



California Citrus Nursery Board

Registration and Certification Protocol Committee

Minutes of Meeting

February 12, 2015

A conference call meeting of the California Citrus Nursery Board's Registration and Certification Protocol Committee was called to order by Committee Chairman Bob Zuckerman at 11:03 a.m. on Thursday, February 12, 2015. Most of the attendees gathered at the Lindcove Research & Extension Center while others chose to participate on the phone. Roll was taken showing a quorum not present with the following in attendance:

Members

Bob Zuckerman

Government Representatives

Danny Harmon, USDA, APHIS, PPQ

Sean Hardy, CDFA

Michael Hennessey, USDA, APHIS, PPQ

Tracey Novak-Marin, USDA, APHIS, PPQ

Francisco, Quintana, USDA, APHIS, PPQ

*Nawal Sharma, CDFA

Nicole Steggull, TCAC

Tom Tucker, TCAC

Ernie Webb, USDA, APHIS, PPQ

Helene Wright, USDA, APHIS

Guests

Tom Delfino, CCNS

Dusty Ference, California Citrus Mutual

*Ricki Kupper, UCR

Nursery Representatives

Jeremy Bahne, The Burchell Nursery

CC Callison, Willits & Newcomb

Mauricio de Almeida, The Burchell Nursery

*Aaron Dillon, Four Winds Growers

Matthew Dynakowski, Hines Growers

Tim Golden, Colorama

Julia Johnston, Willits & Newcomb

Jose Lima, Paramount Citrus

Leonard Massey, B&Z Nursery

*Aimee Meidinger-Smith, Brokaw Nursery

Gary Moles, Willits & Newcomb

Tom Mulholland, Mulholland Nursery

Roger Smith, Tree Source

Roger van Klaveren, Generation Growers

Donnie Williams, Paramount Citrus

Staff

JD Allen, Assistant Manager

John Gilstrap, Manager

* Indicates participation on the phone

ACP/Shipping

Zuckerman explained that the meeting had been called to discuss how to deal with the regulations as they stand at this time, and to do as much as possible to make sure the nurseries, CDFA, and the universities were all on the same page. Smith suggested that Zuckerman give a brief history of how we got to where we are now. Zuckerman explained to the assembled group about the workings of the Science Advisory Panel (SAP) and his interactions with CDFA, and USDA. It was suggested that possibly having frequent and regular meetings with all of the involved entities during the season, would be helpful in determining needed changes more quickly.

Massey was asked to give some feedback regarding his experience with the current regulations. He commented that there seemed to be some flexibility among inspectors which was good in some ways but could also cause a problem with consistency. Something would be acceptable one time, and then the next time a different inspector would have an issue even when all of the relevant factors were exactly the same. Massey said it would be better to have one consistent set of rules.

Golden mentioned that the regulations were slowing business down too much. He gave the example of drenching inside an approved structure every 60 days as something that seemed extreme.

Delfino brought up the use of Movento and asked if anyone had received push back from counties? Some said counties reject product treated with Movento or other similar products. Sharma said he is not sure why this product is specifically listed and said the regulations should have listed just the active ingredient rather than the brand name.

Smith asked if there was any formal appeal process to deal with counties who are being more strict than required by CDFA/USDA guidelines, and if not, could one be created? Smith also asked in the meantime, is there anyone with CDFA (a czar) who could be called that has the authority to call a county and intercede? Sharma said he was not sure but, would check into it. Mulholland pointed out that the County Ag Commissioners have a monthly meeting but, we have no idea if issues such as these are discussed. Sharma said he would try to get on the agenda at an upcoming meeting of County Ag Commissioners and asked Dillon to send him an email outlining this problem which he would then discuss with the Commissioners.

Zuckerman distributed an Existing Regulations Matrix (Exhibit A) for the group to review. This matrix describes the proper permits, treatments, and methods of transportation in every possible movement scenario.

Zuckerman asked CDFA how things went during the season from their perspective. Hardy said he thought it went well, and he reviewed some of the key issues regarding treatment logs and Certificates of Quarantine Compliance (CQC). Smith said there were still a lot of inconsistencies and that he recently met with 4 inspectors who told him something different than what Hardy said about treatment logs. Specifically, Smith was told when moving from an approved structure from an quarantine area, to an orchard in a non-quarantine area, the treatment logs must accompany the movement, whereas Hardy said that was not the case and the logs just needed to be reviewed by the inspector. Smith reiterated the need for someone who could be called and would be available to resolve this issue on the spot. Zuckerman said it was also important to have a single place nurserymen could go to get all of the movement regulations in one location. At a prior meeting of this group it was decided that the CCNB website would be that place but, CDFA has not been yet able to organize the links in a way which would make sense for the CCNB website.

