

**Minutes of the
Research Management Committee Meeting
Wednesday June 2, 2021**

A meeting of the Research Management Committee was held on Wednesday, June 2, 2021 at the Hampton Inn located at 22900 US Hwy 27, Lake Wales, Florida. The meeting was properly noticed and recorded. The meeting was called to order at 12:34 p.m. by Chairman Pat Ouimet. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Committee members participating were Bobby Barben, Tim Dooley, Steve Farr, Ned Hancock, Aaron Himrod, Sean McCoy, Tom Obreza, Pat Ouimet, Daniel Scott, Joby Sherrod, Wayne Simmons, Mathew Story, and Forest Taylor. Also participating were Rob Atchley, Rick Dantzler, Bill Dawson, Megan Dewdney, Steve Futch, Jim Graham, David Howard, Mike Irey, Hailing Jin, Morgan McKenna, Audrey Nowicki, Brandon Page, Jim Syvertsen, John Updike, and Deidra Whatley.

Dr. Ouimet opened the meeting with the approval of the minutes of the February 12, 2021 RMC meeting. Mr. Farr made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dooley and passed unanimously.

Dr. Ouimet and Mr. Dantzler provided background on Dr. Hailing Jin's peptides preproposal and Dr. Megan Dewdney's involvement in Objective 2. Mr. Dantzler reported that the Board had approved \$114,000.00 to be paid towards Objective 2 of the preproposal, contingent on the Committee's review and endorsement of the process. Dr. Jin and Dr. Dewdney explained the need for expedited funding, to obtain the product for application in the current growing season, as well as considerable savings if purchased at this time. Mr. Dantzler explained that while there was a greater scope to the preproposal, this portion was speaking to Objective 2 for the current growing season and take advantage of the reduced cost of the material. Mr. Simmons moved to accept the proposal and recommend the Board fund Dr. Jin's project in the amount of \$200,000.00 to purchase the peptide for Dr. Dewdney's application at this time and for Dr. McCollum's infusion assays. The motion was seconded by Mr. Farr and passed unanimously.

Dr. Ouimet continued with the review of the preproposals, comparing the ranking by the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) scores with the RMC scores, noting considerable differences. The group of forty (40) preproposals with average RMC scores of 3.0 or less were addressed first. Committee members were invited to initiate a discussion on any that they would like to discuss and potentially move forward for invitation of a full proposal.

The first preproposal discussed was Deng,Z-2. Dr. Dawson gave a summary of the proposed project, followed by the RMC reviewers providing the reasonings behind their scores as compared with the SAB scores. There was concern about the probability of success of the project. Mr. Simmons moved to advance the Deng-2 project forward to the Board for consideration for invitation of a full proposal.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Farr and passed with one opposition vote from Dr. Ouimet.

The next preproposal considered was submitted by Dr. Park. Dr. Dawson and Dr. Graham explained the project was attempting to create a specific HLB tolerant rootstock. With little discussion, Mr. Simmons moved that Dr. Park's preproposal not move forward for consideration by the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. McCoy and passed unanimously.

Vincent-1 was the next preproposal brought for discussion. Dr. Futch reported the project was about synchronizing flushes with plant growth regulators to ward off infection by psyllids. There were concerns surrounding tree growth and other mitigating factors due to the PGRs. Discussion followed regarding the SAB 4.0 score compared to the Committee's 2.67. The project failed to advance to the Board for consideration due to lack of motion.

Dr. Futch explained the scientific basis of the Stover-2 preproposal for a mobile rapid testing system and reported on the consensus of the SAB. After discussion, the project failed to advance to the Board for consideration due to lack of motion.

Dr. Ouimet entertained a motion to not advance the balance of the preproposals with an RMC average score of 3.0 or below. Mr. McCoy moved to not advance the preproposals for full proposal invitations with an RMC average score below 3.0, with the exception of Deng,Z.-2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dooley and passed unanimously.

Dr. Ouimet then moved on to the highest scored projects, noting again there were considerable differences in the scores between RMC and SAB.

The first preproposal discussed was Albrecht-2, a continuation of a currently funded project. There was no objection from the Committee to moving the project forward for invitation for a full proposal.

Roy,S.-1 was brought for consideration next. The RMC members discussed their evaluations of the project. Mr. Simmons made a motion to move the preproposal forward to the Board for consideration for invitation of a full proposal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Farr and passed unanimously.

Mr. Dantzer noted it was not necessary to vote on each individual project that scored over 3.0 to move them forward to the Board for consideration, that one vote could be made to advance the entire category. Dr. Ouimet suggested reviewing each preproposal to ensure there was ample opportunity to discuss any significant differences in scoring or opinion on a particular project before casting a block vote.

