

Summary

CITRUS CANKER TECHNICAL ADVISORY TASK FORCE (CCTATF) MEETING

May 14, 1999 9:30 AM

Citrus Research and Education Center

Ben Hill Griffin, Jr. Citrus Hall

Lake Alfred, Florida

Members Present

Mr. John Barben (HCCGA)
Dr. Harold Browning (UF/IFAS/CREC)
Mr. Richard Gaskalla (FDACS/DPI)
Dr. Tim Gottwald (USDA/ARS)
Mr. George Hamner (IRCL)
Mr. Tom Jerkins (Florida Citrus Industry)

Mr. Calvin Lloyd (GCCGA)
Mr. Craig Meyer (FDACS) - Executive Committee
Mr. Mike Shannon (USDA) - Executive Committee
Mr. Norman Todd (Florida Citrus Production Managers Association)

Others Present

Ms. Rosemarie Alfaro (FDACS)
Mr. John Attaway (Florida Citrus Consultants, International)
Mr. Kenneth Bailey (FDACS/DPI)
Ms. Lisa Backman (Florida Citrus Mutual)
Mr. Bill Barber (Lykes Citrus Management Division)
Dr. Michael Bausher (USDA/ARS)
Mr. Wendell Bowman (FDACS/DPI)
Dr. Ronald Brlansky (UF/IFAS/CREC)
Mr. Michael Carlton (Florida Citrus Mutual)
Mr. Peter Chaires (Florida Gift Fruit Shippers, Association)
Ms. Yvonne DeMarino (USDA)
Dr. Wayne Dixon (FDACS/DPI)
Ms. Lisa Dunson (HCCGA)
Mr. Hugh English (A. Duda & Sons, Incorporated)
Mr. Charles Farmer (FCNA)
Mr. Raphord Farrington (BHG, Incorporated)

Mr. Danny Finch (Pokey's Citrus Nursery)
Dr. Jim Graham (UF/IFAS/CREC)
Dr. James T. Griffiths (Citrus Growers, Associates)
Mr. Ron Hamel (Gulf Citrus Growers)
Dr. Chan Hannon (Retired)
Mr. Leon Hebb (FDACS/DPI)
Mr. Paul Hornby (USDA/APHIS)
Mr. Michael Hornyak (USDA)
Mr. Michael Ireby (United States Sugar Corporation)
Mr. Larry Jackson (FCPRAC)
Mr. Richard Kinney (Florida Citrus Packers)
Mr. Nolan Lemon (USDA)
Mr. Laurene Levy (USDA)
Mr. Sam Mahon (Pokey's Citrus Nursery)
Mr. Shashank Nilakhe (Texas Department of Agriculture)
Mr. Bill Peeples (Commissioner Crawford's Office)
Ms. Liza Rath (Florida Citrus Processors Association)

Mrs. Florence Roberts (FDACS/DPI)
Mr. Phillip Rucks (Florida Citrus
Nurserymen's Association) CCTATF
Alternate
Ms. Vivian Rudd (FDACS)
Dr. Tim Schubert (FDACS/DPI)

Dr. Pete Timmer (UF/IFAS/CREC)
Mr. Arnold Tschanz (USDA)
Mr. George Walker (Seminole Tribe of
Florida, Incorporated)
Mr. Charles Youtsey (Retired)

OPENING REMARKS

Craig Meyer advised within about two to three weeks, we will be destroying the 125 feet exposed trees in Dade County. We are gearing up for ramping up the program with Mike Shannon and Richard Gaskalla's efforts and that of all of the supporting people. The draft of the cooperative agreement has been developed and is being reviewed by Mike and Richard's people and, when approved, will result in the release of the other \$15 million of the first \$20 million of the Federal contribution to our efforts. The legislature has funded the program about \$35 million plus; a little bit less than we asked for, but by the time that the actual budget year closes out, it will probably be closer to about \$55 million. Craig said he won't even try to explain government accounting because of its complexity. He added that we have been able to fund the plan with the help of the legislature and with the help of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and we are now at work with Washington on obtaining funding for the Federal government's next fiscal year which begins on October 1, and we will be working in the interim with the legislature delegation to continue funding for subsequent years. We will make sure everyone knows what the program needs and funding are, with the help of the industry people who have been very supportive.

Mike Shannon added that the challenge now, of course, is to spend the money in an effective way that moves this problem forward to closure. Richard Gaskalla and he will be spending most of their day with Mike Hornyak, Ken Bailey, and their staff to talk about important issues and the strategy for moving forward. We are going to address and deal with some of the problems at this meeting today, such as how we are going to deal with the public in this matter, and we now have the resources available to deal with this problem in a big way. Mike feels a lot of constructive things have happened since the last task force meeting.

