

Potato Certification & Foundation Seed & Plant Materials Advisory Committee Meeting

January 24, 2007, Corvallis, Oregon

MINUTES

Voting members present: Lon E. Baley, Gary Chapman, Scott Cheyne, Jim Carlson (for Tom Kirsch), Philip Hamm, Steve James, Rob Lane, Ed Macy, Mike Macy, George Rajnus Jr, Ed Stastny Jr (for Roy Wright), Isabel Vales.

Non-voting members present: Ronald L. Cook, Daniel Curry. Russ Karow (via phone contact during item #4), Jeff McMorran, Ron Pence (for Jim Cramer),

Members absent: Roy Wright (represented by Ed Stastny). Jim Cramer (represented by Ron Pence. Alan Peterson, Tom Kirsch (represented by Jim Carlson),

Guests present: Terry Burr, Bill Brewer, Brian Charlton, Oscar Gutbrod, Tim A. Kerns, Randy Knight, Richard Macy, Iraj Motazedian, Nancy Osterbauer, Sid Sedegui, Solomon Yilma, and John Zielinski.

A. Welcome & Introductions: Meeting commenced at 4:10 PM with a welcome by chair Ed Macy. Introductions were made, in which voting members of the Advisory Committee were asked to identify themselves. All present were asked to sign the signup sheet and verify accuracy of contact information.

B. 2006 Minutes: The minutes for the 2006 meeting were included in the packets and had been emailed to members in advance. A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Baley/Lane), to approve the 2006 minutes without changes or additions, unanimously **passed**.

C. PROPOSALS REQUIRING COMMITTEE ACTION

Note: Due to a phone linkup with Russ Karow at 4:30 PM, the items below were actually discussed in the following order #5, #4, #6, #1, #2, #3 but will be presented in order of the original agenda. See "[Agenda - Background & Detail](#)" for more information on each item.

1. Post Harvest Testing (PHT): (1) Review of Policy for accepting ELISA results in lieu of actual Winter Growouts; (2) Policy on accepting lots with no Post Harvest Testing;

ELISA only for PHT: Jeff McMorran discussed the current situation regarding the acceptance of lots for which the required Winter Growout (WGO) was substituted with ELISA in the Post Harvest Test (PHT) as provided for under the "*special cases*" exemptions of [Policy #2](#) (attached). A slide that summarized this current situation (i.e. out of 147 lots last year, 22% were accepted with an ELISA only, 10% based on an Oregon eligibility growout) was shown (see background info page 6). Jeff cited that the number of lots accepted under the "special case" exemption provision is growing and there is little basis for OSCS to deny such lots. Essentially all states except Washington and Canada {*including Idaho...confirmed 1-29-07*} require a WGO and only accept ELISA as a special case. Phil Hamm wanted to know who was at risk without conducting a full WGO and only accepting an ELISA for PHT, all certified lots are subject to two field inspections anyway so who was this rule designed to protect. The response was two fold, Oregon growers are protected because the WGO generally test far more tubers than the 400

required for the standard ELISA-only PHT and many more ailments are observable in the seed (chemical, dormancy issues, off types, other disease/virus). Secondly, because Oregon growers are required to conduct WGO for recertification purposes (for good reasons) allowing these lots in without a WGO creates an ‘unleveled playing field’ so-to-speak in regards to competition.

Jeff noted that the Advisory Committee need not take any action on this issue (increasing number of ELISA-only lots accepted), but OSCS wanted to make them aware of this trend and have them confirm the current policy or make changes to it if desired.

Lots with No PHT: Jeff McMorran discussed the situation in 2006 in which two lots were accepted into the program, despite lacking any PHT, based on an appeal by the growers and the ruling that the current policy regarding such acceptance of ([Policy #2](#)) did not make it clear that Part B applied to lots with ELISA testing, not lots without any PHT. Jeff noted that the appeals group asked that this issue be brought before the Advisory Committee for review and a final ruling to affect future situations like these should they arise. There was little discussion on this issue, with the general consensus being that lots lacking any PHT should be considered ineligible for recertification in Oregon. In addition, changes to the Policy wording should make it clear as to what exactly is considered an “acceptable” ELISA PHT for Part B of this policy.

