The meeting of the National Grape Clean Plant Network (Tier 2) Board was convened at 9:00 a.m. on November 13, 2009, at the Stonegate Country Club in Davis, California. The Chair of the National Grape CPN, Deborah Golino, made welcoming remarks.

Self-introductions were made. The following people were present at the meeting: Maher Al Rwahnih, Mike Anderson, Gary Ballard, Cathy Caldwell, Annie Cocchia, Mike Colvin, Mike Cunningham, Lynn Epstein, Marc Fuchs, Deborah Golino, Matthew Haddon, Jan Hedberg, Carol Holko, Ernie Ilsley, Justin Jacobs, Carole Lamb, Lori Leong, Steve Maniaci, Bob Martin, Dan Martinez, Judit Monis, Fatima Osman, Aurelio Posadas, Wenping Qiu, Dennis Rak, Adib Rowhani, Erich Rudyj, Tia Russell, Sue Sim, Rhonda Smith, Keith Striegler, Nancy Sweet, Tom Wessels, Tedd Wildman, Jim Wolpert. The following people viewed the meeting on the webcam: Mark Chien, Mizuho Nito, Tony Wolf, Liz Vavricka.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting in Hermann, Missouri, on February 24, 2009, was made, seconded and passed.

Report on Grapes East and West (Tier 3) Meetings

Eastern Grape CPN
Keith Striegler, Chair of the Eastern Grape CPN, deferred his report to the item on the Eastern foundation vineyard.

Western Grape CPN
Deborah Golino, Chair of the Western Grape CPN, gave a report of the meeting held on October 28, 2009.

The group discussed Western needs that were not funded by the 2009 NCPN RFA. Specific needs targeted for potential inclusion in requests in the 2010 RFA process included:

1. Outreach
   There is some controversy about application of the outreach component of the NCPN. The scientists envision direct outreach efforts to assist growers. The Governing Body (Tier 1) wants a national education and outreach communications plan, across commodities. The GB is looking toward bringing in an outside group to do the education and outreach.

2. Standard Protocol
   FPS proposed to retain a scientist to compile a standard protocol for pathogen testing conducted by the NCPN grape network facilities. Some crops require such protocols as a prerequisite for international shipping. Required tests for current permits are minimal (only three index tests). Substitution of one lesser test for a more accurate required test was allowed on at least one occasion. Standard protocols required for obtaining permits are needed for grapes. As proposed, the scientist would visit each location and document techniques, tests and procedures for testing grape foundation material. Golino will improve
the proposal this year to more thoroughly explain the need to the Governing Board for the 2010 RFA process. She stated that this issue is different from regulatory harmonization that is not funded by NCPN funds.

3. Improvements to Tier 2 2010 RFA Review Process
The Tier 3 West Board recommends that the Tier 2 Grape Board adopt the use of an ad hoc committee of industry stakeholders and regulatory representatives to assist in review of grape proposal submissions in the 2010 NCPN RFA process. The 2009 review process was not done on a prioritization basis with industry input because of competing Eastern foundation vineyard proposals and the desire of the Western representatives to allow the Eastern Grape CPN to select which of the multiple foundation vineyard proposals the East felt to be appropriate.

4. National Grape CPN Charter
The Western Grape CPN recommends that terms for all NCPN grape board members be 4 years, with staggered terms and no term limits. It is also recommended that the Tier 3 Boards merge into a single Tier 2 Board as soon as possible.

[A Power Point presentation illustrating Golino’s remarks is posted on the website.]

**NCPN Update**

[Rudyj used an extensive Power Point presentation on various agenda items to illustrate his remarks throughout the meeting. The entire presentation is posted on the website with the minutes.]

NCPN Coordinator Erich Rudyj introduced NCPN Governing Body member Tom Wessels from Washington State and Aurelio Posadas from the National Plant Board.

In his presentation at the meeting, Rudyj initially summarized NCPN background information, process and function, the 2008 Farm Bill provisions and NCPN benchmarks 2005-2010. New commodity networks (citrus, berries and hops) have begun forming their own governing bodies. In a later portion of the talk titled ‘Establishing an NCPN Specialty Crop Group’, he described the nine-step process for joining the NCPN and ultimately obtaining funding.