CITRUS CANKER ERADICATION PROGRAM (CCEP) UPDATE

Richard Gaskalla stated that to just add to a few things in follow up to what Craig and Mike have said, we are spending the majority of our efforts now in taking this program to the next level resource-wise which is the most important thing particularly in the Dade/Broward County program area. As much as we would all like to have all the resources in place and everyone trained,

we can't do that all at once. You have to take it step-by-step and sometimes the process doesn't go as fast as we would like. Richard mentioned that they have the full resources of the Department. The Commissioner, Craig, et al. have made their personnel/fiscal resources basically at our disposal to do the things that we need to do. One hundred and thirty vehicles have been ordered that we hope to have in June and July which will correspond with bringing the new people into the program. Richard advised that they advertised for new inspector resources in Broward County which is probably the most important area right now to gear up; however, they got about 80 applications through the first cut of the newspaper ad which was disappointing. In Dade County, when they started the program in 1995, they had 200 to 300 applications in the first cut, so they are wondering what the difference is between Dade and Broward Counties. We are going to send some more recruitment people down there to see if we can get some more applicants, but the 80 applicants we received will be good for the first round of interviews. We try to bring in anywhere from 20 to 30 new inspectors at one time, train them and integrate them in with experienced people. We will continue to do that until we get up to the level that we need to be. As far as CCEP activities, Richard said there is nothing particularly dramatic to report as far as new finds. There was another block, a small flame-grapefruit block, in the Siboney Grove that showed disease in the last inspection cycle. We have a contractor and Leon Hebb is making arrangements for the pushing of those trees next week. The reinspection of the property in Collier County looks good at this point. There has not been any reoccurrence of disease there, but needless to say, as we go into the high-risk period this time of the year, that will be kept on a very tight inspection frequency, and there are some conversations ongoing with the owners of that grove regarding the total destruction or future disposition. There is an ongoing effort to get the Water Management District to buy that property, and we will be working with John Minton, et al., to hopefully make that happen. In the Palmetto area, nothing particularly dramatic there, other than to say there were a couple of positive trees found in groves that were previously positive in high risk areas.

Leon Hebb reported that the contractor was going to be moving in Monday with his people to start taking out the 16 acres of flame grapefruit in the Siboney Grove. The Indian reservation is almost complete and they are trying to do some disking there which probably will be complete this week.

Wendell Bowman reported that in Palmetto, all the trees that were found in the grove have been burned and the grower has agreed to take out the 125 feet exposed trees. A bid has been let out for this control work.

Ken Bailey reported that they are almost caught up with the positive property destruction in Dade County, and they have not encountered any new sections within the last two to two and a half months which is certainly good news.

WORKING GROUP REPORTS

Scientific Issues Working Group

Tom Jerkins advised that a letter to the agri-business chemical and pharmaceutical companies, that was drafted by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and signed by Commissioner Bob Crawford, briefly outlines the citrus canker problem. It is Tom's understanding that this has been mailed.

Richard Gaskalla reported that they went to the Internet, called up all the pharmaceutical, agri-business chemical companies, and sent the letter to all of them looking for some assistance.

Tom Jerkins advised in other business, they have referrals back to the science group to consider the use of mandatory, non-porous harvesting materials such as ladders, tubs, etc. The committee has done some work on that but they have no opinion yet. The same is true of hedging and topping practices which was also referred to them and they have no opinion yet. They have also been asked to reconsider or evaluate the prior determination to limit plant material from a nursery from a quarantine area and they have no further action on that.

Citrus Canker Urban Miami Epidemiology Spread

Tim Gottwald gave a slide presentation regarding the results of epidemiology studies in Dade County. This presentation was the same research reported to the Risk Assessment Group on May 11, 1999, but more condensed. The data presented demonstrated natural spread of citrus canker disease in excess of 125 feet. (See chart attached entitled "Citrus Canker Urban Miami Epidemiology Spread Study Site 1, attached). Tim said the figures shown are very conservative. Is that consistent with what they found before? In 1991, they did an analysis of grove situations (i.e., the Smoak Grove which he and Jim Graham did.) There was an infected tree in a dooryard and a newly planted grove about five years old at the time this occurred and citrus canker spread from that dooryard tree to those areas and the distances of spread that they measured were a minimum of about 750 feet and the maximum was about 2,200 feet, so the same kind of distances that they are finding in an urban situation are consistent with what they are finding in a grove situation. Essentially how do you take a look at this and what has been going on with the eradication program? Tim Gottwald said by destroying the exposed trees within 125 feet, we are probably suppressing the acceleration of the disease, but we still will probably have an acceleration.

