

CITRUS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION, INC.

Research Management Committee Meeting

October 14, 2013

A meeting of the Research Management Committee of the Citrus Research and Development Foundation, Inc. was held on Monday, October 14, 2013. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Chairman Bobby Barben. The meeting was properly noticed and recorded. Roll call indicated a quorum was present. Committee members participating were: Mr. Barben; Mr. Barber; Mr. Dooley; Mr. Farr; Mr. Howard; Mr. Jerkins; Mr. McClure; Mr. Sherrod; Mr. Simmons; Mr. Snively; and Mr. Stewart. Mr. Larry Davis did not participate. Also participating were Dr. Browning, Mr. Newlin, Ms. Nowicki and Ms. Johnson. Participating by phone was Dr. Turpen.

Mr. Snively moved to accept the minutes of the September 23, 2013 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Barber, the motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Browning gave a brief explanation of the Legislative funds that will end June 30, 2014, as some of the CAPT13 pre-proposals are continuations of projects and enhancements that have previously been approved. It was noted that there are also a few pre-proposals that will be a conflict of interest to committee members, and discussion and voting should take this into consideration.

Some on the committee commented that a few pre-proposals were related to the USDA nuPsyllid grant. It was stated that some members felt the NuPsyllid grant should be relieving the current research portfolio and not adding more to it. This issue was addressed as pre-proposals were discussed.

The pre-proposal format provided for consideration by RMC included a summary spreadsheet which reflected the average rating scores from the SAB preliminary rating, as well as considerations given during the SAB phone meeting. Thus, the pre-proposals were ordered according to the ratings provided by SAB, with the first third highlighted in one color, the middle third a second color, and the final third a unique color. With the input from the SAB, RMC reviewed the first third, top-ranked as sound in science and most likely to have practical benefit to Florida citrus. Each pre-proposal was considered, and members were asked to indicate pre-proposals in this section that should be removed from recommendation for full proposal submission. These discussions led to the following actions:

Pre-proposal 929 was discussed. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 929 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 915 was discussed and oxytetracycline is being addressed through the Commercial Product Delivery committee (CPDC). Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 915 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 903 addresses work that may have already been done, and it was questioned what more could be learned. It was concluded that this pre-proposal author should submit a full proposal with specifics on studies and how it will stop the psyllid. It is very similar to project 862.

RMC felt that Pre-proposal 902 also should be addressed through the CPDC . It is at a stage where a company needs to be found to fund the costs going forward. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 902 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 829 was discussed and the committee felt this would be more beneficial to Texas or California. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 829 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

A series of pre-proposals were discussed individually which, following discussion remained on the list for recommendation forward. Among these were #835, #895, #842, #859, and as needed, the program manager will communicate details of the discussion to the authors.

Pre-proposals 813, 814, 815, 817, and 823 all address research on impacts of HLB on fruit or juice quality, work that falls within citrus processors interest. The Citrus Processors Research Task Force has indicated that they are engaged in assessing the need for research in this topical area beyond what is being supported within the processor community. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposals 813, 814, 815, 817, and to invite 823 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously. CRDF staff was advised to communicate to both pre-proposal authors and the Processors Task Force that they should coordinate further interest in this research.

Project 911 was discussed and the committee felt like this should be done through the CPDC. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 911 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Simmons, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 931 was discussed, and Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 931 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 812 was discussed and the committee decided this was not relevant for Florida. Mr. Stewart made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 812 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 826 was discussed and the committee decided this was more applicable to Texas and California. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 826 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Snively, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposals 886, 820, and 821 are pre-proposals submitted by the same PI and have related goals in better understanding HLB disease and starch accumulation in infected plants. The committee indicated that the PI should combine them and bring forward the best ideas in one full proposal. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 886 to submit a single full proposal combining the most important elements of the 3 pre-proposals. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

The committee then considered the pre-proposals that were in the middle third as ranked by SAB. These proposals were viewed as having potential by SAB, and were closely scrutinized by the RMC. The discussion of each of these pre-proposals led to a recommendation that they remain as ranked or be moved lower in the consideration list.

Pre-proposal 830 was discussed and the committee decided this was more applicable to Texas and California. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 830 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Snively, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 861 looked like it related to the nuPssyllid project. Dr. Turpen said we need to request a full proposal to determine the overlap. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 861 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Simmons, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 880 offers experiments with optical systems, similar to Pre-proposal 874. Some on the committee would like to see if this would work. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 880 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Howard, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 845 is culture related and the committee felt CRDF should follow their current strategy of having one CLas culture team research project. Mr. McClure made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 845 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously. The Program Manager was encouraged to communicate with the pre-proposal's author recommending he work with the CLas culture team.

Pre-proposal 920 was discussed. The committee felt that once the kits are designed and put on the market the growers should recoup the investment money. This pre-proposal remained on the 'invite' list.

Pre-proposal 927 was discussed, including the level of desire to invest more research funding on Diaprepes. Mr. Farr made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 927 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Simmons, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 848 was discussed. RMC members discussed the value of this area of research. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 848 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Stewart, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 862 was discussed in detail. While this project proposes to expand previous work to grapefruit, the committee was concerned about the need in this project to plant and care for additional experimental trees, when perhaps existing cooperators groves might be used for this research. Mr. Jerkins made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 862 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Barber, the motion passed with a 6 – 3 vote with one committee member abstaining.

Pre-proposal 892 was discussed as applicable more to Texas and California. Mr. Howard made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 892 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. McClure, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 874 was discussed. Mr. Stewart made a motion to recommend to the Board not to invite pre-proposal 874 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

The committee then discussed pre-proposals ranked initially in the middle third by SAB review, but after SAB discussion, were moved lower in the overall rankings. These pre-proposals were all considered with the presumption that they not be invited to full proposal unless the Research Management Committee discussed and voted to move to “invite” status.

Pre-proposal 849 was discussed. Mr. Barben made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 849 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Farr, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 904 was discussed. Mr. Howard made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 904 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. McClure, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 923 was discussed. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 923 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Simmons, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 838 was discussed. Mr. Jerkins made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 838 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Simmons, the motion passed unanimously.

The RMC continued, discussing pre-proposals that were ranked in the lower third by the SAB. Chairman Barben suggested that pre-proposals in this group be presumed “Do Not Invite” unless the Research Management Committee discussed and concluded with a recommendation to “Invite” a full proposal.

Pre-proposal 916 was discussed and the committee is interested in expanding antibacterial work. Mr. Jerkins made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 916 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Howard, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 850 was discussed. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 850 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Howard, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 858 was discussed. Mr. Howard made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 858 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Snively, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 907 was discussed. This is a low budget pre-proposal and the committee was interested in reviewing a full proposal for its merit. Mr. Snively made a motion to recommend to the Board to invite pre-proposal 907 to submit a full proposal. Seconded by Mr. Jerkins, the motion passed unanimously.

Pre-proposal 918 was considered, but it was noted that this was not a pre-proposal for a research project, but rather an equipment request. CRDF does not support equipment requests, absent evidence that it is essential to the conduct of specific research objectives. The committee weighed options, and determined that this pre-proposal is outside of the scope of CRDF research projects. The Staff was encouraged to communicate to the institutional leadership on how such an equipment need might be presented for consideration by CRDF.

Other business: There was no other business.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Diane Johnson