinion. Once the risk factors were described and qualitative ratings were assigned, she combined them using DEXi, a program for qualitative multi-attribute

decision-making. She noted that some risk factors apply to the zone of origin, and some to the zone of destination.

After presenting the model to the Regulatory Taskforce on September 14, 2018, Sara was asked to allow a panel of Taskforce members the opportunity to assign qualitative risk ratings to the risk factors. Twelve stakeholders were invited to participate, including five grower representatives from the Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee (CPDPC); four California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) staff; one employee of the Citrus Research Board; the grower liaison coordinator and one University of California (UC) researcher. Of the twelve invitees, nine participated. The raters were provided a spreadsheet, instructions, and an invitation to suggest additional risk factors and propose weighting criteria. This was done prior to the October 12th Regulatory Taskforce meeting.

Sara presented the outcome for each risk factor. The first risk factor was the level of ACP infestation in the zone of origin. Zone 1 was uninfested by definition and was given a negligible risk rating. Zones 2, 3 and 7 were considered to be partially infested and were given a rating of low to medium risk. Zones 4, 5 and 6, being generally infested were given a rating of medium to high risk. Sara did receive a few comments on this risk factor, including, “there is citrus everywhere, so the likelihood of a psyllid being present at the zone of origin can’t be *Negligible*,” and that there was a request for information from latest ACP find maps for each county to be included in the review.

Risk factor two was described as whether Hunaglongbing (HLB) was found in the zone of origin. There was 100 percent agreement on this risk factor. HLB has not been detected in zones 1-5 and 7 and that it had been detected in zone 6. Raters wanted to know what the weight of this risk factor was in the model. An additional risk factor for the zone of origin was suggested, this was the risk associated with organic citrus acreage.

The third risk factor was the commercial citrus acreage in the zone of destination which relates to availability of hosts for establishment. Zones 1 and 7 received a rating of low risk, 3 and 6 got a rating of medium and 2, 4 and 5 received a high rating. It was noted that data from 2018 Citrus Report would be useful to determine the extent of commercial citrus, as there is scattered production throughout the State (e.g., mandarins in Butte county).

The fourth risk factor was the density of residential areas in the zone of destination. There was clear agreement that in zones 4, 5, 6, and 7 there was high risk of residential areas in these zones, zones 1 and 3 were medium risk and zone 2 was split 50/50 between high and medium risk.

The fifth risk factor was climatic suitability for ACP, this includes temperature, elevation, and rainfall. Most raters used the USDA plant hardiness maps. Zones 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 received a high

risk as those areas are very suitable for ACP establishment. Zone 1 was split between high and low, due to part of the area being too cold and having high elevation. Zone 5 was split between high and medium due to the hot desert areas.

Risk factor six evaluated the density of packing houses and the volume of fruit movement into the zone of destination. Zones 2 and 4 were rated high, zones 1, 3, 6 and 7 received a low rating as there aren't packinghouses in those areas, and zone 5 received a medium risk rating.

Risk factor seven included assessing the damage potential in the zone of destination. Zones 2, 4 and 5 received a high risk rating, zones 3 and 6 received a medium risk rating, and zones 1 and 7 received a low risk rating.

Risk factor eight, the environmental potential for spread, aligned with risk factor 5, the only deviation between the climatic suitability (risk factor 5) and environmental potential for spread was zone 7, where it switched from high risk for climatic suitability to medium for risk of establishment.

Risk factor nine was the level of participation in insecticide treatments in commercial areas (AWM). Zone 1 was low, as there are not any ACP detections in this area and therefore no treatments. Zones 6 and 7 received low ratings, zone 3 received a medium rating and zones 2, 4 and 5 received high ratings. There was some discussion about the variability of treatments throughout the different zones.

Risk factor ten was described as the frequency of insecticide treatments in residential areas. Zone 1 received a negligible rating again and there were no ACP detections in this zone. Zones 2, 3 and 7 received low ratings, zones 4 and 5 received medium ratings and zone 5 received a high rating due to the intensive treatments in response to HLB detections. The group discussed the variability of residential treatments and recommended removing this risk factor.

Risk factor eleven was the level of implementation of a biocontrol program. It was suggested to remove this risk factor and the group decided to remove it as it did not impact the outcome of the risk model. Sara stated that she would remove this risk factor from the model.

Sara noted that for each risk factor, the majority rating was used. She noted that the risk with the new ratings increased for some combinations of origin and destination, but none of the combinations provided a decrease in risk. Sara mentioned that the next step would be for her to interview the raters to set decision rules on the risk factor utility tables. The Taskforce agreed to participate in interviews prior to the next meeting. Sara will share the outcomes with the Taskforce at the next meeting.

Review Mitigations for the Movement of Bulk Citrus Between Regions

Victoria mentioned that California Citrus Mutual has been working on the Evergreen direct spray and that news should be coming out soon. There is still some work to be done with counties in preparation for approving post-harvest application structures. She mentioned that Nawal and his team will take a closer, more in-depth look at hand field cleaning and she noted that staff will be reaching out to remind Counties of the appropriate mitigations measures. Keith Watkins asked to have the topic brought back to the Full Committee meeting in November for consideration to remove the option for hand field cleaning.

ACP Regional Quarantine Removal Criteria

Dr. Kyle Beucke, Primary State Entomologist, stated that he and Dr. Beth Grafton Cardwell conferred and could not find any data to support reducing the time frame from two years to one year for proving that an area is ACP free. Beth stated that she recommends four flushing cycles, not four flushes, and further described this to be spring season followed by a fall season in the same year and a spring and fall season in the following year. Kyle will develop a criterion to remove an area from an active regional zone using the two-year time frame and present it at the next meeting. He will be using San Benito County as a test case for the removal criterion

Etienne mentioned that with the revised risk matrix the mitigations may be revised based on risk.

The next Regulatory Taskforce meeting will be a joint Science Subcommittee on November 7, 2018 at 2:00 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.