Discussion ensued.

Question: The question was how much suppression do we have to have? Someone asked if a minimum of 1,900 feet would be feasible?

Mike Shannon mentioned that if we are going to destroy exposed trees within 1,900 feet in the urban areas, but we are not going to apply that same rule to the groves, the public is going to ask why we are treating the citrus industry differently.

Craig Meyer said he is struggling trying to get a handle on this as to what we have to do in the context of what we can do, because Craig thinks there is some relationship between the time of detection and removal and the distance. As an example, we did not cut 1,900 feet out of the Minton Grove and so far, we are not getting any new finds. The big difference between this data and the Minton Grove is the fact that there was a detection and an immediate response that exceeded the 125 feet in the first pass, and the second pass, 125 feet distance and subsequently a site-by-site situation. There is clearly some real evidence that says there is a relationship between how fast we can get at this and reducing it down from a 1,900 feet number. None of us can think that we can go to Dade County and cut 1,900 feet immediately or in the near future. That would have the effect in most neighborhoods, looking at those trees in the very early sites, of pretty much removing all citrus from most of those neighborhoods so there would be no citrus, which overtime might become a reality, and there are data from the project where we have done almost exactly that. In addition to the impact from the citizenry down there, if we start to cut 1,900 feet, we are not prepared to do that today and we don't have the resources.

George Hamner asked Ken Bailey if there was any practical way to step up the survey range, distance-wise? If you have a positive tree found, do you intensify the survey?

Ken Bailey said they intensify the survey if they find a positive tree, they inspect a one-mile area around the find.

Richard Gaskalla remarked that it goes back to the strategic plan that we developed because we kind of anticipated that the data was going to show that we needed to be more aggressive so we are going to try to get the survey frequency down in infected areas and other areas that we consider to be high-risk to 60 days, preferably 45 days. Anything less than 45 days from a disease-detection standpoint is kind of a waste of time because it takes 45 days for the disease to manifest itself as far as visual symptoms. So, the

answer is we would like to get the survey frequency down to 45 to 60 days in all areas that we think are at risk for finding disease and then cut some distances of exposed trees.

Craig Meyer advised that relative to the legal filter, no rehearing has been granted by the courts so he assumes that it is a final judgment that relative to destruction of exposed trees within 125 feet, "no compensation" is the law of the State of Florida so we know we can move back to 125 feet. We know there is no fiscal impact on our program other than the cost of removing those trees and the associated support on delivering the documents, etc. Craig said he talked to the Commissioner and we would like to get support at some distance greater than 125 feet and based on preliminary reporting to him of what this data says, Craig believes we can support a distance greater than 125 feet at the no compensation level. Again, that just has to deal with keeping our resources towards eradication than using our resources to purchase the trees which is another thing that we have to take into consideration. If we have to buy trees beyond 125 feet, we are woefully underfunded. If we were buying trees, we would probably be having volunteers, if the price were right, to have their trees removed. To get some handle on what we are talking about, we have removed about 130,000 trees at say an average of \$200 per tree. Consider if we had to buy all those trees (\$200 would be way low). Craig said Connie Riherd had done some research work for us based on a formula developed by the Urban Forestry Association on the pricing of what a tree is worth in an urban setting, and the average citrus tree in Dade County would probably price out under that formula at about \$438.00 x 140,000 trees. It is a big number and it exceeds the funds that have been allocated to the program. It would be more to pay for those trees than we have available to us to eradicate the disease.

More discussion followed regarding the value of dooryard trees.

George Hamner said he would like clarification. They have had the presentation now, but he understands that the CCTATF is not seeking a recommendation from the regulatory group as to what to do with the information. George said he is not sure, other than to intensify surveys, reality is that no one is going to say to cut 1,900 feet, although he thinks they would all like to see it. Politically this may kill you but on the other hand, it may help you stabilize your 100 - 200 feet whatever.

Craig Meyer responded that one of the things he has recommended to the Commissioner is that we know what to focus in on is that having the knowledge that 1,900 feet is scientifically supportable may be useful to us; for instance, in the Coral Springs area, where it jumped out of the main body of

infection 15 miles up the road, we went in there and got that aggressively, surveyed quickly and eradicated quickly and so far it has not moved outside that original area, so there again is an application of that survey time and rapid removal. We may want to say an area that is a "hot spot" outside the core area, will allow us to go beyond the 125 feet.

George Hamner said it may be a good idea, instead of recommending cutting, if the committee simply endorse the information and recommend that risk assessment be used in there to formulate plans for the future. At least we will be on record and the public can be on record that 1,900 feet is our new recommendation.

