MINUTES
MEETING, WESTERN GRAPE CLEAN PLANT NETWORK
DECEMBER 16, 2008

The meeting of the Western Grape Clean Plant Network was convened at 9:00 a.m. on December 16, 2008, in the AGR Room of the Buehler Alumni Center on the campus of the University of California, Davis. WGCPN Chair Deborah Golino made welcoming remarks.

Self-introductions were made. The following people were present at the meeting:
Maher Al Rwahnih, Mike Anderson, Malli Aradhya, Murali Bandla, Diego Barison, Tom Bewick, Cathy Caldwell, Annie Cocchia, Mike Colvin, Cheryl Covert, Mike Cunningham, Nick Dokoozlian, John Duarte, Ken Eastwell, Bev Ferguson, Phil Freese, Deborah Golino, Jan Hedberg, Todd Berg (for Hal Huffsmith), Justin Jackson, Justin Jacobs, Carole Lamb, Lori Leong, Steve Maniaci, Dan Martinez, Susan McCarthy, Butch McKinley, Judit Monis, Tom Nemciik, Fatima Osman, Jean-Mari Peltier, Dennis Rak, Adib Rowhani, Erich Rudyj, Tia Russell, Sue Sim, Rhonda Smith, Keith Striegler, Mysore Sudarshana, Nancy Sweet, Liz Vavricka, Judy Yang, Tom Wessels, Tedd Wildman, Jim Wolpert.

Introduction of Board Members
The Board members for the Western Grape CPN (Tier 3) were introduced: Chair: Deborah Golino (FPS); Industry-Nursery: Dan Martinez (California), Cathy Caldwell (Oregon); Industry-Grower: Phil Freese (California), Tedd Wildman (Washington); Extension: Rhonda Smith (UC, Sonoma County); Research: Ken Eastwell (WSU); State regulatory: Mike Colvin (California), Jan Hedberg (Oregon), Tom Wessels (Washington). The Vice-Chair, Bob Martin (Oregon), was unable to attend the meeting due to severe weather conditions in Oregon.

Election of Tier 2 Representatives
The Tier 2 Board for the National Grape CPN will meet in late February. Four Tier 2 Board members must be elected from each of the Tier 3 Boards (East, West). The WGCPN Board elected four representatives to the Tier 2 Board: Mike Colvin (state regulatory), Deborah Golino (extension/research), Dan Martinez (nursery), Tedd Wildman (grower).

The Tier 2 representatives will serve on both the Tier 2 and Tier 3 Boards. The Tier 2 Board will hear proposals for funding from both the East and West Grape CPNs and will recommend funding to the Tier 1 National Governing Body.

Tier 1 Governing Body members will be chosen by the Core Working Group (CWG) to serve on the Tier 1 body only and may not serve simultaneously on Tier 2/3 Boards. Tom Wessels (Washington State Department of Agriculture) has been nominated to serve on the Tier 1 Body. A replacement for him on the Western Grape CPN Board will be necessary. The Chairs of the Fruit and Grape CPNs will be non-voting members of Tier 1.
In the NCPN Governance Update & Review of Allocation Procedure for NCPN Funds, Murali Bandla spoke about NCPN funding and the Tier 1 Governing Body.

The Core Working Group (CWG) will issue a call for proposals (also known as an RFP, Request for Proposals) for NCPN funds in February, 2009, or shortly thereafter. OMB (Office of Management & Budget) approval is needed before NCPN funds can be accessed through the CCC. The funds for federal fiscal year 2009 will most likely be available after March, 2009, one option being through multi-year cooperative agreements, subject to annual renewal. Funding proposals should be coordinated with each other to the extent practical and should embody a national strategic plan. The CWG supports new construction on a case-by-case basis and is currently seeking legal input on the allowability of using the appropriation for such requests. The legal opinion will be obtained prior to issuance of the RFP. The NCPN Core Working Group will make funding decisions in consultation with the National Governing Body (Tier 1), based on recommendations received from the Tier 2 commodity boards.

The Core Working Group consists of Murali Bandla (PPQ), Tom Bewick (CSREES), and Gail Wisler (ARS). The CWG has nominated five government employees to the National Governing Body (Tier 1): Bill Dickerson (APHIS/PPQ), Wayne Dixon (FL), Joseph Postman (ARS), Ken Rauscher (MI), Tom Wessels (WA). The charter document will provide that 2/3 of the 5 members will serve for two years and the remainder for three years. Erich Rudyj (PPQ) has been selected as the NCPN Coordinator.