A motion, duly made and seconded (Lane/James), to affirm that lots without Post Harvest Testing to be ineligible for recertification in Oregon, and to modify the wording of “*Policy Statement #2 - OSCS Policy Regarding Accepting Lots Which Have Not Had A Winter Grow Out*” (Part VIII page 12)” to clarify this requirement, unanimously **passed**. (revised “[Policy #2](#)” attached)

2. **Downgrading Nuclear 40 plant sections** – should this continue?

Jeff McMorran reviewed the concern of OSCS that Nuclear class lots with multiple virus infected 40-plant blocks could still be sold as Nuclear class (after removal of the + blocks) despite the fact that statistics would indicate that there is a good likelihood that at least some of the remaining blocks were virus infected. Jim Carlson felt that this material is too valuable to have it downgraded in such circumstances, did not pose a threat to surrounding lots in the area because of their low virus level and small acreage, and that the grower should continue to have the option of rouging out the virus. This seemed to be the consensus of the group, however OSCS was concerned about the possibility that such material could be sold to unsuspecting buyers because the final report would show a 0% virus for these lots. It was also pointed out that these lots were rarely sold but generally were kept for the growers own use to produce G1 lots the next season. Jim Carlson suggested that a lot in which multiple lots were found to give + virus ELISA could be classed as Nuclear (after removal of the infected lots), but that such lots would officially carry the “own use only” subclass to prevent them from being sold as a nuclear class lot. There was some additional discussion as to what % value to use.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Carlson/Stastny), to continue to allow Nuclear class lots to retain the nuclear class if any 40 plant blocks testing + for virus are removed, however requiring that any such lots with greater than 7% of the tested blocks giving + virus reaction be limited to “One Use Only” subclass.

unanimously **passed**. To reflect this change the following sentence will be added after sentence 7 to Part XIII. LATENT VIRUS TESTING Part A.

....exceed the tolerance will be downgraded. *Any lot for which the % of removed blocks exceeds 7% will be sub-classed “Own Use Only” and not available for sale as certified seed.* Testing for PVY.....

3. Sample size requirements for Nuclear lots;

The need to revise the Potato Standards in regards to maximum required sample size for small lots was reviewed Jeff McMorran, stating that strict interpretation of the current rule may mean a grower of just under 0.5 acres could be require to submit more tubers to the WGO than a grower of 0.5 acres. He also mentioned that OSCS had made temporary rule interpretation to correct this oversight in 2006 (see wording in motion below) but needed the Advisory Committee approval to make this change permanent in the Standards. There was little further discussion on this item.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Hamm/M. Macy), to add the following to the end of the “Small lots” sentence” (Part XIV – C, page 16):

2. *Small seed lots: 4 tubers per hundred weight, with a minimum of 50 tubers, **need not exceed 220 tubers.***

unanimously **passed**.

Steve James then reminded the groups that eye indexing, following a specified protocol, was an option for growers of Nuclear lots who wished to minimize the amount of seed lost to the WGO.

4. Linkage of owner permission with certification on PVP protected varieties (C. Oregon)

Jim Carlson presented the reason why the Central Oregon Growers wanted owner permission linked to certification of protected varieties, citing it as a tool to help variety owners control production and return value to the variety development programs. Linking certification to variety owner approval would also help to prevent the unauthorized production of new varieties that might jeopardize their changes of obtaining PVP protection. He recognized that there is no uniform way that all states approach this issue, but stressing it was the intent of the sponsors to see this passed in Oregon in order to join the growing group of states who do enforce similar provisions. Jeff McMorran presented a short slide presentation outlining the current practice of OSCS in accepting new varieties and informing variety owners of non-listed growers wishing to certify lots (see slide [printout](#) in Agenda-Background). He also discussed some possible mechanisms that could be used to achieve the stated goal of linkage of owner permission with

certification, and some of the ways that owner denial might affect the certification process. A final slide summarized the number of varieties and Oregon lots that would have been impacted by such a rule change in 2006. Russ Karow (via phone linkage) discussed some of the University's concerns about such linkage including possible liability, and the increase cost of administering such a program. The concern of how adding this provision to the relatively small acreage potato program might have an adverse affect on the certification of crops such as grass seed and cereals which have much larger acreage, was also discussed. Russ also pointed out potential complication on establishing ownership rights in disputed cases.