Richard Gaskalla said, indeed, Tim presented his data to the Risk Assessment Group. A risk assessment for Dade and Broward Counties will come out of the Risk Assessment Group. We have a draft that will be presented to the Risk Assessment Group. Richard said his suggestion would be to send that risk assessment to the Science Issues Working Group and maybe the Regulatory Issues Working Group could meet together to look at it, to talk about the realities of what we can and can't do.

Question: Could some of this movement out on the far edges have been human movement?

Tim Gottwald answered there is always a possibility that human movement could be a part of the action there, but he thinks there is a preponderance of evidence that would suggest that even without human movement, the data is still valid. Tim said he wanted to stress again (and he is not trying to shoot holes in the regulatory theory), but these data are highly conservative underestimates. Tim said he wanted this fact driven home because it is a scientific fact.

Richard Kinney stated, if he is reading the data correctly, then looking at the percentages, we know we need to do something different than 125 feet whether it is heavy up on the surveys so we know where the positive trees are or to extend that. Something needs to change dramatically. If we don't take 1,900 feet, it means that we need to do surveys every 45 days, whatever we can come up with.

George Hamner asked Richard Gaskalla if what he really wanted was for the Risk Assessment Group to sit down with the regulatory group to see if they can iron it out. Is it not something we should try to do today?

Richard Gaskalla replied that he is of the opinion that it needs to go through a couple of more filters and we need to give it a reality check, as to what we can do and what we can't do and implement what we can do because it doesn't do any good to make a recommendation and say we should just go to 1,900 feet tomorrow because, frankly from a logistical and socio-economic viewpoint, it is not going to happen.

Jim Griffiths said he was disappointed in them. Let's call a spade a spade. Jim told Richard Gaskalla that he heard the risk assessment people talk on Tuesday and he feels they came to a pretty good conclusion. He doesn't know if they formally adopted a motion. But, Jim said he thinks what the citrus industry people want from CCTATF is that you assure us that you are going to keep citrus canker from spreading north into Martin County (he said he might as well write off Palm Beach County) and you are going to protect the lime industry south of it. Obviously, you all have to make a substantial change in what you are doing because the program is a failure up to now in Dade and Broward Counties. The scientists are telling you that you need to go to a bigger margin, you have to probably go to more frequent surveys and you better do it on the margin and be sure you are ahead of the infestation and not be like you have been up to now which is behind it. You have a 15 mile jump ahead of you. The problem is we don't know where the line is, but it is probably there in north Broward or South Palm Beach, and you have a lot narrower area when you get into Palm Beach, with houses and people and trees than you have in Broward County and you need to set up some kind of a buffer there that probably involves something close to 1,900 feet, whether it is 2,600 or 1,500 feet probably doesn't make that much difference because that will be clear cut before very long if you have an infestation and if you survey, you could maybe establish that it is not infected, but you have to take the "bull by the horn". You know what to do, let's get on with it. You people here may not know, but if you listened to the discussions on Tuesday, you would know. You just have to do it; socioeconomically, it may be tough. It is going to take some selling and it is the job of these folks down here to help you sell it, but you have to protect the citrus industry. Jim said if he owned a grapefruit grove in Martin County, he would be hollering a lot more than he is hollering right now and he doesn't know where those people are and why they are not hollering, but they should be. (Jim reiterated that they need to do something a lot more drastic than they are currently doing and they need to get on with it and not keep dragging their feet.)

Craig Meyer commented that he didn't disagree with anything that had been said, but he does want to point out that they have never cut 1,900 feet before and we have eradicated earlier outbreaks in a grove setting and he thinks it goes back to the concept that the faster you can get it out, the better chance that you have of eradicating it.

Jim Griffiths told Craig that you can't claim that you have eradicated it anywhere yet; not in the last ten years, you haven't or you wouldn't be fighting a campaign in Manatee County today.

Tim Gottwald advised that in studying different eradication methodologies that have been applied in the citrus industry Dade County and south Florida, are areas where there has never been a citrus canker eradication campaign before. You are dealing with tropical situations that you have not dealt with before, and to say the Dade County area is the same situation as in Manatee County would be a stretch. True, you have tropical conditions, but as you progress further north, the weather is not as tropical, so it hasn't been as severe there and it is a little easier to deal with.

Richard Gaskalla commented that we were successful in eradicating the citrus canker from Anna Maria Island and we only went 50 feet there. So, Richard thinks a lot depends on the circumstances.

Question: Does anyone have any idea as to how much it would cost to take trees at 1,900 feet distances?