A draft of the NCPN business plan will be forwarded to the NCPN governing boards and posted on the NCPN website in January. The document will contain NCPN goals and proposed funding allocation for 2009-2012 by commodity.

The Tier 1 Governing Body will meet the end of March or early April at the National Arboretum in Washington D.C. The Tier 2 commodity boards should have completed charters and funding proposals by that time.

Other pending/ongoing initiatives include:

1. Ruth Welliver (PA) is coordinating the harmonization of regulations for state certification programs under the NCPN umbrella.

2. A feasibility study for establishing a G1/G2 grape mother block for the Eastern U.S. is underway;

3. Consideration is being given to the establishment of an Eastern network for the Fruit Tree CPN.

At the present time, the NCPN has no money for direct support of the state certification programs.
Approved October 28, 2009

Dr. Bandla’s presentation can be viewed on the NCPN website under the Grape CPN menu item.

**NCPN Business Plan & Additional Sources of Funding**

Tom Bewick, the CSREES representative to the CWG, reported on the NCPN business plan and the availability of funding for state certification programs. He urged patience with the tight timelines for NCPN events in light of the generous financial support provided by Congress to the NCPN.

The NCPN business plan will be published to the boards and stakeholders in January, 2009. The stated goals and objectives were developed at the 2007 Workshop, including those for governance, research, extension/outreach and quality control. The business plan will provide a breakdown for the allocation of NCPN funds for 2009-2012. Bewick stated that it is important that funding proposals submitted to the Tier 2 commodity boards be coordinated across the network, so as to present a national perspective rather than funding for individual sites. The goal is to demonstrate a successful national NCPN program when renewal of NCPN funding is requested in 2012.

[The proposed business plan is now available under “NCPN NEWS” on the Home Page of the NCPN website, http://ucanr.org/ncpn/. Comments are welcome.]

Bewick mentioned two additional sources of funding for clean plant activities related to NCPN programs. The Farm Bill (section 10201d) provided a continuing appropriation that must be spent on an annual basis for safe nursery practices and was primarily intended for CAPS. It is also money available to the NCPN that may be used for state certification programs. Murali Bandla applied for funds to be used by NCPN under this provision (for mother blocks), and his request has been tentatively approved for a substantial sum of money starting in 2010.

Jim Wolpert asked whether the funds could be used for evaluation of viticultural material. The USDA feels that evaluation of new varieties and clones should be industry-driven. The industry would then advise the NCPN on varieties of interest to be brought into the program. Deborah Golino indicated that the need for varietal and clonal evaluation is currently being addressed by the NE 1020 project.

Bewick explained that the second source of additional funding is money available outside the NCPN program for five specified areas of specialty crops research ($28 million in 2008 and $50 million in 2009). The money is designed to support preliminary work for data collection to allow movement to the next level of research. The NCPN should provide CSREES with input for priority funding for research within the five areas. A solid proposal with good science supporting it has a good likelihood of funding. There will be an announcement in January, 2009, advertising the Specialty Crop Research Initiative; applications must be submitted within 90 days of the announcement (April).
Nick Dokoozlian commented that there should be another layer in the technical aspects of the business plan, i.e., an integrated technical road map to support the business plan. The facilities within the NCPN should be brought up to modern standards with common infrastructure platforms. The concern should be spending efficiencies (non-duplication) on centers of excellence across the nation, as determined by industry and scientists.

**Preliminary Review of WGCPN Proposals for Funding**

**Foundation Plant Services**

Deborah Golino presented proposals for NCPN funding on behalf of FPS.

*Dr. Golino’s full presentation can be accessed on the NCPN website under the Grape CPN menu item.*

**Northwest Grape Foundation Services**

Ken Eastwell presented proposals for NCPN funding on behalf of the NWGFS. Eastwell clarified that the $600,000 request for a new 2070 square foot research greenhouse is for maintenance and control of virus (diseased plants).

