

California Department of Food & Agriculture

Minutes

of the Meeting of the Pierce's Disease and Glassy-winged Sharpshooter Board
and Pierce's Disease Advisory Task Force
Held on Wednesday, November 19th, 2025.

Physical Location:

Trinchero Family Estates Building
501 Hopkins Rd, Davis, CA 95616 and via
Web-conference and Teleconference.

PD/GWSS BOARD

Members Present: Jeff Bitter*, Greg Coleman, William Drayton, John "JD" Harkey*,
Randy Heinzen, Kendall Hoxsey-Onysko*, Aaron Lange, Jim
Ledbetter, John McCarthy, Steve McIntyre*, Seth Schwebs,
Dave Teuschler

Members Absent: Rich Hammond, Trey Irwin, Dominic Rossini

PD ADVISORY TASK FORCE

Members Present: Chris Bowland*, Tracy Cleveland*, Glenn Fankhauser*, Kris Lowe, Beth
Stone-Smith*, Judy Zaninovch*

Members Absent: Casey Creamer, Ha Dang, Martin Mochizuki, Todd Sanders

OTHER ATTENDEES

Buddhi Achhami*, Chasika Bandna, Stephanie Bolton*, Noelle Cremers, Joseph
Damiano, Zachary Dashner*, Ariana De la Torre*, Anna Ferrera, Leah Gayagas*,
Mark Harrington*, Matt Kaiser, Giancarlo LaGiusa, Neil McRoberts*, Michael Miiller*,
Joe Monson, David Morgan, Stacie Oswald, Michelle Pham, Giuseppe Rosetti*,
Nicole Shorter, Tom Solury*, Miranda Townsend, Sean Veling, Myrna Villegas

*Denotes attendance via web conference or teleconference.

CALL TO ORDER

PD/GWSS Board Chairperson Randy Heinzen and PD Advisory Task Force Chairperson
Kristen Lowe called the joint meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

PDCP Statewide Coordinator Joseph Damiano conducted the roll call for the PD/GWSS
Board (Board) and the PD Advisory Task Force (Task Force). Quorums were present for
both the Board and the Task Force.

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Randy Heinzen took this opportunity to welcome everyone to the meeting. Task Force
Chairperson Kris Lowe also thanked everyone for attending and expressed her pleasure
in updating the Board, Task Force, PDCP, and all the various stakeholders on all the
recent Grapevine Virus Committee discussions. Joseph Damiano of the PDCP took the
opportunity to recognize the recent passing of Youngsoo Son, an employee of the CDFA
and valued member of the PDCP. Youngsoo was in charge of the CDFA Biocontrol

facility in Arvin, California and Damiano recognized his numerous contributions to the program and sympathies to his family. David Morgan, State Primary Scientist for Biological Control, elaborated on Damiano's comments and explained a brief history of Youngsoo's outstanding qualifications and work performance, and expressed both appreciation for Youngsoo's contributions to the Biological control program and sympathy for his passing as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Board member Aaron Lange stated that there was a recent video of Dr. Stephanie Bolton in Lodi, California and her work in canine detection of mealybugs as well as recent virus work. Lange expressed interest in sharing the video. The video was created and published by PBS with a positive response from viewers. Stephanie Bolton was also online and introduced herself by explaining that she works for Lodi Winegrape Commission, has worked on numerous virus committees, and has been funded by the Board for virus outreach projects. Technical difficulties prevented the video from being played during the meeting but a link was provided to virtual attendees:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M_XicEEBvGU.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Randy Heinzen asked the Board for a motion to approve the minutes from the joint Board and Task Force meeting held on July 1st, 2025. Aaron Lange of the Board commented that the composition of the minutes was impressive and captured all the contents of the meeting verbatim.

- It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed by the Board to approve the minutes from the joint Board and Task Force meeting held on July 1st, 2025.

Details of Board Vote

Motion: Greg Coleman Second: Aaron Lange
In Favor: Bitter, Coleman, Drayton, Harkey, Heinzen, Hoxsey-Onysko,
Lange, Ledbetter, McCarthy, McIntyre, Schwebs, Teuschler
Against: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Hammond, Irwin, Rossini

Kris Lowe asked the Task Force for a motion to approve the minutes from the joint Board and Task Force meeting held on July 1st, 2025.