A lengthy discussion followed concerning some of the items presented in the "Agenda background", specifically:

- (1) **Documentation types:** What type of documentation would be required (see options on slide printout) – many felt it would not be too onerous to require a signed document with each proprietary line, while others felt the 'check off option' in which growers would be required to sign off that they had permission to produce a protected variety, and spelling out the consequences of inaccurate statements, would be enough. When asked which of the options shown on the slide OSCS (i.e. Jeff) preferred, the answer was the one that stated that OSCS would assume a grower had permission to produce a proprietary line unless informed otherwise by variety owner (third one on options), simply because this option was the easiest to administer and would therefore cost the least. Jim Carlson pointed out that a sign off on the application form should help absolve OSCS from most liability issues cause by inaccurate information, but felt that there would need to be a resolution of any lingering approval issues before some 'drop dead date' set prior to harvest. An additional benefit of the signoff option was that it put the grower on notice that owner approval of protected varieties would be necessary for certification of his/her crop. The general consensus of the group was somewhere between the 2nd and 3rd options (see slide 4).
- (2) **Lack of Documentation:** What would happen if no documentation was received, at what point would the certification process be stopped? Jeff McMorran noted that it could be very expensive to not conduct 1st inspections in a timely manner (due to the lack of a signed document) because OSCS staff might be out of the area when the permission was finely received, and by then a good first inspection may not be possible. OSCS would prefer that final certification be held up in such cases. Ed Macy felt that a second inspection should not be done if the variety owner's permission was not received, and that a 'cut off' date could be set up for receiving of such permissions, after which time lots would be simply rejected for eligibility. Ed felt that it would be too easy for an unscrupulous grower to simply move the inspected, but uncertified, seed into a state that does not require that all seed be certified. George Rajnus and others felt that OSCS should inspect fields, but not issue any inspection reports until any permission issues were resolved.
- (3) **Ownership issues:** Ron Cook outlined the current process of notifying variety owners of Oregon production, and discussed some of the difficulties in establishing just who had the authority of signing off on documentation forms. He noted that using PVP would not help in the case of early generation material, and where the certificate rights on the PVP did not control the ownership rights. He also noted complications of having ownership (i.e. PVP) established mid-season or after several years of 'legitimate' production by a single grower and emphasized that OSCS had been advised to try to stay out of the middle of grower-variety owner contract disputes. Jim Carlson pointed out that some protected varieties are

not PVP and how it was critical that variety owners of protected varieties are able to keep track of who was growing their varieties.

There was some discussion on just how to define what varieties are “protected” and establishing just who is the legitimate owner or agent for “proprietary varieties”. A system of establishing a list of varieties requiring (or perhaps not requiring) the sign off, should be developed, especially for “proprietary” varieties released from public institutions (like OSU, CSU, NDSU). Bill Brewer noted this was a national issue right now and an increasing concern. He noted that the NPC was sponsoring a meeting on March 19th to discuss the ownership – certification issue. Lon Baley stated that it should initially be left to the grower, not the owner, to resolve any unresolved issues with permission to grow a variety and that the grower should be made aware of problems in this regard prior to alerting the owner of a variety. George Rajnus expressed a concern about lack of control over protected varieties when sold overseas.