Zuckerman said it was important to move the discussion along to how to handle 2015 since there was no chance any regulations would be changed anytime soon. With this he explained the matrix handout and Zuckerman went through some definition of terms regarding this particular form:

Pesticides= Treatment needed

Tagging= Treatment tags must be applied

Seal= Refers to the loads on the truck

Commercial= Wholesale

Zuckerman went through the handout box by box to discuss any needed updates and changes. Below is a summary of the needed changes.

- Smith pointed out that all boxes needed to include a CQC since that was always required.
- A1 - Pesticides not needed if movement is from an approved structure to an approved structure by the same owner.
- B1 - remove the words "or permit" and replace GCA with NCA
- C1 - permit #1378 needs to be modified to include wholesale nurseries. Sharma will modify the permit.
- E1 - Eliminate "permit", none is needed.

- G1 – Eliminate “permit”, none is needed.
- B3 – Add NCA
- A4 – Add county NCA if applicable
- E4 – Remove “tagging”.
- A5 – Add NCA and *pre-approved paperwork
- B5 – Change to no restrictions
- D5 – Remove “Enclosed”.
- E5 – Add “required at receiving end”
- F5 – No Restrictions
- G5 – Add “required at receiving end” (same as E5)

There was a discussion regarding seals between loads when making multiple deliveries. Wright pointed out that this was a USDA regulation and CDFA must enforce USDA rules and is not allowed to be more lenient than what USDA allows. The opinion was expressed that pesticide treatments should be enough and possibly the regulation could be changed if the SAP and Subject Matter Experts (SME) would sign on. Wright explained the sealed load requirement was not completely about ACP and was the standard under any product quarantine. Zuckerman and Dillon said they would work together to come up with a potential compliance agreement to present to the SAP and SME.

Hennessey suggested that monthly calls, at least during July and August between nurserymen and regulatory agencies may be in order, with an end of the season meeting for review.

Zuckerman asked how the industry is to be updated on regulatory changes and where he could go to find them since CDFA either go nowhere, or are impossible to follow. Specifically, information on how to handle cuttings and seeds is scarce. Wright said she would like more information about cuttings and seeds so she can come up with suggestions. Wright committed to work with Zuckerman to get the SME to California, for a meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned and concluded at 3:05 am.

I, John Gilstrap, Manager of the California Citrus Nursery Board do hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of a meeting of the Citrus Nursery Board's Registration and Protocol Committee held on February 12, 2015.



John Gilstrap, Manager

FROM/TO	1 Q Contiguous (CDFA)	2 Non Q Contiguous (CDFA)	3 Q to Q Thru Non Q (USDA)	4 Q to Non Q (USDA)	5 Non Q to Q (CDFA)	6 Non Q to Q Thru Non Q (USDA)
A APS to APS	Enclosed Pesticides (USDA) #1353	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides #1353	Enclosed Pesticides #1353	Enclosed	
B APS to commercial nursery	Pesticides or permit GCA #1378	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides #1353	Enclosed Pesticides #1353	Enclosed	
C field to commercial nursery	Pesticides or permit GCA #1378	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides Tagging GCA Seal #1380	Not Allowed	To field only	
D APS to ground	Pesticides or permit GCA #1378	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides GCA #1353	Enclosed Pesticides #1353	Enclosed GCA	
E APS to retail	Pesticides Tagging #1378	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides Tagging #1353	Enclosed Pesticides Tagging #1353	Pesticides Tagging	
F field nursery to ground	Pesticides or permit GCA #1378	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides Tagging GCA Seal #1380	Not Allowed	GCA	
G field nursery to retail	Pesticides Tagging #1378	No restrictions	Enclosed Pesticides Tagging Seal #1380	Not Allowed	Pesticides Tagging	

BUDWOOD: Enclosed no pesticides (by permit) #1359
SEED: no restrictions (Reg source)
CUTTINGS: same as trees #1401
APS= Approved Protected Structure
GCA= Grower Compliance Agreement
Pesticide Treatments
CDFA Systemic ≤ 90 days Foliar ≤ 90 days
USDA ≥ 30 and ≤ 90 days ≤10 days
 Existing Regs Matrix rev. 2-11-15A