- It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed by the Task Force to approve the minutes from the joint Board and Task Force meeting held on July 1st, 2025.

Details of Task Force Vote

Motion: Kris Lowe Second: Beth Stone-Smith
In Favor: Bowland, Cleveland, Fankhauser, Lowe, Stone-Smith
Against: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Creamer, Dang, Mochizuki, Sanders, Zaninovich**

**Not present for this action item

NEXT MEETINGS

The next Board and Task Force meeting was set for Thursday, January 29, 2026, at CDFA Headquarters, to begin at 10:00 AM. A poll would be sent before the meeting to help determine new meeting dates for 2026. Matt Kaiser of the PDCP stated that there would be an opportunity for additional training related to Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act rules if anyone was interested or available. Joseph Damiano stated that he had taken the training before and invited the Board and Task Force to attend. Due to conflicts with the Unified Wine and Grape Symposium and meeting logistics, the training was ultimately postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF NOMINATION COMMITTEE

Randy Heinzen of the Board asked if there was anyone willing to assist in the nomination committee for the next Treasurer of the Board. Board members Will Drayton and Seth Schwebs volunteered to assist in these efforts.

FISCAL UPDATES

Beth Stone-Smith of the USDA provided a brief update regarding federal funds. Stone-Smith began by informing the group that an area-wide update would not be provided during this meeting. This was a direct result of the recent federal government shutdown, as the initial days of staff returning to work were primarily dedicated to catching up on administrative functions. During the shutdown and while Stone-Smith was working without pay on other programs, the USDA was prohibited from performing any work related to PDCP, including corresponding, sending emails, or conducting other activities. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) was responsible for handling these matters in the interim. Stone-Smith affirmed that an update on this topic would be presented at the next meeting. Regarding the federal fiscal situation, Stone-Smith delivered positive news. A recently signed legislative package had funded the USDA through the end of the fiscal year. This development means that the USDA would not be operating under the continuing resolution and was not just awaiting internal decisions about allocations to programs. Stone-Smith was quick to point out that USDA staff has only been back to work for five days post-shutdown and had not yet initiated contact with USDA budget personnel. The process of receiving the full program allocation could extend for several months. Consequently, no specific funding numbers can be shared at this time. Stone-Smith reminded the audience that the CDFA had requested an increase in funding for federal FY 2026 compared to previous years, but the final outcome will depend on decisions made at higher levels within the federal government.

Myrna Villegas of the PDCP provided a brief update on PDCP program funds and their current status. Her report provides a summary of fiscal data, presenting the financial actuals for FY 24/25 and the budgeted amounts alongside year-to-date expenditures for the new FY 25/26, concluding with a breakdown of expenditure categories. The total actual reported for FY 24/25 amounted to about \$18.7 million. This figure is composed of \$2.8 million in board funds and \$15.9 million from other funds. The category of other funds included Federal funds plus resources from Reserve and Emergency Funds. Villegas outlined the financial plan for FY 25/26 and provided a status update on current spending. The total budgeted amount for the period was about \$22.3 million, which is allocated between \$2.8 for Board Funds and \$19.5 million for other funds. As the new fiscal year had just begun, year-to-date expenditure was currently low. The total expenditure to date was about \$3.5 million comprising \$107,498 from Board Funds and \$3.4 million from other funds.

Matt Kaiser of the PDCP provided an update regarding Board funds and their current status. For FY 24/25, assessment and interest revenue totaled just shy of \$4.3 million, while expenditures were just under \$5.3 million. The Board was expected to carry over approximately \$7.1 million into FY 25/26. Assessment revenue for FY 25/26 had been

minimal so far, though a few payments arrived early. The timing of incoming revenue was expected to shift due to Assembly Bill 1322, which moved the assessment due date from January 10 to January 30. The legislation also synchronized grape crush reporting timelines, moving the preliminary grape crush report from February 10 to March 15 and the final report from March 10 to April 30. As a result, assessment revenue may be reported later than in prior years. The projected assessment revenue for FY 25/26 was \$3.5 million. This projection was based on an informal estimate at the last meeting that the crop value may be down 15%.

