

CITRUS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION, INC.
Minutes of the
Commercial Product Delivery Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 9, 2019

A meeting of the Commercial Product Delivery Committee of the Citrus Research and Development Foundation, Inc. was held on Thursday, May 9, 2019 at the UF/IFAS CREC in Lake Alfred, FL in the Packinghouse Conference Room. The meeting was properly noticed and recorded. The meeting was called to order at 1:31 pm by Chair Pat Ouimet. Roll was called, and a quorum was present. Committee members participating were Larry Black, Holly Chamberlain (telephone), Tim Eylich, Alec Hayes (telephone), Greg Hodges (telephone), Jeanna Mastrodicasa (telephone), Pat Ouimet, Shannon Shepp (telephone), Tom Stopyra, and John Updike, Jr. Committee members not in attendance were Kelly Friend, Jerry Newlin, and Brian Scully. Other participants were Rob Atchley (telephone), Bobby Barben (telephone), Brandy Brown, Dan Casper (telephone), Rick Dantzler, Fred Gmitter (telephone), Jim Graham, Ned Hancock (telephone), David Howard (telephone), Audrey Nowicki, Brandon Page, Gee Roe, Ralph Scorza, and Jim Syvertsen.

Mr. Updike moved to accept the minutes of the March 11, 2019 CPDC meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stopyra and, with no discussion, passed unanimously.

Dr. Ouimet opened the meeting by introducing Dr. Ralph Scorza, who was the chair of the Transformation Lab Panel Committee. Mr. Dantzler thanked Dr. Scorza for chairing the committee and for joining the CPDC meeting to present the report of the Citrus Tissue Culture and Transformation Laboratories (TCTL) Review Panel. Mr. Dantzler reported that in conversations with Dr. Scorza, he has expressed his willingness to help CRDF in any way possible. He is a very distinguished scientist with an outstanding career in Plant Breeding and Biotechnology. Mr. Dantzler also discussed the other panel members, reporting they were outstanding members as well. The committee met for two days, meeting with several scientists from the CREC about the transformation labs, which allowed for them to bring recommendations forward for improvements.

Dr. Ouimet gave a brief overview of the continuation of the transformation labs. She reported that the reason the committee was asked to review the transformation labs was a follow up from the CRDF Board directive to look at funding projects vs. funding programs. CRDF has been funding the transformation labs for several years and the last time we voted on the labs it was agreed to fund the labs for an additional year, with the caveat to create a Transformation Lab Panel Committee to review the labs and provide a report on their operations before voting on funding for years two and three of the request. Dr. Ouimet then asked for Dr. Scorza to present the report from the TCTL.

Dr. Scorza gave a brief background of the Transformation Lab Panel, reporting that two of the members, Mr. David Tricoli and Dr. Martha Orozco-Cardenas, have their own transformation labs at UC Davis. He thanked Mr. Dantzler and Dr. Graham for their guidance and clarification of CRDF interests and for arranging for scientist interviews. Also, he thanked Audrey and Brandy for their support before, during, and after the panel meetings.

Dr. Scorza reported that on the first day, the transformation lab panel interviewed several scientists, discussing their labs' use of the transformation labs and processes. On the second day, the panel compiled the information they received, discussed it, and came up with a report of the TCTL. Dr. Scorza presented the four major areas of focus: TCTL R&D Program Structure; Management Structure; Demand for Services; and Staffing and Facility Improvements. The summary from the report of the TCTL Review Panel includes:

- The work of both laboratories is necessary.
- Both labs should be overseen by the same supervisor.
- Existing funding is adequate to support the current level of lab activities in both TCTLs.
- The panel recommends that the facilities for both TCTLs be improved and modernized.
- CRDF should consider longer-term funding of both laboratories.

There was lengthy discussion on the Green Fluorescent protein (GFP) gene marker and whether combining the TCTLs would be beneficial. Dr. Gmitter reported on the GFP marker, reporting that, at this time, the GFP marker is still the marker of choice when sorting through multiple genes quickly and efficiently. He also reported that in Dr. Grosser's lab they have been using the anthocyanin gene (the blood orange gene) which is also working quite well.

Mr. Black made a motion to accept the report, deliver the report to the University of Florida for review and wait for comment from UF for further discussion to address issues. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stopyra and it passed unanimously. The committee asked that the letter and report be sent to Drs. Payne and Rogers.

Dr. Scorza went through the remainder of the TCTL report, which led to further discussion of gene transfer markers in transgenic citrus.

Mr. Dantzler gave an update on the CRaFT program, reporting that he received communication from UF with concerns on how CRDF would be involved in contracting with the federal agency, and how we would be administering federal money and administering the CRaFT program. Mr. Dantzler provided a history of what gave rise to UF's policy of requiring all contracts with federal agencies to go to a centralized unit in Gainesville, which administers the programs, which is why we are not able to administer CRaFT.

Mr. Dantzler reported that an idea has surfaced to create a special purpose DSO under the Florida Department of Agriculture specifically for the CRaFT program. It is still unclear how

CRDF will be involved with CRaFT, if at all. Mr. Sparks discussed details of Florida Citrus Mutual's involvement with the CRaFT program and ideas of how they plan to move forward, perhaps including how to use the special purpose DSO.

