

CITRUS PEST DETECTION PROGRAM (CPDP/Program)

operated by the

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA TRISTEZA ERADICATION AGENCY (CCTEA)

SPECIAL MEETING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE LREC Conference Room

January 24, 2023

MINUTES

TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

On-site: Dr. Georgios Vidalakis (Chair), UC/CCPP; Mr. Jim Gordon, grower; Dr. MaryLou Polek, USDA-ARS (retired); Dr. Ray Yokomi, USDA-ARS; Dr. Sandipa Gautham, UCANR. **TAC members absent:** Dr. Ed Civerolo, USDA-ARS (retired); Glenn Fankhauser, Kern County Ag Commissioner; Melissa Cregan, Fresno County Ag Commissioner.

On-Zoom: Dr. Beth Grafton-Cardwell, UC/LREC, Retired; Victoria Hornbaker, CDFa; Dr. Neil McRoberts, Professor, UC Davis; Dr. Weiqi Luo, USDA-ARS; Dr. Richard Lee, USDA-ARS (retired); Dr. Robert Krueger, USDA-ARS; Tom Tucker, Tulare County Ag Commissioner.

ATTENDANCE: CPDP Staff: On-site: Dr. Subhas Hajeri, Plant Pathologist/Program Director; Karen Westerman, Field Operations Manager; Mia Neunzig, Administrative Manager; Cindy Thomas, Greenhouse Supervisor.

On-Zoom: Tony Patino, Testing Supervisor; Tina Acevedo, Tissue-Prep Supervisor; Dolores Molina, Field Supervisor.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Georgios Vidalakis called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.
- II. **INTRODUCTIONS:** Attendees made self-introductions.
- III. **APPROVAL OF MARCH 29, 2018, MINUTES:** It was moved by Mr. Gordon, seconded by Dr. Yokomi, to approve the minutes as presented. The motion carried on a rollcall vote, all members present voting AYE.
- IV. **REPORTS:** Dr. Hajeri gave a brief background about the pest control districts in the San Joaquin Valley (SJV), the mission statement of “agency” (Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency), which is operating the “program” (Citrus Pest Detection Program -CPDP) and CPDP’s operations such as mapping, field activity and lab testing. “Committee” (Technical Advisory Committee) members felt the current mission statement was appropriate. Dr. Yokomi raised a question regarding the term “suppression” missing from the mission statement. Dr. Polek and Ms. Hornbaker agreed that the term “control” is synonymous with “suppression,” and it should be sufficient.

CPDP utilizes a high-risk-based survey (RBS) model for the ACP/HLB survey. With 20 years of weather data from over 270 weather stations, Dr. Luo shared his latest California climate pattern analysis and how this information can be used to select high-risk areas for the state's ACP/HLB surveys. Dr. Luo explained how the RBS model is dynamic, incorporates feedback, and improves every year. In answering a question from Dr. Grafton-Caldwell, Dr Luo explained how the RBS

model for Central California is different from that of southern and coastal California. In answering the question from Dr. Vidalakis, Dr. Luo clarified that climate data is used to select riskier locations based on recent and current weather conditions, which could be very favorable for ACP development. Dr. McRoberts added that he is looking into the correlation between ACP finds in the valley to other areas in the state; does the detection of ACP in the fall season is due to the rise of cryptic populations enough that the traps are catching, or the ACP finds are a consequence of hitchhikers entering the valley?

Dr. Grafton-Caldwell commented on the possible impact of degree days and climate change on insect development. Dr. Vidalakis commented on the timing of the flush, ACP development, and weather correlation. Dr. Vidalakis brought the flush data for discussion to see if it has any value in the RBS model such that riskier locations are selected for the ACP survey. Mr. Gordon commented on several factors affecting flush patterns in commercial citrus production, such as grove management, pruning, irrigation, microclimate, and others. Drs. Grafton-Caldwell and Yokomi made comments about the significance of degree days on insect development. **TAC proposed that Drs Luo and McRoberts include the 'degree day' data in the climate pattern analysis for the RBS model.** Dr. Vidalakis commented about the negative survey results; even though the program has no ACP findings through visual inspection, tap sampling, or 3D cylindrical traps, negative data is equally important information for the industry.