Craig Meyer said he thinks our current logistical situation is we have available funds to support 50 cutting crews. We believe that next month when we start cutting at 125 feet, the efficiency of those crews will go up dramatically. We have the money to keep probably 100 crews going through next budget year.

Richard Kinney asked that if there has been any thought about the trees that have been removed that you know the disease was there, is there any justification for going back and going 125 feet from a tree that had already been removed, and you remove those exposed trees up to 125 feet?

Craig Meyer replied if there was spread in that area, it will be expressing citrus canker disease now anyway. The survey people will detect it and we will go back and remove those trees.

Richard Kinney said he believes we don't need to survey those properties and just take the 125 feet anyway. Logistically, he feels we could save time and money and there would be greater efficiency by this approach.

Craig Meyer advised that our survey crews are constantly surveying those properties and will be going back to those properties, and if it has spread from the previous positive tree into the 125 feet, we will be back there anyway and remove an additional infected tree or trees and 125 feet from the infected tree(s).

More discussion on survey frequency, survey strategies, etc.

George Hamner commented to Tim Gottwald that one of the concerns he has with relative to Tim's research in commercial groves is that good or bad, the grove study Tim did was in the Smoak Grove which shows that movement, but what are the circumstances in Siboney which is an old find? It has not spread like that. The distances are more compact and that to him was probably as bad or worse case scenario in a commercial site, and it has been a dilemma to him all along because it was topped, hedged, and picked and moved through that area unknown. Where is all the spread? George said he did not want to down play that, but it is a dilemma to him that we don't see it in bigger and more far-reaching places. George said he understands that Miami is more variable and more tropical-prone because of being near the coast.

Tim Gottwald said to address that, because it is probably an inaccurate assessment of Siboney. He and several others visited Siboney. We found where we believe the original epicenter is. All of the other subsequent spread that we saw was of a certain age and when we went back and looked, that particular spread was consistent with "Mitch" and so you had spread up to several thousand feet from a single event and that is collaborating evidence with what we have in grove situations such as the Smoak Grove. When you get rain storms and winds, the inoculum moves much faster and you can never predict when that is going to happen.

Richard Kinney remarked that in Dade and Broward Counties, the data clearly shows that we have to take out as many trees as we possibly can as soon as we can, especially if they were exposed to infected trees and that is what we have to look at. The science justifies it and maybe we need to go back and look at areas where we have already taken out trees and we have justification for going in and doing 125 feet. We can go back in and remove those trees without surveys, without all that extra work. Maybe there is justification for that because we need to get those trees out of there as fast as we possibly can.

Craig Meyer told Richard that it is a logistical thing. We still have to go everywhere at least once a year because we cannot rely, unfortunately, on the citizens to not replant. So we are going back through the whole county to make sure that they are not replanting. We are still going back but we could cut our survey frequency.

Mike Shannon mentioned that there are recommendations coming forth from the Risk Assessment Group as to how the strategy could be implemented. Now that we have the information and have heard comments from everyone, the State and Federal program people will have to sit down and plan the strategy, including

the public affairs strategy, including the economical factor, instead of throwing it back to the committee.

More discussion.

Richard Gaskalla stated that the risk assessment document will have some options for the program to consider.

Craig Meyer commented that to reiterate it, we will take from today's meeting, and from the Risk Assessment Group, and we will go back and price out and logistically lay out the resources that are coming in the pipe line what it would take us to do, say, 500, 800 (we will punch out some higher numbers) in terms of what we can do with what we got money-wise because, considering what the research points out and what Dr. Griffiths says, at some leading edge point, we are now back to pretty much that buffer concept that we talked about a year ago which the Commissioner recommended. At 1,900 feet, we would pretty much have a buffer anyway because we are going to remove everything anyway and we may want to combine both of those approaches.

More discussion followed regarding the previous exposed trees within 125 feet of infected trees (already removed) and possible strategies to pursue to remove them.

Jim Griffiths stated that there are only limited resources and money and our efforts should be concentrated on margins and for awhile, we need to forget about what was left behind. Do what MacArthur did in World War II; skip over some stuff and get ahead of where the enemy is. That is what you have to do. You probably don't have enough money to remove all the trees in Dade and Broward Counties. Make sure it doesn't spread out there.

Craig Meyer agreed with Jim Griffiths.

Richard Gaskalla mentioned that we do not have the risk assessment document here in front of us this morning, but Richard said he was going to try to capture what this risk assessment was and it is exactly what we are talking about here. As Richard recalls, everything in Broward, (it will give a date whenever we decide), every positive tree that they find in Broward County, we will go out 1,900 feet around that tree and just consider all of Broward County to be close to the leading edge. Then we will take a two-mile wide swath on the south part of the infestation in Dade County and do the same thing to help protect the lime industry and in between those two areas, we will either cut all the infected trees and exposed trees on the positive properties or we will go to 125 feet. That is kind of what we are talking about; being aggressive on the outside edges and if we can, adopt that

philosophy and bring it back in. Richard said the question he has is whether or not we can get away with destroying the 1,900 feet from a public relations standpoint, because that is going to be very difficult.