Rudyj spoke about major challenges for the NCPN in 2010, including resolution of two critical issues (foundation vineyard for the eastern region; formation of an education and outreach component) and determination of the NCPN role in nursery certification issues.

He then provided an update on NCPN program governance and displayed a chart illustrating the entire NCPN network as it will exist by mid 2010. The former CSREES agency is now known as the National Institute of Food & Agriculture (NIFA).

The administration in Washington D.C. has assigned Karen Grillo to the USDA to monitor programs of interest. She will assist in drafting a white paper for information regarding the NCPN.
NCPN Funding 2009 – Program Criteria and Priorities
Rudyj then reported on funding awards made as a result of the 2009 RFA. He summarized the scope of NCPN funding, the terms of the 2008 Farm Bill, funding eligibility requirements, the NCPN 2009 funding priorities, and specific funding allocations made by the Governing Body in connection with the 2009 RFA.

The Governing Body allocated $3,574,901 of the $5 million NCPN funds available for the 2009 RFA process. Approximately 53% of the money went to grape programs and 47% to fruit tree programs. Additional funds from non-NCPN sources were allocated to states for pilot programs for state certification and harmonization of certification standards.

Rudyj indicated that the Governing Body is considering requiring some type of cost sharing or matching funding for future applicants for NCPN funds. The matching requirement would indicate a move toward long term self-sufficiency by the applicant. Additionally, NCPN funds are ephemeral.

Rudyj commented that the Governing Body did not fund the Eastern Grape CPN proposals for a foundation planting because the proposals were competitive rather than cooperative. Although the GB did not fund the foundation proposal from Cornell University or any of the other eastern grape network applicants, the GB did fund grape diagnostic and therapy work for Cornell because it found that those activities would be useful to the grape industry in the eastern region. Missouri State University also received funding for diagnostic and therapy work for grapes in the heartland of the United States as well as for managing a small foundation planting. Industry representatives in states adjacent to Missouri spoke highly of that program to the GB.

The Governing Body will not fund new construction, which would require a return to Congress for permission to fund that item, nor will it fund DNA plant identification work.

Rudyj explained that standard protocols for pathogen testing (an FPS request) were not funded because the proposal was institutional rather than network-wide. Adib Rowhani commented that standardized testing is necessary to build trust as plant material is moved around the United States. Rudyj suggested that the grape network reapply for this item in 2010 and emphasize a national application.

He concluded that the Governing Body (Tier 1) and the Tier 2 commodity boards continue to struggle to define their roles for such things as outreach and standard operating procedures for testing.

2010 RFA – Grape Needs and Review Process
Rudyj described anticipated NCPN program funding logistics for 2010. The full $5 million will be made available for distribution in 2010. The RFA will look very much like the 2009 RFA because that version has already been fully vetted by the Office of Management and Budget. It is anticipated that the 2010 RFA will be issued in April, in advance of the 2010 General Meeting in Davis, California, in May. Proposals will be due in May and the funds will be available to cooperators by July. Rudyj indicated that the Governing Body encourages mega-centers such as WSU-Prosser and FPS-Davis to apply for multiple speciality crops.
RFA 2010 revisions and likely timelines
Possible changes to the 2010 RFA include the addition of federal applicants as eligible for NCPN funds, a requirement for industry-driven proposal review, and more rigorous requirements related to explaining how a proposal meets industry goals and to listing proposed deliverables.

Rudyj again stated that the Governing Body may possibly require applicants to seek additional external program funding through cost sharing and matching. A comment was made that any matching requirement must be defined broadly or it would hinder applications. For example, UC Davis’ Office of Research does not allow IAB money (industry funds) to be considered a ‘match’. Rudyj commented that he considered IAB money to be a match within the spirit of the GB’s requirement.

Deborah Golino commented that the Viticulture Consortium West RFP allows applicants to explain within the text of their VCW proposals the source of other industry funding for a project without explicitly designating such funding as ‘a match’ for VCW funds.

Rudyj mentioned that there is no Congressional mandate for matching funds for NCPN money. The intent of the GB is to require an applicant program to show that it receives other funding in support of the program that seeks NCPN funds. Golino requested that the RFP allow a description of such funding in the text of the Application in Response to the RFA without defining the additional funding in terms of matching funds.