The general consensus seemed to be that there was a desire that owner’s permission be linked to certification of proprietary varieties; even if there was not consensus as to exactly what such program would look like. Steve James then asked if the Advisory Committee could simply vote to link the two and leave it to OSCS and the University to work out the details (yes). The rest of the discussion centered around the precise wording of the motion.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Carlson/Hamm), to add the following bullet item to Part VI. VARIETIES CERTIFIED (Page 11) of the Potato Standards, to be accomplished via a grower signoff on the application attesting to the fact that they have the owner’s permission to produce the specific proprietary variety:

C. Approval of “Proprietary” Varieties: All material with proprietary status must have the permission from owner, or agent, prior to release of inspection reports or issuing of final certification.

unanimously **passed**.

Jeff McMorran then reminded the group that all motions made that the Potato Certification Advisory Committee must be approved by the Full Certification Board, and that the Dean had the ultimate authority to approve policy regarding certification by OSU. Though the Board and the Dean generally approve the recommendation made by the PCAC, possible legal exposure issues or overall costs may become over-riding issues that result in disapproval.

5. Not listing “OUO” lots in the Directory (Blue Mtn District)

Jeff McMorran discussed the request being put forth by the Blue Mountain District to not include ‘Own Use Only’ (OUO) lots in the directory, including possible complications and limitations (see background info). Steve James asked for further explanation as to what the audit process was that led to this request, which was further explained by Tim Kerns. Jim Carlson explained that the Oregon Potato Commission does not collect assessments from lots not to be sold, but felt it was very important that all lots appear in the directory to help the OPC keep track of seed

production in Oregon. In response to the concern over mid-season changes use status to avoid exposure in the directory, Rob Lane felt that the OOU declaration would have to be on the original application. Ed Macy noted that the Central Oregon growers discussed this issue at their meeting and felt that having the early generation OOU lots in the directory, even though not sold, was a benefit to growers due to the exposure it had for these growers. They wanted to keep OOU lots in the directory.

The proposal died for lack of a motion.

6. Deadline cutoff for accepting late lots & harvest requirements (Blue Mtn District)

At the request of the members of the Blue Mountain District, Jeff McMorran reviewed the two items being put forth regarding absolute cutoff dates for accepting applications, and denial of certification for lots not harvested in the fall (see Agenda background info).

Cutoff date: Some discussion followed as to what an acceptable cutoff date would be. Jeff McMorran felt that the Idaho date of June 25th, might be too early for years with late plantings due to spring rains, such as what happened in Klamath Falls 2 years ago, suggesting a date as late as early July might be acceptable. Phil Hamm asked if a statement that defined a certain number of days from planting (as is found with the late fees) might be acceptable, but Jeff explained that OSCS has a difficult time verifying the accuracy of planting dates listed on the applications. Phil also pointed out that rouging fields early in the season (in reaction to early field inspections) was essential to prevent virus spread to adjacent lots. Ed Stastny suggested a date of June 30th, which seemed to be generally accepted.

Fall Harvest: There was little further discussion as to the need for this provision other than asking just what “Fall” meant. Basically any date prior to winter (Dec 21st) could be considered “Fall”. Winter and Spring harvested lots would not be considered eligible for certification.

A motion, duly made and seconded (James/Lane), to:

(1) Insert the following sentence in the Potato Standards after paragraph 2 of Part IX.
SEED STOCK ELIGIBLE FOR CERTIFICATION -

“*Application acceptance cutoff: Applications for recertification of potato lots for classes G1- G5 will not be accepted after **June 30th***”; and

(2) Add the following bulleted item to Part XI. FIELD MANAGEMENT –

“*H. Fall Harvest: Field planted lots not harvested in the fall are no longer eligible for certification.*”;

unanimously passed.

D. UPDATES & ISSUES FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. **Fee Increases for 2007 were presented** (see “[Agenda – Background](#)” for details)

2. **The [Revision of Standards](#) Parts XV – XVII for Clarity were presented.**

Disease issues: Phil Ham confirmed that “Black Wart” was the same as “Wart” (Wart” will be used in Part XV-B). There was some discussion as to the meaning of “light scab” in XVI-D, whether this meant common scab or simply a slight infection of ‘scab’. Oscar Gutbrod felt the whole sentence should be discarded as unnecessary, but Phil felt that simply removing the words of light scab would suffice.