*Dr. Eastwell’s full presentation can be accessed on the NCPN website under the Grape CPN menu item.*

Tom Bewick spoke about the form the WGCPN proposal should take. The ideal format would be a single proposal from each Tier 2 commodity network broken down into the “Proposed Activity Areas” contained on page 7 of the “NCPN Draft Business Plan – January 12, 2009 Version 7.1.2”. (See NCPN NEWS on Home Page of NCPN website). The individual sites within the region or nation should work together sharing resources and present the joint national proposal to the Tier 1 body. The Tier 1 body will fund the proposals on the basis of the Proposed Activity Area categories.

Deborah Golino commented that the Eastern Grape CPN must make some important decisions before the entire (national) Grape CPN can combine into a single proposal. The Fruit Tree CPN starts with a national proposal since that commodity is not yet divided into regional networks.

**Thoughts on Evaluation of NCPN Work**

Erich Rudyj presented some thoughts on how the Tier 2 Boards might evaluate NCPN proposals presented to them. The focus should be on the deliverables (products or information) that are ultimately provided to growers and nurseries. The evaluative process might proceed as follows:

1. What are the products/results from the prospective proposal?
2. Who are the recipients/beneficiaries of the proposal?
3. How long will it take to reap any rewards?
4. How does the proposal relate to others before the Board? Does the proposal incorporate shared resources from around the network? How does the proposal tie into the strategic (business) plan?
5. How does industry fit into the proposal?
6. What is the improvement to the industry or public now that the new resource is available? What will be available that was not available before the NCPN?

Report on Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network Meeting
Keith Striegler, Chair, reported on the Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network (EGCPN) meeting held at Geneva, New York, on October 8, 2008.

The October 8 meeting was attended by thirty representatives from the Eastern region. Governance decisions were made. Tony Wolfe presented an inventory of the EGCPN assets. Pathogen testing standards, in particular a reliable testing method for *Agrobacterium vitis*, were discussed. Funding proposals were not addressed at the October 8 meeting because no information on that process was available at that time. A committee was appointed to research the issue of whether or not to establish a G1 or G2 block in the Eastern region. Striegler stated that the Committee is tasked with determining the need for a G1 or G2 block in the Eastern region and then a decision as to the most appropriate location for such a block. An RFP will probably be issued by the EGCPN for a G1 block to determine whether or not any site can meet the requirements.

Golino asked whether the EGCPN could be ready with a proposal by March, given the time needed for research on the G1 block issue. Striegler replied that Maryland and Virginia Tech have proposals and are considering the issue. Bandla indicated that a proposal should be made to the Tier 1 body if the East region assesses a need for a G1 block in the region. The proposals must be ready for the Tier 2 NGCPN meeting in February, but the G1 block proposal could contemplate delay in spending the money for a G1 block in the East until the end of 2009.

Dennis Rak is not convinced that the East region needs its own G1 block but believes that it is critical that the East have an effective G2 source to provide grape material for the Eastern region.

Tom Bewick asked about the impact on FPS if the Eastern region does not have its own G1 block. Deborah Golino replied that a G2 block in Virginia would be a good solution. FPS (as G1) could supply G2 plants to Virginia to multiply, maintain and supply to the Eastern region. FPS currently performs that same function to the Pacific Northwest through the NWGFS (Prosser). FPS could easily assist Tony Wolfe create a G2 block in Virginia, and then Virginia Tech would make the decisions thereafter on testing and maintenance. FPS has been developing its collection of cold hardy grapes for some time now.

Golino added that an important decision for the Grape Tier 2 Board will be whether or not grape plant material may be shipped freely within the NGCPN without the parties having to bill each other.
NE 1020 has been having difficulty getting work funded and clones selected. However, the plots are in the ground now with the assistance of Novavine Grapevine Nursery (California) and Double A Nursery (New York). NE 1020 should provide valuable clonal information to the NCPN.

Malli Aradhya (USDA National Clonal Germplasm Repository, Davis) indicated that the Repository has received useful grape plant material. FPS has been testing and cleaning grape plant material from the NCGR at the request of NE1020 and NCPN constituents. Golino suggested that NCPN money could be used to assist the Repository in screening selections. Once the new management structure is in place at the NCGR-Davis, virus testing of the collection and therapy (by FPS) of the selections requested by the industry should be facilitated.

[The minutes of the October 8, 2008 meeting of the Eastern Grape CPN can be accessed on the NCPN website under the Grape CPN menu item.]