Tedd Wildman inquired about in-kind matches. Rudyj replied that ‘in kind efforts’ could constitute the required cost sharing sought by the GB.

It was suggested that the GB consider conducting a post-RFA release meeting of applicants in order to receive specific comments from the applicants about the terms of the RFA. Various state and local governmental agencies hold such bidders’ conferences in order to address and clarify bidder concerns in advance of drafting the applications.

In response to a question about whether the NCPN is over-extended in terms of commodities, Rudyj commented that the most the NCPN can accommodate through 2012 is grapes, fruit trees, citrus (moderate needs), berries (moderate needs), hops (small need), sweet potato (small need) and perhaps olives (small need).

Improvements to 2010 Tier 2 Proposal Review Process
The Tier 2 review process for the Grape CPN in 2009 was constrained by the competing proposals for establishment of a foundation vineyard in the eastern region of the United States. The decision was made to score the proposals on a pass-fail basis (i.e., did the applicant work through the National Grape CPN to vet its proposals) rather than a prioritization basis. This method was chosen because of the presence of many proposal reviewers from the western region of the United States on the Tier 2 grape board.

The proposed 2010 review procedure (recommended by the Tier 3 Grapes West board after a meeting in October, 2009) is to adopt a procedure similar to the one used by the Fruit Tree CPN in 2009. An ad hoc committee of industry and regulatory stakeholders would be
selected to advise the Tier 2 Board in prioritizing the grape proposals in response to the RFA.

Deborah Golino suggested that every member of the Tier 3 East and West Boards that does not submit a proposal in response to the RFA be on the *ad hoc* committee. Tedd Wildman suggested a broader inclusion of industry experts. Golino responded that the problem with industry members who are not on either of the Tier 3 Grape boards is that they would have a steep NCPN learning curve. Bob Martin indicated one method to include knowledgable industry representatives on the *ad hoc* committee is to include industry representatives from the Fruit Tree CPN for technical advisors. Carol Holko is concerned about conflict of interest on the *ad hoc* committee and proposed adding more people.

The proposal review process will be included in the NCPN Tier 2 charter.

**2010 Needs for the Grape CPN**

No responses were received to the question of unmet needs from the 2009 RFA cycle. However, the question segued into the issue of the following topic of grape network outreach.

**Proposal for NCPN Grape Outreach Effort on a Network-wide Basis**

Keith Striegler began the discussion of an outreach proposal that would serve the entire grape network. He supports an outreach program targeted specifically to grape producers and nurseries. Information should be provided to them describing the value of clean plant material and proper maintenance of clean plants. If clean plants are neglected and then reinfected, the grower will fail to see the benefit of a clean plant program. Striegler stated that the NCPN outreach program should provide best management practices for growers. He concluded that an economic analysis on the cost of vines dying from disease prematurely in the field is necessary.

Deborah Golino envisions a Grape CPN team that visits user groups of the NCPN products. The team of scientists could contact growers and explain NCPN concerns and solutions. High level NCPN representatives (knowledgable in plant pathology and grape virology) could conduct workshops all over the nation. This outreach design was intended for the 2009 Golino/Striegler outreach proposal that was derailed last year by the requirement that only single institutional proposals be submitted in response to the 2009 RFA.

The separately submitted outreach applications (FPS, WSU) in 2009 were not funded by the Governing Body. Erich Rudyj commented that the GB wrestled with funding the outreach issue and ultimately decided not to fund the separate institutional proposals because they did not work as a network and the GB was not sure of the appropriate approach to take for NCPN outreach.

The GB eventually tentatively concluded that appropriate NCPN outreach efforts should not consist of traditional extension work in connection with plant diseases but rather more general communications to the public on the value of the clean plants that emerge from the
network. The GB has not made a definite decision yet. Karen Grillo will work with the Secretary’s office to oversee the communication function.

All present acknowledged that extension funding has been seriously curtailed in the past few years.

He suggested that the National Grape CPN consider submitting a single, multi-institutional outreach proposal in response to the 2010 RFA. The proposal should reflect the common needs and interests of the institutions. The structure of the proposal could be designed in one of two ways: (1) a lead institution could be funded and the funds could be bifurcated/trifurcated through that lead institution; or (2) funding could be allocated directly to each institution.