Certificates: There was considerable discussion on why the sentence “*Certificates of Final Certification can only be used on Generation 2, 3, 4, and 5 classes*” was in the Standards. Jeff pointed out that this was not the current practice, that Foundation Seed lots are often accompanied by these certificates. Oscar relayed that the intent of this provision was that early generation lots must be shipped in bags and thus must have tags (though this is not so stated). It was asked if removal of this sentence would simply leave things the way they are currently practiced (yes), leaving it in would mean that OSCS would have to disallow the use of these certificates for Pre-nuclear, Nuclear, and G1 classed lots.

PVX%: Jeff pointed out that since PVX testing is no longer required for early generation lots, the place on the “Certificate of Final Certification” that has PVX% almost always shows a “NA” and that PVY testing is not shown. He questioned the group as to the value of the PVX% notation on the form and asked if it should be removed, augmented with a PVY% box, or left as is. It was pointed out that PVX testing is still required for export of early generation lots, but that PVX% could still be placed in the comment area if needed. It was also pointed out that the PVY% was only to be used to assign a sub-class “-PVY” on the reports and thus the PVY% really should not be listed on the Certificate of Final Certification. There didn’t seem to be any pressing need to change the PVX% item or line in the Standards (Part XVI-C-4).

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Stastny/Cheyne), to remove the following sentence “*Certificates of Final Certification can only be used on Generation 2, 3, 4, and 5 classes.*” from (revised) Part XVI. TAGGING, SEALING, AND SHIPPING - C. unanimously **passed**.

Tags and Certificate of Final Certification, and Item 4 “*Virus %: Percent occurrence of PVX if applicable (Final Certificate only)*” was left as is

3. **ODA Updates: MOU/SNHP, PVYn Survey, other items**

Nancy Osterbauer gave a review of several current potato related topics concerning ODA including: (1) the current status of the MOU and the National Seed Potato Harmonization Program – ODA is awaiting approval of the “Quality Manual” before signing (Oregon was the 1st state to turn in a QM); (2) the Potato Cyst Nematode Survey – mandated by APHIS, voluntary for growers but necessary for continued access to our trading partners, is in progress (so far all samples test have been

negative for PCN). **Sid Sedegui** summarized the PVYn Survey's FY2 program (handout distributed) and noted that they are missing several samples needed to complete the tuber testing part of the program (the late generation "scoping survey") and encouraged growers to send in their samples.

4. OSU/OSCS/Seed Service/Foundation Seed Updates

Ron Cook referred to the "Activity Summary" in the meeting packets and expressed his appreciation of all present for their continued involvement in the certification process especially in light of all the important changes taking place; **Jeff McMorran** related that OSCS is in the process of developing three changes to the computer database that would (1) allow growers direct 'on line' access to their field records through a pin number; (2) allow for preparation and printing of the Final Shipping Certificates 'on-line'; and (3) allow variety owners access to real time information on who has applied to produce certified lots of their varieties in Oregon. Jeff noted that the priority of working on these projects by the OSCS computer group will depend largely on the level of interest expressed by the growers. **Dan Curry** gave an update of activities associated with OSU Seed Services (summary Handout included in packets) and noted that a CSS update from **Russ Karow** was in the meeting packets. **Isabel Vales** reviewed some of the activities of the OSU Potato Foundation Seed Project (see yellow Update found in packets). Dan Curry also presented plaques of appreciation to Lon Baley, Isabel Vales, and Alan Peterson.

F. ELECTION OF OFFICERS & REPRESENTATION ON THE CERTIFICATION BOARD

1. Rob Lane was elected for another term on the Certification Board.
2. Rob Lane was unanimously elected for the position of vice chair of the Potato Advisory Committee Meeting for 2007.

G. **ADJOURN** – meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

These minutes are available at:

<http://www.oscs.orst.edu/committees/minutes/potadvcomm07.pdf>