Kaiser stated that expenditures for the current fiscal year were projected at about \$5.6 million. The budget includes the usual categories such as Research Projects, Public Outreach Contracts, and Urban Treatments. Last year's Urban Treatments budget was \$1.3 million. For FY 25/26, Urban Treatments were projected to be somewhat higher and closer to the previous full budgeted amount. The Delimitation and Rapid Response Contingency line was intended for urgent projects arising from unexpected detections in nurseries or residential areas. Kaiser stated that unfortunately, there have also been several such GWSS detections this year. Specific budgets for these Rapid Response efforts are not yet available because the counties are determining the associated costs. Urban Rapid Response Treatments were continuing with funding directed at treatments in parts of Solano County and other counties. Last year, the Board made a one-time allocation of \$850,000 to prevent cuts to County Contracts. Contract changes were subsequently implemented, and no additional funds were in the current budget for this purpose. Kaiser continued by explaining that Reserve for New Projects has been removed from this year's budget, following a previous Board decision. The previous reserve for this line-item was \$250,000. The total cost of last year's Grower Vote was \$85,065 against a \$100,000 budget. Approximately \$75,000 of this total covered Marketing Branch efforts, and another \$10,000 was billed through the Agricultural Statistics Service related to voter list generation.

REFERENDUM PROCESS

Joseph Damiano of the PDCP started the conversation with a synopsis on the recent referendum for the continuation of the Board. Damiano addressed the significant risks and inefficiencies of the current mail-in referendum process, which nearly resulted in the program's termination due to low participation despite strong industry support. Following a detailed presentation on alternative continuation methods, the board discussed the merits of adopting a public hearing model, which is used by a majority of other CDFA programs. The discussion began by addressing the critical issues with the program's current continuation process, which relies on a mail-in referendum. The recent referendum highlighted the system's fragility, as it only surpassed the required 40% participation threshold by a slim margin of 0.8%. This created a difficult situation where the program's existence was jeopardized not by a lack of industry support, but by voter apathy, difficulty confirming accuracy of the voter list, and the logistical hurdles of mail-in voting

Joseph Monson, Branch Chief of the CDFA Marketing Program, and Miranda Townsend, Associate Agricultural Economist for the CDFA Market Program, provided a list of options moving forward on the next referendum. Both identified a series of key problems specific to the current referendum process which include low participation, inaccurate voter lists, high operating cost, and lack of meaningful feedback. Townsend stated that the requirement for 40% of all eligible growers to return ballots is a significant barrier. In the last referendum, out of 7,100 eligible entities, over 2,800 ballots were needed, and the threshold was barely met. Had the turnout not been met, the program would have been terminated despite overwhelming support among those who did vote. Furthermore, Townsend stated that the grower list, compiled from a questionnaire sent by USDA NASS to wineries, is prone to significant errors. Wineries sometimes report third-party intermediaries instead of the actual growers, which artificially inflates the number of eligible voters and makes the 40% participation target even harder to reach. Both CDFA and PDCP lack the ability to identify

and fully correct these inaccuracies.

Monson continued by explaining the high financial cost associated with this method of operation. The process itself is expensive, with the last continuation referendum costing between \$75,000 and \$85,000, primarily due to the logistics of mailing and tabulating thousands of ballots. They also pointed out that the simple "yes or no" format of the ballot provides no forum for growers to offer contextual feedback, suggestions, or concerns. This was evident when some growers returned ballots with handwritten notes about issues like red blotch virus and mealybugs, indicating a desire for more nuanced engagement.

Both Monson and Townsend continued their presentation by providing an overview of alternative options for continuation used by CDFA programs. The options provided and presented were a Public Hearing, a Simple Referendum with either a majority "yes/no" vote, or a majority "yes/no" vote combined with a majority volume requirement, and a Full Referendum with a majority "yes/no" vote combined with a majority volume requirement and a participation threshold (which the PDCP currently uses). Both Monson and Townsend elaborated on the details of what these methods were. Public Hearings are the most prevalent method, utilized by 27 of 44 state programs. It replaces a formal ballot with public testimony, allowing industry members and the public to provide direct feedback. A Simple Referendum is a method that removes the 40% participation requirement, but it comes in two forms: a majority "yes/no" vote (used by 11 programs) and a majority "yes/no" vote combined with a majority volume requirement (used by two programs). Lastly there is Full Referendum, which is the most stringent model requiring 40% participation, a "yes/no" vote, and a volume requirement, which is used by only four programs, including the PDCP. Townsend stated that the current system is an outlier and that many comparable programs have adopted the public hearing model, finding it to be more cost-effective and engaging while maintaining industry authority and transparency. The Marketing Branch recommended that the board consider switching to a Continuation Hearing Process.