Deborah Golino proposed that the Grape CPN build off the 2009 proposal, with Keith Striegler and University of Missouri as the lead institution, with the primary aim of outreach and extension work to meet needs of the end users of the product.

Economic Study
Another component of an outreach proposal could be an economic study conducted by experts from centers such as WSU, UCD, Cornell, and MSU. The following discussion was had about a possible economic study related to outreach efforts – this proposal is distinct from the economic study/feasibility report issue related to the Eastern Grape CPN foundation vineyard.

Tedd Wildman supports a multi-institution economic study to support the Grape Network outreach proposal. Deborah Golino indicated that the study could become a part of Striegler’s proposal (University of Missouri as lead institution in Grape CPN outreach).

Erich Rudyj commented that the multi-institution approach would comply with the GB interest in a national (Tier 2) outreach proposal. The GB would be very impressed if the Tier 2 outreach proposal included an economic study, e.g., the value of clean plant material and the catastrophic effect of disease wiping out the germplasm. Economists could identify gaps in the current studies. Rudyj indicated that an economic study could be funded with FY 2010 NCPN money because such study would clarify funding needs.

Carol Holko commented that extension work could be accomplished through state certification programs using 10201(d) funds. Rudyj indicated that the GB is considering a special section in the next RFA for Extension and Outreach, maybe even requiring a separate Tier 2 –type national body to administer that activity.

Golino asked if the GB had an idea for a lead person/institution for the economic study portion of the extension/outreach activity. Rudyj stated that he would identify a person, possibly associated with an institution not currently part of the NCPN. He will speak with USDA’s ESA administrators and request the name of a credible economist.

Keith Striegler stated that Tier 2 and Tier 3 Grapes must be intimately involved with such an economic study. Striegler added that the economic study must involve a convergence of the following: (1) information collectors who survey problems; (2) extension representatives
working on grapes; and (3) economists with knowledge of the industry. He will submit a proposal to the GB, perhaps in advance of the 2010 RFA, consisting of a request for funding for a workshop on how to do the economic study.

Rhonda Smith mentioned that the Department of Agricultural Economics at UCD has a full-time extension specialist who is experienced with crop studies and cost estimates for production. The UCD personnel are familiar with such studies in relation to grapes.

Rudyj stated that Striegler should include in the Tier 2 national outreach proposal funding for a workshop on the economic study. The proposal should include the method for conducting such a study, the necessary people to be included in the project, and the necessary economic studies and analysis.

Rudyj indicated that the Tier 1 GB could fund the workshop in advance of issuance of the 2010 RFA. He stated that the GB would need a short proposal (2-3 pages), using the same format as required last year including a budget (food, lodging and travel expenses). He proposed that each center in the Grape CPN provide a representative to the workshop. Golino proposed that the centers supply an economist with knowledge of the grape industry.

Striegler proposed that a one-day workshop be held around the Unified Symposium in Sacramento in January, 2010. Each institution/center will provide an economist familiar with grapes. The NCPN travel money will be used to fund scientists and economists associated with NCPN centers. Striegler’s budget proposal will cover travel for scientists and economists not associated with NCPN centers. The workshop will be conducted on the Friday before the Unified Symposium. [That date was later abandoned.]

Cathy Caldwell commented that any economic study must address the issue of the increased value to a nursery for selling certified plant material and the additional profit that a nursery could make as a result. The grower and nursery must be able to see a value in order for certified stock to make sense.

Ken Rauscher had asked previously whether or not juice grapes are included in the NCPN clean plant work. Golino indicated that juice grapes, table grapes and raisins are all included. Dennis Rak indicated that the Cornell program is familiar with the economic considerations around juice grapes. Gary Ballard added that juice grapes, especially related to Concord, are included in Washington State trade associations.

**Naming Committee for Network-wide grape selections**

WSU Prosser, FPS, and potentially a new foundation vineyard in the eastern region all assign unique numbers for grape selections at each center. A uniform naming system for grape selections of common cultivars at multiple centers is needed for clarity and uniformity of reference. The uniform system would avoid confusion and duplication involved with the use on the National Grape Registry website of the same variety and selection numbers from multiple centers. The system should be transparent, coordinated among the centers, and not overly burdensome.