**The Future of NCPN Governance**
The issue of the continuing existence of the Tier 3 regional Boards for the Grape CPN was raised. A comment was made that perhaps it would add efficiencies to eliminate the Tier 3 regional Boards and proceed with only a national (Tier 2) Board.

Keith Striegler indicated that there are historical issues presented to the Eastern region that must be addressed before the Eastern region would agree to eliminate the regional Tier 3 Boards.

Deborah Golino stated that she is not certain whether or not the Western region would need a Tier 3 region meeting for every Tier 3 meeting of the Eastern region.

**NCPN Website**
The NCPN website (http://ucanr.org/ncpn/) is maintained by Nancy Sweet on a UC Davis server. The site is undergoing regular review and updating. Tom Bewick commented that the Home Page could be made more user-friendly by incorporating a news or press release section with short summaries of key events.

**Status Report on Model Grape Regulations**
Ruth Welliver submitted a written report on the status of the Model Grape Regulations. Bob Martin has agreed to prepare the first draft of a model document from which the group can work. The Working Group has agreed to prepare a tentative draft by March, 2009.

*Dr. Welliver’s written report can be accessed on the NCPN website under the Grape CPN menu item.*
Finalization of WGCPN Pathogen List
It was proposed that a Scientific Committee composed of plant pathologists and regulatory staff be appointed to evaluate the pathogen list for the Grape CPN. The primary issues will be virus, rupestris stem pitting, crown gall and Pierce’s Disease. Oregon has recently raised an issue with California grape material and wants PD tests done in the Fall on fresh wood, not dormant cuttings, before allowing California material into Oregon. Jan Hedberg reported that Oregon through the USDA (Bob Martin) has established some trials on the issue of whether PD is really an issue in Oregon.

The isolation requirements for grape plant material will be addressed in the Model Grape Regulations report.

Identification Using DNA Fingerprinting Techniques
Judy Yang (Foundation Plant Services) gave a presentation on DNA fingerprinting techniques used for evaluation of the NCGR and FPS grapevine collections.

The USDA feels that DNA fingerprinting is not an appropriate activity for NCPN funding and is a liability issue. Bandla stated that disease issues are a higher priority for the NCPN than identification testing; if funding is adequate, both activities could be supported. Deborah Golino stated that perhaps DNA typing could be centralized for the NCPN under a different umbrella than NCPN funds.

Nick Dokoozlian stated that two considerations important to the grape industry are the disease-tested status and true-to-type (DNA identification) testing. The DNA identification is an integral part of the foundation vineyard. Phil Freese indicated that he could not envision an NCPN that did not incorporate varietal identification within its quality control parameters. Steve Maniaci (Sunridge Nurseries) stated that nurseries are frequently asked about trueness to type and do not typically take on the responsibility of varietal identification.

Tom Bewick felt that the NCPN funds are not adequate to address all nursery issues, that clean plant issues should have priority and that industry should be responsible for identification of grape plants they wish brought into the NCPN.

Deborah Golino spoke from a “G1 manager point of view” when she said that there is a big concern in the industry with possible sale of incorrect material and mislabelled material. Identification testing of the strawberry foundation blocks at FPS reduced the University’s liability for that crop.

Jim Wolpert commented that varietal name (identification) is important for wine sales under the Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) regulations. France requires DNA fingerprinting of all selections before they are entered into the French certification program.

Ken Eastwell indicated that the fruit tree industry decided that trueness to type determination is a nursery responsibility. Clones cannot be differentiated with DNA
testing. Bob Martin commented (via the webcam) that DNA fingerprinting for trueness to variety does not capture diversity due to mild mutations.

Murali Bandla concluded that the issue is what can be done realistically with the dollars appropriated to the NCPN. Since the NCPN program is industry driven, DNA testing could be funded if the industry places a priority on it. Keith Striegler commented that DNA testing could be considered “Outreach” because NCPN testing would assist the grape nurseries in accurate identification of plant material.

Future Meetings
A Tier 2 meeting for the National Grape CPN will be held in late February in the Midwest. Keith Striegler volunteered to host the meeting in or near St. Louis, Missouri.

A meeting of the Tier 1 National Governing Body will be held in late March or early April in Washington, D.C.

The next Western Grape CPN meeting will probably be held after the funding decisions have been made, sometime in the Summer or Fall of 2009.

The meetings will be announced via the LISTSERV and the NCPN website.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:
Nancy Sweet
Foundation Plant Services
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