- V. **ACP Survey: Traps:** Dr. Hajeri explained how the program evolved over the last few years on ACP and HLB surveys and how the program selects commercial properties for the survey. Ms. Hornbaker talked about the experience of using cylindrical 3D traps by CDFA staff, where 3D traps did not perform well compared to yellow sticky traps. Answering Dr. Yokomi's question, Ms. Hornbaker talked about the difficulty of getting ACP off the yellow sticky traps for DNA extraction. Ms. Hornbaker talked briefly about the upcoming meeting of pest control districts and CDFA to discuss potential coordinated efforts in the valley. Dr. Polek suggested deploying a higher number of traps in an area where the breeding population ACP is found. Dr. Gautham suggested putting the traps for longer periods in a high-risk area. Mr. Gordon talked about the problem of finding CLAs in the valley when the low density of ACP might be mostly due to a persistent incipient ACP population. Dr. Grafton-Caldwell suggested putting high-density traps for longer periods in areas with i) repeat ACP finds and ii) near packing houses. Dr. McRoberts suggested that one possible avenue is for CCTEA to act as science support for the local ACP task force where the local needs and interests are aligned. TAC members discussed the possible role that CCTEA can play working cooperatively with CDFA, such as grove trapping under the right protocol and the right agreements. Considering an upcoming meeting involving CDFA and pest control districts regarding potential grove trapping activities and assessing the whole situation, TAC did not make any specific recommendation on the type of trap that should be used for the ACP survey, but the committee talked about discussing the **appropriate type of traps for ACP in the next meeting.**

- VI. **Multi-Pest Survey and Detection Program:** Dr. Hajeri requested the TAC to deliberate on the idea that the program can become a multi-pest survey and detection program which would be beyond CTV and HLB survey to include *Citrus yellow vein clearing virus* and exotic insect vectors and pathogens such as *Citrus leprosis virus*, citrus variegated chlorosis, brown citrus aphid, and others. Answering questions from Drs Luo and Gautham, Dr. Hajeri clarified that the current program focuses on training staff on CTV and ACP/HLB only; however, if the program expands, then the training would expand to include other potential pests. Drs McRoberts and Luo raised concerns

about survey efficiency when dealing with multiple pests and diseases at the same time. The consensus of the TAC was to pick the top 5-10 most important pests and diseases of concern to the industry and develop protocols and procedures. **Dr. Yokomi made a motion to make the program a Multi-Pest Survey and Detection Program. It was seconded by Dr. Polek. The motion carried on a roll call vote, with all members present voting AYE.**

VII. USDA-NPPLAP Certification and /or National Plant Diagnostic Network's STAR-D

Accreditation: Dr. McRoberts made comments about where the agency sits in relation to the regulatory program and talked about the advantages and disadvantages of USDA-NAPLAAP certification. Then he explained what is the National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN), how it is funded, and the main advantages of being part of NPDN, such as it provides standards for accreditation, access to USDA training programs, and networking to communicate with fellow diagnosticians to keep up to date with technology. Further, he explained two options available as per becoming part of NPDN: i) NPDN full membership and ii) NPDN **partner lab** status. The main difference is that the NPDN partner labs do not contribute data to the National Data Repository, nor do they receive subcontract funds from NPDN, but are active collaborators of the network in diagnostics, professional development, supportive tools, and communication. Mr. Gordon felt that the NPDN route might be beneficial to the agency but not necessarily the NPPLAP certification. Since the STAR-D program no longer exists due to budgetary issues, the NPDN is currently in the process of building a lab accreditation procedure. **The committee consensus was that the agency should participate in NPDN either as a full member or as a partner lab.**

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS: None.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Georgios Vidalakis, Chair

Subhas Hajeri, Program Director