Deborah Golino, Gary Ballard, Nancy Sweet, Wenping Qiu and a representative from Cornell University were appointed to meet and recommend a uniform numbering system.
Additional volunteers should tell Nancy if they wish to be included. The committee should consult with programmer Karl Krist for technical input.

**Proposal for Managing NCPN Grape Testing Standards**
Deborah Golino indicated that FPS intends to resubmit the proposal for documenting standard operating procedures for pathogen testing of grapevine foundation material.

**Lunch**

**Report on Status of Eastern Grape CPN Foundation Block**
Keith Striegler, Marc Fuchs and Erich Rudyj presented the issue of the Eastern Grape foundation planting.

Rudyj began the discussion by framing the issue. The Governing Body highly recommends a foundation planting for the eastern region, believing that such a planting will be useful to the Grape CPN. Recognizing that funding is limited, the GB further feels that such a planting should not be in competition with the established grape centers but rather should be collaborative with them. They envisage a national network of grape centers with redundancy to accommodate potential failures. Rudyj characterized the eastern foundation project as a multi-disciplinary group (‘collaboration in coalition’).

Rudyj indicated that the GB can fund one eastern foundation vineyard project. That proposal can include an eastern region administrative support person to coordinate activities for Tier 3 Grapes East and consult and coordinate with the Tier 2 national board.

Rudyj described the following possible discussion points: expansion of the eastern U.S. wine industry; high value grapes; concerns re disease unique to grapes in the eastern U.S.; ready access to special clones unique to the eastern region; a collaborative foundation project; the Tier 1 recognition of the desirability of redundancy (bioterrorism); multiple centers as backup for each other.

Keith Striegler reviewed the teleconference that the Tier 3 Grapes East Board conducted on Friday, November 6, 2009. About 15 people participated in the conference. Initially, it was noted that the Tier 1 Governing Board will fund only foundation (formerly known as G1 type) plantings. Funding sources include the NCPN portion of the Farm Bill, as well as some other sections of the bill related to specialty crops. The group agreed that the Tier 3 Grapes East is the appropriate body to determine the needs of the eastern region. The Tier 1 Governing Body will assist the Eastern Grape CPN to meet the needs.

The grape industry in the eastern region recognizes that a foundation planting in the eastern region would be useful. Additionally, participation of an eastern clean plant center in a national NCPN grape effort would facilitate movement of grape plant material between the eastern and western regions.

The conference call group recognized that a model for foundation plantings has been established by existing clean plant centers. They concluded that it might be a good idea for an eastern foundation planting center to follow that model but acknowledged that the eastern center should not be required to follow that model, recognizing that today things
might be done different than when the existing foundation plantings were established years ago.

They discussed the need for a coordinator for the Eastern Grape CPN and foundation center, to serve the function that Bill Howell does for the National Fruit Tree Network and Nancy Sweet for the National and Western Grape Networks. The coordinator would monitor critical issues, organize meetings, and draft funding proposals. Some names were proposed.

The eastern foundation plant center proposal was then defined. It would include diagnostic work, disease elimination therapy, and a foundation vineyard. The Eastern Tier 3 Board is committed to the concept of establishing an eastern foundation vineyard to cooperate within a network with UCD (premier planting), WSU (cold weather grapes) and MSU (heartland grapes). The issue of multiple v. single institution was resolved by having a multi-institution advisory group to the eastern foundation center, including the applicants in the 2009 RFA (Cornell, Maryland, Virginia Tech), with a single lead institution. Dennis Rak indicated that the participants in the conference call designated Cornell University as the lead institution with the foundation planting. The remaining stakeholders would participate on an advisory board for the foundation vineyard. Carol Holko stated that she did not agree the conference call concluded that there would be only a single planting at Cornell. The issue of possible indoor facilities for such a foundation proposal was mentioned.

The Grapes East Tier 3 Board concluded that the administrative coordinator is a good idea and would add value to the organization.

The Tier 3 Board then assigned a small group to meet and draft a two to three page action paper to explain and document the conclusions reached during the conference call. The following institutions were suggested as participants: University of Missouri, Missouri State University, Maryland, Virginia Tech and Cornell.

