



**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (CDFA)
CALIFORNIA CITRUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CCAC)
January 26, 2012 Meeting Minutes
Teleconference**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Kirkpatrick, Chairman
Gus Gunderson, Vice Chair
Etienne Rabe
James Sherwood
Franco Bernardi
Keeley Bramer
Mark Golden
Seth Wollenman
John Eliot, Jr.
John Gless
Ron Matik

INTERESTED PARTIES

Kathryn Hogan, Hogan Family Ranches
Bob Blakely, CA Citrus Mutual
Gavin Iacono, Tulare County
Ruben Arroyo, Kern County
Manuel Villicana, Kern County
Jennifer Stilwill, Kern County
Scotti Walker, Fresno County
Ron Bray, Riverside County

CDFA

Steve Patton
Andrew Valero
Susan Shelton
Stacey Hughes
Sarah Cardoni

MEMBERS ABSENT

David Hines

ITEM 1: ROLL CALL

The Committee was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Mr. Brett Kirkpatrick, Chairperson. Roll was called and a quorum was established.

ITEM 2: FREEZE UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Stilwill, Kern County, stated that on December 20, 2011, samples taken showed evidence of freeze injury but nothing was out of tolerance. For January, there were roughly 70 tests conducted in which 16% showed evidence of freeze injury with nothing out of tolerance. There have been no rejections in the packinghouses.

Mr. Gavin Iacono, Tulare County, stated that nothing has been done specifically for freeze work. Monitor cutting has been done while conducting maturity samples and exports. There has been a little freeze damage on fruit coming from cold areas and nothing has been out of tolerance. There have been no rejections in the packinghouses or field.

Ms. Scotti Walker, Fresno County, stated that a sample pulled in December showed evidence of freeze damage, but nothing out of tolerance. On January 20, 2012, field samples that were taken after cold temperatures were cut. Three orange samples showed damages of 0%, 27%, and 40%. Other varieties revealed that W. Murcott had 8% damage, mandarin had 2.5% damage, lemon had 10% damage, and a Cara Cara

had 58% damage. There were non-compliances on two bins of oranges that had freeze damage.

Mr. Mark Golden noted that each county had their own system for observing freeze damage and asked if there could be a protocol in place so that there is uniformity across the counties in the way they report their data.

Mr. Steve Patton stated that there is no protocol until an official freeze declaration has been established. Once there is the declaration of a freeze, there would be an inspector in every shed. Assessments of freeze damage should occur in the fields and be reported to counties. Furthermore, because of the maturity issues and the maturity testing that is still occurring, freeze monitoring is taking place in the packinghouses. The Program has sent out two letters to counties indicating that they should continue to monitor for freeze damage at this point. In addition, Program staff has been working with counties to ensure freeze monitoring is occurring.

Mr. Patton stated that the Program welcomes industry input on how the Program can improve the data that is collected from counties by creating a procedure they are to follow during a pre-freeze situation. It is very clear what must be done once a freeze is established. The protocol should include how much information is expected from counties and how much time should be spent on freeze cutting.

Dr. Etienne Rabe asked what percentage of freeze damage either in the field or the packinghouses must be seen in order to declare an official freeze. Mr. Patton replied that there is no set percentage of damage and that it is declared based on industry and Program assessments.

Dr. Rabe suggested that in order to get consistency to quantify where industry is in regard to freeze damage for navels, mandarins, and lemons, that counties should conduct a blitz for the next ten days in all facilities. Following the ten-day blitz, the Committee will have a report that is consistent between all counties and will assist in an accurate decision of how to proceed.

Ms. Stacey Hughes stated that there are procedures in place for counties to follow that are outlined in a synopsis that specifies cutting procedures. Furthermore, Program staff have been in contact with all counties to ensure consistency in freeze monitoring. The counties have been instructed to take cursory samples from the field bins coming in and off of the pack line and to record that information. Official freeze sampling will not take place until there is an issue. Until then, freeze monitoring will continue.

Mr. Ruben Arroyo, Kern County Agricultural Commissioner, stated that CDFA supervisors have been out to all counties to ensure uniformity in the freeze monitoring process as far as cutting and sampling. He stated that the data from the counties is consistent; it is just being expressed differently. In addition, the method of data collection is different among counties.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that if there were consistent reports from counties it would make it easier for the Committee to assess the freeze situation. Mr. Patton agreed that there should be a consistent collection and standardized method of reporting that data amongst counties in order for the Committee to make an informed decision on whether to declare a freeze.

Discussion ensued regarding the different ways to best to approach a pre-declared freeze situation.

MOTION: Dr. Rabe motioned that; one, CDFA will work on developing a protocol for the counties to follow, including a data sheet that is acceptable, the number of samples to be pulled by county in a certain given time, the location of where those samples are to be taken, and the time frame in which to give it to the advisory committee; and two, to keep the meeting open and reconvene next Tuesday by teleconference at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Mark Golden seconded the motion. A roll call vote was called. Mr. Ron Matik opposed the motion. The motion passed by a majority vote.

ITEM 3: REGULATION UPDATE

Mr. Patton provided the Regulation Update Report. He stated that a regulatory package for the proposed regulation change to the California Standard was returned to CDFA for changes. The requested changes required an additional 15-day public comment period that has ended. Public comments received were addressed and the regulation package will be resubmitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL).

ITEM 4: PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

ITEM 5: NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will reconvene at 10:00 a.m. on January 31, 2012.

ITEM 6: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was recessed at 11:50 a.m. by Mr. Kirkpatrick, Chairperson.

Respectfully submitted by:



Sarah Cardoni, Office Technician
Inspection and Compliance Branch
Inspection Services