Mr. Dantzler reported that CRDF received \$8 million in funding from the legislature. \$2 million of that funding is required, by proviso language, to be spent on large-scale field trials. What we anticipate CRDF doing is having a separate RFP specifically for that \$2 million for the large-scale field trials. This leaves us with \$6 million for new projects. Mr. Dantzler reported that we will have an approximate funding total for FY 2019-20 in the amount of \$12.1 million. His breakdown of this funding includes:

- \$6 million in legislative appropriation
- \$2.1 million in box tax
- \$4 million is cash carried forward

Revenue obligated for FY 2019-20 is \$10.7 million:

- \$8 million in existing contracts
- \$950,000 in office and field administration
- \$1,750,000 in desired balance carried forward

Revenue available for new contracts is \$1,288,490. Regarding new contracts, there were 91 pre-proposals submitted. The Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) met a few days ago, and they are recommending 30 of the 91 be invited for submission of a full proposal. Mr. Dantzler explained the breakdown of the costs for the 30 pre-proposals, if funded, as:

- The first-year cost of the 30 pre-proposals was \$3,131,000. The range was \$37,500 - \$200,000, for an average of \$105,000
- Number of proposals that could be funded based on an average first-year price of \$105,000 would be 13 proposals

Mr. Dantzler reported that the RMC will be meeting on May 15 to review the 91 pre-proposals and invited the CPDC to participate in the RMC meeting and give input. There was discussion on how many of the 91 pre-proposals are considered applied research, due to the legislature wanting to see more applied research funded over basic research. Mr. Dantzler reported that of the 30 recommended pre-proposal, there are several with the potential to be a CRaFT proposal. This led to discussions of the separate RFP for the \$2 million for large-scale field trials, which would allow for the PIs to submit a proposal that was not funded during the 2019 RFP.

Dr. Ouimet opened the floor for committee discussion on CPDC jurisdiction, which included commercial products, field trials, and off-cycle projects. The committee defined Commercial Products as products being brought to market within three to five years. Field Trials was defined as large-scale field trials. Off-cycle projects were defined as a proposal being presented as a one-off, not during the RFP process, that the committee deemed to be a beneficial project, as well as

proposals that may have missed deadlines. There was a question about where the transformation labs that are funded would fall, and it was determined that the labs are part of the CPDC jurisdiction. The committee agreed that infrastructure (transformation labs) be included as part of the CPDC jurisdiction.

Mr. Dantzler discussed the NIFA policy on co-funding. He reported that he spoke with Tom Bewick, who is heading up the NIFA grant program, and he said there is a 1:1 co-funding match that is required for NIFA projects; however, in kind contribution will still be allowed. Dr. Mastrodicasa read a letter regarding the 1:1 matching requirement received from USDA. The letter reads: The changes to the Specialty Crop Research Initiative (SCRI) program due to the 2018 Farm Bill:

1. 1:1 Matching Requirement

- a. Unrecovered IDC cannot be used as match, nor can IDC be charged again on matching support, if the full allowable federal IDC has been used in the budget.
- b. Matching sources have to directly relate to further the NIFA project and have to be during the award period.
- c. Any funds used as 3rd party match have to be specifically used for the NIFA award; if another grant is for a specific purpose then it would not be eligible for the NIFA award. The best candidates for other grants to be used as 3rd party match are those that (1) are for the same type of research, (2) are broad in nature, (3) the funds are already at UF, and (4) the funds to be used as match have not already been spent.
- d. A separate budget justification (i.e., in a separate document), including a list of matching sources and amounts, is required to show how the matching requirement will be met.
- e. No matching letters are required to be included in proposal; however, UF is requiring them in UFIRST because they would be needed for audit purposes.

2. Indirect Cost

- a. IDC has been changed to 30% of the total federal funds awarded (TFFA), or your institution's approved NCIRA, whichever is the lesser. The 30% cap includes indirect costs for all sub-awardees under the project (i.e., the cumulative amount of IDC cannot exceed the 30% of TFFA or your approved rate). The allowable IDC can be based on the direct charged (Federally funded) amount, match, or split between match and Federal funds.

3. Additional Information

- a. USDA is allowing changes from pre-proposal to full proposal, but they must be explained in detail so reviewers understand why the differences were made and

the explanation must be put in the appendix section (e.g., budget changes, different key personnel, etc.)

- b. The new matching requirement is based on awards after December 21, 2018, the date the new Farm Bill was enacted.

Dr. Ouimet asked if there was any other business. Mr. Dantzler reported that Mr. Gee Roe has previously addressed the committee on his interest in trunk injection of oxytetracycline to control HLB. Mr. Dantzler invited Gee to make a presentation at the next CPDC meeting. Gee reported that his group has some preliminary observations and he is looking for some direction from the CPDC on what the growers or committee is wanting to see on data efficacy, data on residue left on the tree, and data on grower feasibility. The product includes trunk injections of Oxytech but is not the currently registered product.

Mr. Dantzler reported that he asked if Gee Roe would be willing to serve on a federal committee to screen research proposals for funding, and Mr. Roe has agreed to do so.

With no further discussion the meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Brandy Brown