Erich Rudyj noted that the eastern foundation vineyard is a complex question, involving both science and politics. He commented that the scientific point of view requires a determination of what makes sense for the grape industry. The Governing Body is prepared to support the concept of the eastern foundation vineyard. The precise form that the proposal manifests is yet undetermined. Rudyj stated that the issue needs to come to closure within FY 2010. He recognized that there probably will not be unanimity but hopes for a consensus.

Tedd Wildman commented that the ball is in the court of the Eastern Grape CPN Board. He inquired about funding new facilities. Rudyj responded that the GB might be able to justify some limited funding of ‘something new’ with the NCPN funds. The Farm Bill indicated that existing facilities should be used ‘to the extent practicable’. New programs may have to pay for their own new bricks and mortar but NCPN funds could be used to rehabilitate existing facilities, as was done with Clemson for Fruit Trees.

Deborah Golino mentioned that the former NRSP-5 organization at Prosser, Washington, for fruit trees is a good model for multi-state participation. NRSP-5 had a national board
with people from all over the United States. The program was housed at Prosser, where the foundation planting was located.

Erich Rudyj indicated that Grapes East should quickly determine what its needs are for a foundation planting. The determination should be made prior to the issuance of the next RFA. The national perspective is a desire to see Tier 3 East keep working at it.

Keith Striegler stated that a meeting was held among some Grapes East Board members the evening before that day’s meeting (November 12). A single page concept paper was created memorializing the November 6 conference call and action plan for addressing the eastern foundation issue. Striegler read the action plan statement to the Tier 2 meeting.

The November 12 summary was presented to the Tier 2 group as follows:

1. Striegler and Marc Fuchs will draft a 3-page white paper containing: (a) a proposal for a foundation vineyard in the Eastern CPN region; (b) the concept of a single lead institution; (c) collaborative effort with other NCPN institutions that have foundation vineyards; (d) a committee representing multiple Eastern Grape CPN institutions to manage the foundation block or materials in the foundation vineyard; and (e) a half-time Eastern Grape NCPN coordinator to manage Board activities and communications.

2. A Grapes East (Tier 3) Board meeting via conference call shall be scheduled at a convenient time for the week of November 30 to December 4; Doodle poll

3. At the conference call meeting, an up or down vote shall be taken on the proposal for a foundation vineyard in the Eastern region.

4. If the Tier 3 Board recommends a proposal, a National Grape CPN (Tier 2) Board meeting will be scheduled via teleconference to review the EGCPN proposal. This should occur before Christmas.

5. Erich Rudyj will submit any approved proposal to the NCPN Tier 1 Governing Body. The GB will then determine whether the eastern foundation vineyard is a go this year as a ‘discretionary’ funding matter or must wait until the next formal funding cycle.

The participants at the Tier 2 meeting expressed no objection to the proposal procedure but offered comments as described below.

Deborah Golino indicated that the existing plant centers (UCD, WSU, MSU) will need a list of plant materials required by an eastern foundation planting very soon, or the planting will have to be delayed one year.

Mike Colvin noted that the eastern foundation vineyard would lose plants if there is a hard freeze. Keith Striegler commented that a hard cold would not be a problem with screenhouses or on Long Island, which has never suffered a cold injury problem.
Steve Maniaci (Sunridge Nurseries) asked whether a cost analysis has ever been performed relative to the eastern foundation block. Erich Rudyj replied that it had not. The GB has a list of names of potential experts for such an analysis and will decide soon on how to proceed for such an analysis.

Dennis Rak stated that it is important to have a foundation in the eastern region in order get stakeholder ownership in the NCPN. The establishment of the foundation is necessary regardless of cost benefit.

It was mentioned that UC Davis and Prosser, Washington, are ‘premier’ plantings and provide premier grape material. Premier in this context means a ‘well recognized, established facility’. The question was asked about whether the new eastern foundation would be a premier planting.

Deborah Golino analogized the new grape center structure to the fruit tree network consisting of foundation plantings at Prosser, Washington and UC Davis. Prosser takes the lead on the foundation in terms of planting and science, except for testing. If Cornell as a foundation location in the east accepts bundles of grape wood for planting from FPS, WSU or MSU, Cornell would retest it. It is acceptable that Cornell retests it. Cornell would be a redundant foundation vineyard (G1) in the east. Prosser, Davis (FPS), Cornell and Missouri State have all invested in grape virology positions that the other institutions do not have.