Jim Griffiths reiterated that they need to do what is right.

More discussion.

Mike Shannon said we all want to do what is right but if we don't do it the right way, we won't be allowed to do it at all. No one is disagreeing. So the idea is there is the concept so what is it going to cost and what is the strategy to make sure it succeeds? We are getting what we ask for from the Risk Assessment Group. Now it is up to us as a government agency to execute this, to run up the logistics and to have people like Ken Bailey advise us what it is possible to do here.

Ken Bailey addressed his remarks to Jim Griffiths and invited him to come to Miami and take charge of the program and to go and cut that 1,900 feet because that is the "right thing to do". Ken said he has people that have guns pulled on them every single day. You can call it scientifically right if you want to, but from a public relations standpoint, you are not just going to walk on these properties and start cutting 1,900 feet.

Jim Griffiths said nobody is going to disagree with Ken, but you have to decide on the north end that you are going to do this and maybe you won't have to do the 1,900 feet because maybe you will move far enough north that you won't find anything.

Question: Is it this risk assessment proposal that you are going to bring back to this joint scientific/regulatory meetings?

Craig Meyer agrees that this would be done. Craig added that there is no lack of resolve on the part of the Commissioner and on the part of the State or the Federal government to eradicate the disease, however, we just have to keep in mind the people that we work for, which is not the citrus industry. We work for the people of the State of Florida, and the people of the United States, and those people are the ones who are paying us to do this to help the citrus industry, but to also help protect their dooryard trees. We can't lose sight of the fact that if we stir them up and anger them enough, they may cease to pay us to do this, which will then result in a catastrophic loss to the industry. We want to make sure that these people continue to pay us to do what we know we have to do.

Craig Meyer advised that by the time the CCTATF meets again in a month, we will be back to removing the 125 feet. Hopefully, we will be able to go forward at 125 feet and explain to the people who are affected, why they need to endure this sacrifice because we are asking these people that are within 125 feet of an infected tree to give up their trees. They are giving them up just like the growers have to give them up if the disease gets into their grove, and the only difference is they are not getting anything from the trees that so far have had economic value. (There is no money available, per the legislature, for anyone whose property was cut commencing January of 1999.)

Question: Based on the information you now have on the scientific side, are you going to change your strategies in Manatee, Collier and Hendry Counties?

Craig Meyer replied that is why he brought that up in the very beginning of this discussion, is that we are not cutting 1,900 feet around the groves. Craig said he would like to ask the Risk Assessment Group that question.

Discussion regarding the grove situation in Manatee County.

Public Relations/Education Issues Working Group

Lisa Backman reported that the Public Relations Subcommittee had already put together a public education plan regarding the need to remove the 125 feet exposed trees. All they need now is money to pay for the advertisements and public opinion surveys that they feel need to be done and to determine a starting date. The more time you could give us to get out there with the paid advertising, the better. We would like to announce it in a press conference with people like Tim Gottwald and other scientists there to explain why we are having to take the exposed trees.

Mike Shannon said he agrees that is good and we need to tell them that today we are going to 125 feet, but the research that was done is showing 125 feet is probably going to be adjusted upward and that way, you will get the people used to that idea.

Lisa Backman said that we just need to be honest with the people in the beginning and tell them how far we need to go. If the program is taking it to 125 feet, then that is what we have to say in our message, but also say in our message that we do have the research that supports taking out as far as 1,900 feet if we are going to expect to be 99% effective. The point is we are trying to work with the community on this and we are asking for their cooperation. But again, science is going to have to drive this message. Lisa mentioned the advertisements they are planning to place in newspapers which would be a full page ad from Commissioner Crawford and, hopefully, Governor Bush, to explain why we need to launch the exposed tree program and thanking

residents for their cooperation, and she also mentioned the public opinion survey they are planning. The costs of the ads and the survey will be approximately \$200,000. She mentioned that they would also like to do some radio and television advertisements which would be an additional cost. The exposed tree public relations plan encompasses both community outreach and media outreach initiatives, and Lisa said she will provide them with a list of all their plans. (Lisa further elaborated on their public relations plans and the actions they have taken thus far relative to this plan). Lisa said all they need is a starting date and the money for the paid advertisements.