Following the presentation, the Board deliberated what would be the best path forward. There was strong consensus that the Public Hearing model offered significant advantages. The discussion then shifted to strategy and timing, focusing on the need for legislative changes and industry outreach. Board members agreed it was crucial to engage with grower associations first to explain the rationale, gather feedback, and ensure any change is not perceived as an attempt to overhaul the current system unilaterally. A possible legislative strategy was considered, which included amending the State statute. Michael Miiller of the California Association of Winegrape Growers (CAWG) explained that a "gut and amend" strategy could be used. This would involve introducing a placeholder bill in the upcoming legislative session for a simple five-year extension that could be amended later in the year to include the new referendum process, a potential program name change, and other adjustments. This approach would buy the board more time for deliberation and industry outreach without missing the legislative cycle. Overall, most Board members suggested waiting to allow more time for association meetings, while others noted the legislative calendar favors acting sooner. The urgency of seizing momentum from the recent referendum challenges and coordinating the change with a potential name change was also highlighted.

- It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed by the Board to direct PDCP staff to move forward with communications and development of materials regarding changing the referendum process to a continuation hearing process in preparation for further discussion.

Details of Board Vote

Motion: Aaron Lange Second: Jeff Bitter
In Favor: Bitter, Coleman, Drayton, Harkey, Heinzen, Lange, Ledbetter,
 McCarthy, McIntyre, Schwebs, Teuschler
Against: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Hammond, Hoxsey-Onysko**, Irwin, Rossini

**Not present for this action item

GRAPEVINE VIRUS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND ANNUAL RFP

Dr. Kristin Lowe, Chairperson of the Task Force and Research Coordinator for the PD/GWSS Board, provided an extensive review regarding the Grapevine Virus Committee and the annual RFP. She started with an overview of committee work on translating the National Academies' Advancing Vineyard Health report into actionable items for the Board and research funding. The report is approximately 270 pages across six chapters; a consensus study by 14 recognized researchers completed December 2024. Lowe reported that at the three committee meetings between May and October, there was open discussion amongst Board and Task Force members, along with industry, academics, and PDCP staff which concluded in a structured consensus that prioritized knowledge gaps and funding focus areas. Lowe continued her presentation highlighting latency period between virus inoculation and symptom expression, the importance of clean plants and strengthening the clean plant supply chain, and affordable, reliable, standardized viral laboratory diagnostics. Some additional ideas included continuation of remote sensing/hyperspectral imaging, virus infection dynamics in rootstock–scion interactions, and mealybug population dynamics and dispersal studies. There was a continued emphasis on inexpensive, grower-available, reliable diagnostics with cross-lab standards. Regional data sharing and area-wide management and the potential for more pest control districts. The committee also asked the Board to consider renaming the PD/GWSS Board to better reflect on the current mission that includes other pests and diseases and to be more aligned with the report's recommendations. Other recommendations included data-driven replanting; exploration of gene editing for viral resistance, vector management, and ultimately elevating clean plant program standards.

Lowe also spoke about a tiered system designed to emphasize specific pests and their subsequent danger to the industry for the annual RFP. For instance, Tier One pests would include Pierce's disease and vectors, especially GWSS, grapevine leafroll disease, grapevine red blotch disease, and mealybugs. Tier Two pests would include brown marmorated stink bug, spotted lanternfly, and grapevine fanleaf disease. Regarding the RFP process, Lowe stated that funding priority will favor Tier One proposals, including topics related to understanding the latency period, development and evaluation of area-wide management, data-driven replanting strategies, education on disease prevention and clean planting materials, and improved, affordable, reliable viral diagnostics. The RFP would open December 1, 2025; and had been revised to focus on near-term, measurable, grower-relevant outcomes.

Lowé concluded by explaining the research review process including the Research Screening Committee, which would include members of the Grapevine Virus Committee and must comply with public meeting rules. Lowé suggested the Research Screening Committee would meet again as usual in March or April, then could meet again after the research funding cycle is completed to review the process.