Erich Rudyj commented that there is a limit on funding for those things.

Tedd Wildman asked whether there has been any preliminary discussion among the stakeholders regarding infrastructure. Cornell and some of the other states already have the infrastructure to support a foundation vineyard. Striegler commented that everyone must bring something to the table – facilities, people, or industry match.

Marc Fuchs stated that Cornell has done index and/or certification since the early 1960’s and that the program vanished due to lack of support in the late 1990’s. The infrastructure for that work is already present at Geneva, New York. Cornell has always worked directly with the nurseries but has not established a foundation vineyard. Long Island is a distance away from Geneva. There are facilities (offices, labs, experimental farms and cold storage) at the proposed foundation site on Long Island. LIREC at Riverhead, NY, has an experiment station, infrastructure for variety trials, personnel, and irrigation. It is one mile away from the nearest commercial vineyard. The current eastern foundation vineyard proposal is built upon the existing program at Cornell.

The pieces missing from the 2009 eastern foundation vineyard proposals were consensus of direction, clear statements of industry support and an agreed-upon location or shared locations for the foundation vineyard – all the rest was there. Erich Rudyj advised that the Tier 3 Grapes East Board seek the counsel of the affected industry representatives, which would weigh heavily with the Tier 1 GB.

Steve Maniaci asked whether or not the eastern block proposals ensure long term deliverables. Redundancy may offer more flexibility in the management of clean material.
Marc Fuchs commented that crown gall is a big issue in the East at the present time.

Deborah Golino mentioned that having industry participants near the foundation vineyard facilitates outreach.

Erich Rudyj commented that a successful bidder will require the contribution of land, a functional facility (in light of the limited funds), and existing people (who are expensive). A scientist is very expensive. Any proposal starting anew with an entire program would be very expensive.

**Review and Finalize the Grape CPN Charter**

Several modifications to the proposed National Grape CPN charter were discussed. At its October 28, 2009, meeting, the Western Grape CPN recommended some amendments to the charter (see minutes of Grapes West meeting on October 28, 2009).

Tedd Wildman moved, and Bob Martin seconded, a motion that the terms for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Board members be changed from two years to four years (similar to the Fruit Tree CPN). Martin moved, and Wildman seconded, that the terms be staggered – i.e., that if the NCPN is still receiving funding after four years, half of the Board members be replaced. The motions passed.

Martin then made a motion to dissolve both Tier 3 entities and merge them into a single grape Tier 2 board. The motion was seconded. Carol Holko stated that she did not feel it was appropriate to vote on issues affecting Tier 3 East because she thought there were not enough Tier 3 people present at the meeting. Deborah Golino commented that it would be more appropriate to wait for the concurrence of the Tier 3 East Board prior to voting on the merger. Keith Striegler indicated that the eastern foundation vineyard issue ought to be resolved by the end of December, at which time a subsequent conference call of the Grapes East Board could be conducted to consider the issue of the merger.

Deborah Golino suggested that a committee be appointed to advise the Tier 2 Board on the foundation vineyard for the eastern region of the United States. That issue was deferred to the Tier 3 East Board.

The members of the Tier 3 West Board present at the meeting all voted approval of the merger of the Tier 3 Boards into a single Tier 2 Board as soon as possible.

**Future Meetings**

Erich Rudyj reported that the Governing Body (Tier 1) will have three ‘in person’ meetings each year – one closed meeting at one of the NCPN centers to conduct a business meeting; one closed meeting to review proposals submitted for the annual RFA process; and one open General Meeting for stakeholders. In 2009, the General Meeting was held at the U.S. National Arboretum in Washington D.C. In 2010, the GB will hold the General Meeting at UC Davis in April. [The date was subsequently changed to May 11-13]. Rudyj anticipates a two-day meeting with a tour of a California grapevine/fruit tree nursery and grapevine grower on a third day. GB member Tom Wessels concurred.
Deborah Golino indicated that the National Grape CPN will meet in advance of the General Meeting.

Dan Martinez was appointed Chair of the *ad hoc* committee for review of National Grape CPN (Tier 2) 2010 proposals.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Sweet
National Grape CPN Coordinator