Craig Meyer advised Lisa that he had taken the liberty of reviewing their plan to his people, and they have started brainstorming all of this. They have video production facilities where we can knock it all out very quickly and may need for Lisa to get with the Department people, probably next week.

Craig Meyer and Mike Shannon will get together to get the production in the works and to make the needed funds available.

Citizens Issues Working Group

Craig Meyer also mentioned the Citizens Issues Working Group and reported that they have asked four legislators who are basically from the core area to each recommend persons to serve on this committee. Craig said he has their names (there will be five of them). Craig is hoping they can meet the last week of May. The purpose of this committee is a place where people can focus their concerns. Craig said they received a lot of questions and concerns via the mail and on the phone. (Craig elaborated on the group's purpose and gave some examples of some of the concerns and questions they will be discussing with the public when this committee meets.)

More discussion ensued regarding public relations strategies relative to how to get the public's cooperation and understanding of the citrus canker problem.

Regulatory Issues Working Group

George Hamner advised that his report is very brief, but they will need action on a few of the issues. The group met and they were asked to look at the selling of the fruit from the citrus quarantine area that was washed and properly handled from a packing house, to other citrus producing states. It started out primarily as Florida, but since it is a Federal regulation, it becomes citrus producing states. George said they took the time to pass it out to the industry and, quite frankly, the gulf remains opposed to this: Indian River Citrus League, Florida Citrus Mutual, and Florida Citrus Packers supported the concept, provided an aggressive eradication program was in place. The motion that came out of the committee was as follows: "The

regulatory working group recommends to the CCTATF that the USDA, through rule-making, revise the quarantine to allow the movement of fruit within a canker quarantine area to other citrus producing states and within Florida provided an aggressive eradication effort is in place with inspection, decontamination, harvesting, and packing requirements consistent with the current regulations. George said he thinks the CCTATF needs to take action on this.

Question: Was there any discussion on other countries that would like to export fruit to the United States, such as Argentina?

George Hamner: There was some discussion about how this would affect our export market, but the only market it would affect would be Europe because of Spain. All the Asian markets have citrus canker, so that is kind of a non issue. Potentially if we have major outbreaks in Florida, you could see the European group take a hard look at us because of the open borders because of Spain. With regards to importation of fruit, the country that was discussed in the forefront was Argentina because it is on the verge of being accepted into the country. The argument was that we always based our arguments on any product phyto-sanitarilly being accepted into the United States on scientific data and the science is telling us that it is 99.99% certain that if you treat fruit through a packing house and properly handle it in an aggressive eradication effort then it is safe. One of the reasons for the movement in the citrus league in favor of this is that in the 1980s, Florida operated entirely under a quarantine State and that is why we had tarping throughout the State and a lot of regulations were everywhere because we quarantined the entire State. Now we are only quarantining areas. If something happened and we had to quarantine the State, then once again, we will be cut off from the citrus-producing states and it may play negatively to us and our trading partners if we won't take our own fruit back. There is severe discomfort with Argentina because no one is comfortable with the protocol that is potentially in place down there and that is why the motion is very explicit and states that this fruit movement will be allowed only if an aggressive program is in place in the country that we are working with. It will be up to the USDA and the University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. George said they have unofficially asked for an oversight to come through Federal as well as the State people and our own industry people to oversee some of the protocol procedures.

Mike Shannon mentioned that they are putting together an issue paper to give to the industry. On May 20, 1999, there will be a meeting in California. The idea is to get an issue paper that puts up the key issues appended to this. Mike said they want to have this issue paper in hand at this meeting so that what they perceive to be the key issues appended with this policy change can be fully laid out. Mike said he believes this is a policy change that the

time is right for. If we miss this window of opportunity to change the policy and for some reasons, for example, we should not succeed with eradication and then come back and try to change the policy, it would be perceived as a political thing and not a technical thing. If we change it as part of this program, we have "white hats" on. Mike said he would like the issue paper to be in people's hands, including the California people, before the meeting so that they can think about the issues on this policy change and how it may affect them before the meeting because if you set the risk bar on fruit so high that it is zero and that is exactly what the policy is right now, if the canker gets spread around, you are not going to be able to draw it down later. If you look at California's situation with invasive, exotic species coming in such as greening, the vector is here now, and we have multiple fruit crisis in California, they better think real hard about keeping the risk bar to zero. The current Federal regulation that prohibits importation of fruit from any country that has citrus canker, that's the only thing that one regulation speaks to and it has two sections to it. (Mike talked further about the current Federal canker rule.)