The Schumann-1 preproposal to determine timing application of fertilizer for better fruit quality was discussed and moved to the Board for consideration for a full proposal. The Committee discussed the lack of regulatory concerns the project faced, and noted it was a little expensive. There was also a contingency suggestion to include a potassium effect.

With little discussion the next five preproposals, Alferez-2, Dewdney, Zhang, Chaparro, and Pederson, were agreed upon to advance to the Board for consideration for invitation of a full proposal.

The Grosser-Gmitter preproposal that evaluated the necessity for sustainable and profitable breeding and the evaluation of scions and rootstocks was discussed in detail. Dr. Futch reported on the scientific basis of the project and the Committee members gave their reviews based on the merit of the proposal. Mr. Barben made a motion to not advance the preproposal to the Board for consideration for a full proposal. Mr. Story seconded the motion, which passed with six yays, five nays, and one abstention.

Conrath-2 was the next preproposal discussed. Dr. Graham compared the project to Bayer's Plant Defense Modulator. He explained the SAB's scores were not a strong endorsement of the project due to the accessibility of results to growers. The Committee members who reviewed the preproposal scored higher due to the reasonable budget and a novel response to HLB and resistance to other citrus diseases. The Conrath-2 preproposal moved forward to the Board for consideration for invitation for full proposal.

Dr. Dawson reviewed the Wang-3 preproposal which approached unraveling the cultural approaches and mechanisms responsible for the tolerance of the Sugarbelle. He explained that the SAB was not overly enthused with the project, found it confusing, and recalled having reviewed it in the past. RMC reviewers scored middle of the road. Each stated that, while it may not be groundbreaking, they found the horticultural aspects pleasing and the hope of a varietal tolerance peaked interest. The Wang-3 Preproposal, based on SAB and RMC scores, did not advance to the Board for consideration for invitation for full preproposal.

Bowman-2, high throughput inoculation using ACP to evaluate germplasm for resistance or tolerance, was the next preproposal discussed. Dr. Futch mentioned it would be used for conventional and nonconventional breeding at USDA and would also be available for use by other groups. He also mentioned the project versus program aspect of the matter and how SAB scored based on funding concerns. Committee members who reviewed the project preproposal were concerned about the potential use for growers, however, it was noted that the CPD Committee has supported the program as a service/support project for the past several years. After additional discussion regarding programmatic vs project funding and which PI would handle the project, and based on the RMC scoring, the project was not advanced to the Board for consideration for invitation for full proposal.

The next two preproposals, submitted by Havranek and Niedz, were also not advanced to the Board for consideration for invitation for full proposal based on scoring by the Committee.

After re-sorting the list, twenty-three preproposals had been moved forward for Board consideration for full proposal. Those preproposals not advanced were reviewed again to be sure any projects that should be invited at this time were not overlooked.

Mr. Dantzler asked the Committee to review the El Mohtar preproposal using CTV as a tool to induce efficient flowering in citrus seedlings. Dr. Dawson gave a brief scientific background on the project.

After discussion regarding the reasons for the ratings, Mr. Farr moved to advance the El Mohtar preproposal for consideration of a full proposal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Simmons. There was discussion regarding the El Mohtar CTV preproposal as well as the reconsideration of a CTV project submitted by Mr. Irej. It was stated that the two projects were vastly different and the reconsideration of one should not automatically result in the reconsideration of the other. The motion was repeated to elevate the El-Mohtar preproposal for advancement to the Board for consideration and passed unanimously.

Mr. Howard asked for a contingency in the Rossi full proposal, to include a clarification dealing with the intellectual property, patents, etc. in the full proposal. Dr. Ouimet asked that the full proposal provide a time range that results could be disclosed to the industry, which all agreed. With no other comments or discussion on the preproposals, Dr. Ouimet entertained a motion for the advancement of the twenty-four preproposals to the Board. Mr. Himrod moved to recommend the twenty-four preproposals to the Board for invitation of full proposals. The motion was seconded by Mr. Farr and passed unanimously.

The Committee inquired as to the budget availability for first-year costs and overall budgets for the preproposals advancing for consideration. Mr. Dantzler responded that the first-year budgets for the twenty-four projects were in line with the funding that the Finance and Audit Committee had budgeted.

Mr. Barben addressed the Committee regarding the breeding program. He mentioned time and money are limited to keep at status quo. He would like to help the plant breeders help the growers.

Mr. Irej addressed the Committee during Public Comments. He stated that Southern Gardens did not pursue transgenics because they do not flower for years. Addressing juvenility is very important and is a way to cut five years off the program if you can get them to flower in year two.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m.
Minutes submitted by Deidra Whatley