BOARD NAME AND OTHER POSSIBLE CHANGES REQUIRING LEGISLATION

Nicole Shorter of Brown-Miller Communications started the conversation by exploring the possibilities of changing the name of the Board. Shorter noted the current name did not reflect the Board's full scope of work, which covers additional viruses and pests, and instead proposed "Winegrape Pest and Disease Prevention Board," which was also unanimously endorsed by the Grapevine Virus Committee. Shorter outlined the rebranding process and how a name change would be rolled out.

The Board expressed concern that a name change could signal a shift away from Pierce's disease, potentially affecting federal funding. Beth Stone-Smith of the USDA noted federal agencies often treat grapes as a single category and are unlikely to track specific industry Board name changes, so funding impacts were unlikely. The distinction between the "Pierce's Disease and Glassy-winged Sharpshooter Board" and the "Pierce's Disease Control Program" were also broadly discussed. A question arose about whether specifying "winegrape" could limit future collaboration with table or raisin grape growers but the Board consensus was that winegrape growers fund the research, so the name should reflect that. It was emphasized staff should investigate any impacts of a name change, including whether it would require updating legislation for both the Board and the Program to ensure consistency. The Board expressed general support for the proposed new name but noted that further discussion within the industry was needed, as was further analysis on implications including legislative requirements and preferred terminology ("Board" vs. "Program").

- It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed by the Board to direct PDCP staff to move forward with communications and development of materials regarding changing the name of the Board in preparation for further discussion.

Details of Board Vote

Motion: Jeff Bitter Second: William Drayton
In Favor: Bitter, Coleman, Drayton, Harkey, Heinzen, Hoxsey-Onysko,
Lange, Ledbetter, McCarthy, McIntyre, Schwebs, Teuschler
Against: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Hammond, Irwin, Rossini

Finally, Michael Miiller of CAWG asked whether the Board would be interested in being involved in setting the fee for the Grape Crush and Grape Acreage Reports in the future. General consensus by the Board was that they were not interested and that those reports and associated fees were outside of the scope of the Board.

RESEARCH PROGRAM UPDATE

Matt Kaiser of the PDCP provided an update regarding Board funded research and related topics. He started by stating that the Unified Grant Management (UGM) website at hosted by UC Davis will again be used for the RFP process, running from December 1, 2025, to January 31, 2026. He noted that CDFA is developing new Salesforce-based grants

software, which may be implemented next year.

Other updates included a recent announcement by Foundation Plant Services (FPS) reporting one red blotch detection and one leafroll positive were found in the classic foundation this year and the vines were removed. Trace-forwards did not reveal any additional issues. FPS was moving forward with building a second new greenhouse, with a potential open house in April 2026. FPS received an additional \$174,000 from the National Clean Plant Network, supplementing board funding for moving varieties into the greenhouse. A public scoping meeting for the Nursery Registration and Certification (R&C) program was scheduled for December 10 to review regulations, particularly concerning virus issues. The National Grape Research Alliance (NGRA) website now features an inventory of current grape research projects, including funding and research information. A Red Blotch Roadmap group had released a document with identified priorities, which may lead to related funding applications. A hybrid grapes conference would be held in Davis on January 26, 2026, and an NGRA workshop on grape improvement was held on November 5, 2025. The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) was seeking nominations for its new Scientific Prioritization and Review Committee (SPARC), which may be of interest to industry groups.

Kris Lowe added that some researchers had expressed concern over the new cost of obtaining clean cuttings from FPS, which were previously free. FPS now offers cuttings to funded researchers at a strong discount but can no longer provide them for free since last year's costs totaled about \$25,000. This creates challenges for researchers, especially when they need cuttings to develop preliminary data before securing funding, potentially slowing the research process.