Comment: Gulf Citrus's position is really very simple. In their mind, one of the reasons this came up is that there is a packing house that has been incorporated in a quarantine area, but the amount of movement of fruit from that house is minimal compared to the overall movement in their minds, the scheme of the world look at this and they are concerned that this aggressive protocol that we are talking about may or may not be in place in foreign countries sufficient enough to protect us here if it comes in and the amount of fruit we are talking about moving out of that quarantine house is a drop in the bucket compared to the whole scheme of the program, so they feel like if it ain't broke, don't fix it" so it is a perfectly legitimate position. The league and packers looked at the export market and the risk and they felt long term, maybe it would be better to have it in place than not, so there is no cut and dry way here.

Richard Gaskalla stated from a regulatory standpoint, it is the sort of thing of "what if?" If we allow citrus to come in from Argentina, we are going to look at that very closely and the minute you find the first piece of fruit that has a citrus canker lesion on it which is much easier to see visually than the fruit fly issue where you have the larva in the fruit. It is an easier thing to monitor.

Comment: The Florida Gift Fruit Shippers Association also voted to support this issue.

Richard Kinney stated that it is important to know that it is a matter of access to markets - fruit going out and fruit coming in and we have to make

our decisions based on sound science; whether or not it is protocol or a system is in place to address a pest or disease is actually doing what it is supposed to do, that is part of the responsibility of the governmental agencies conducting the process. If the science indicates and there is a system that can be placed upon that science to protect the industry, we need to endorse that. We need to move forward to endorse that because that is the same premise that we use to get access to other markets and if we don't reciprocate that philosophy and that approach, then we don't have any credibility. Therefore, if the science dictates, we need to endorse it.

NOTE: A MOTION was made by George Hamner seconded by Tom Jerkins, to adopt the recommendation of the Regulatory Issues Working Group *to allow the movement of fruit within a canker quarantine area to other citrus producing states and within Florida provided an aggressive eradication effort is in place with inspection, decontamination, harvesting and packing requirements consistent with the current regulations.*

After discussion, this MOTION was withdrawn (it had also been tabled at the March 19, 1999, and April 1, 1999, meeting.)

NOTE: An issue paper is being developed which will be given to the industry. On May 20, 1999, there will be a meeting in California with the State, Federal and California officials to address this issue because, if adopted, it will require a policy change through rule-making.

Richard Gaskalla stated that he would be attending the meeting in California on May 20 and he would report to the people there that the general feeling of the industry regarding the fruit movement issue is that they have seen it and for the most part, the major industry groups in Florida generally approve it.

NOTE: Ron Hamel requests that in addition to the members of the CCTATC being sent copies of the meeting minutes; he would appreciate if the alternate members were sent copies.

Citrus Canker Tree Insurance

Note: As of Wednesday, the USDA had submitted a policy to be published in the Federal Register that expands the three-year program relative to all citrus trees in Florida to include citrus canker as a risk peril. Unfortunately, because of the red tape in Washington, the permanent policy will not be available until 2001. As an interim step, management is having a board meeting on June 16-17, 1999. The agency is going to recommend to the board as a interim step that they expand the pilot program to all citrus-producing counties and include citrus canker.

Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 22, 1999, at 9:30 AM, at the Ben Hill Griffin Auditorium, Lake Alfred.

Attachment: Chart entitled "Citrus Canker Urban Miami Epidemiology Spread Study Site 1"

Submitted by Florence Roberts.

Citrus Canker Urban Miami Epidemiology Spread Study Site 1 ¹

Temporal Window	No. Focal (Alpha) Trees	No. 2ndary-Infected Trees	% Captured at 125 ft	90%	95%	99%	Max. Distance
1st 1-Mo Window	38	15	13	800	4150	4150	4150
2nd 1-Mo Window	52	39	33	1450	1450	1650	1650
3rd 1-Mo Window	90	73	41	1200	1600	1900	1900
4th 1-Mo Window	162	235	30	700	800	1450	1850
5th 1-Mo Window	396	124	36	350	500	700	750
6th 1-Mo Window	519	32	69	250	950	950	950

1st 2-Mo Window	38	53	24	1450	1450	4150	4150
2nd 2-Mo Window	90	307	22	1050	1400	1650	2100
3rd 2-Mo Window	396	155	39	350	600	950	950
4th 2-Mo Window	550	490	56	300	350	700	850

1st 3-Mo Window	38	125	24	1400	1450	3200	4150
2nd 3-Mo Window	90	430	22	950	1250	1600	2100
3rd 3-Mo Window	396	420	45	350	450	700	950

1st 4-Mo Window	38	359	14	1400	1650	2150	4150
2nd 4-Mo Window	90	461	21	950	1300	1800	2250
3rd 4-Mo Window	396	644	46	350	650	850	950

¹ Recalc. 5/26/99 T. R. Gottwald