OUTREACH AND EDUCATION UPDATE

Nicole Shorter of Brown-Miller communications provided a brief synopsis on recent public outreach efforts, and stated plans to incorporate new ideas discussed at the recent Grapevine Virus Committee meeting. Shorter stated that the next quarterly newsletter and postcard would be distributed to over 5,000 growers and stakeholders soon, including stories on GWSS eradication projects and spotted lanternfly. Additionally, a monthly newsletter reaches about 1,100 stakeholders with an average open rate of 45% and click through rate of 4% for board website reading. Media coverage report includes coverage of referendum passing, assessment rate set, and new "quiz infestations" in county material development. Shorter attended trade shows in Turlock and Fresno the previous week. In Turlock, viticulture advisor Carl Lund presented on the seriousness of Pierce's disease and the Stanislaus County Agricultural Commission spoke about GWSS infestation issues. Significant booth engagement was reported, and Shorter stated that overall, trade show outreach generated strong engagement and awareness. Spotted lanternfly (SLF) advertising and engagement was ongoing, and American Vineyard advertisements ran in September as well as web banners that ran in August and October. Meta ads in English and Spanish ran August–March, reaching 631,000 people. Post-engagements such as clicks, likes, shares, comments, and site referrals reached 1,100. Digital outreach achieved broad reach and measurable engagement. Steve McIntyre suggested promoting the USDA Tree Assistance Program (TAP), which may be able to help with removal of diseased vines, in future outreach.

PDCP OPERATIONS UPDATES

Stacie Oswalt of PDCP provided an update regarding Nursery Operations and PDCP Operations as well. Oswalt stated that over 5,000 shipments and nearly one million plants have moved in the Approved Treatment Program (ATP), with no regulatory actions taken. A high-risk nursery delimitation recently concluded in Modesto, Stanislaus County and a second nursery delimitation in Sonoma County was nearly complete. Both appear to be isolated "hitchhiker" incidents with no other life stages found. Overall, there are five counties that have ongoing urban delimitations/rapid response activities including Santa

Clara County, where a new delimitation in Morgan Hill is planned and predatory wasps have been released. In Kings County there is a new project in Hanford. In El Dorado County there is ongoing work in El Dorado Hills with significant treatments in response to GWSS detections. Parasitized egg masses have been collected. The Vacaville, Solano County project is nearing eradication with only one adult detected year to date. Stanislaus County has done extensive treatments in the Turlock project area in response to GWSS detections. Suppression treatments will continue through November. A full summary of 2025 efforts will be reported at the January 2026 Board meeting.

Further discussion ensued regarding the rising urban infestations. Several Board members stated that despite nursery inspection success, urban infestations are increasing in number, duration, and cost. Sources of new infestations are difficult to trace and likely not the result of commercial nurseries. Homeowner plant movement is suspected, but this is nearly impossible to verify or conclude while hotter weather and milder winters may be increasing GWSS populations. Tracy Cleveland, Napa County Agricultural Commissioner, discussed the role and challenges in tracing “patient zero” for these types of infestations, since the counties lack the resources for in-depth investigations. Neil McRoberts, Director of Western Plant Diagnostic Network and an Associate Professor at UC Davis, mentioned the potential for drawing from Citrus Huanglongbing (HLB) and Asian Citrus Psyllid (ACP) experience that a data-intensive, risk-based approach that improved detection efficiency. McRoberts further stated that a similar research project could be launched, requiring data sharing and collaboration with Agricultural Commissioners to identify likely pest pathways. David Morgan of PDCP stated that GWSS differs ACP due to the numerous host plants that can sustain it and greater flight ability, which immensely complicate tracking efforts. Napa County’s local wine grape pest control district was cited as a successful model for local engagement, funding, and outreach.

Lastly, Stacie Oswald used this opportunity to thank and congratulate Dr. David Morgan of PDCP who was retiring at the end of 2025. Oswald mentioned how critical Morgan was in the initial creation of the PDCP and his effectiveness in the development of the CDFA Biocontrol program that they rely on so much. Dr. Morgan thanked Oswald and everyone for the recognition and provided a brief overview of biological control strategies and goals. The Board and the Task Force echoed Oswald’s comments and wished him the best of luck in retirement as well as all his future endeavors.

AREA-WIDE PROGRAM UPDATE

Beth-Stone Smith of the USDA previously stated during the fiscal updates that no updates were available for this item due to the recent government shutdown.

OTHER ITEMS

None

CLOSING COMMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT

Board Chairperson Randy Heinzen and Task Force Chairperson Kris Lowe adjourned the meeting at 1:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted on January 12, 2026, by
Giancarlo LaGiusa, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Pierce’s Disease Control Program
California Department of Food and Agriculture