

Potato Certification & Foundation Seed & Plant Materials Advisory Committee Meeting

January 31, 2008, Portland, Oregon

MINUTES

Voting members present: Lon E. Baley, Larry Barns (for Tom Kirsch), Gary Chapman, Scott Cheyne, Philip Hamm, Steve James, Rob Lane, Ed Macy, Mike Macy, Alan Peterson, Ed Stastny Jr, . Solomon Yilma (for Isabel Vales)

Non-voting members present: Jim Cramer, Daniel Curry. Russ Karow, Jeff McMorran (sec)

Members absent:, Tom Kirsh, George Rajnus Jr, Isabel Vales

Guests present: Tony Amsted, Terry Burr, Bill Brewer, Brian Charlton, Jim Carlson, Jim Carlton, Oscar Gutbrod, Randy Knight, Richard Macy, Iraj Motazedian, Sid Sedegui

A. Welcome & Introductions: Meeting commenced at 9:20 AM with a welcome by chair Scott Cheyne. Introductions were made. All present were asked to sign the sign-up sheet and verify accuracy of contact information.

B. 2007 Minutes: The minutes for the 2007 meeting were included in the packets and had been emailed to members in advance. A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Hamm/Macy), to approve the 2007 minutes without changes or additions, unanimously **passed**.

C. PROPOSALS REQUIRING COMMITTEE ACTION

(1a) Isolation from 'commercial seeds' – General requirement

Jeff McMorran reviewed the isolation issues that have been summarized in the background section of the Agenda Packet. He noted that strictly following the current Standards in regards to the 300 foot isolation of all G2 and G3 class seed lots could have unforeseen (and undesirable) consequences, and asked for ways this dilemma could be resolved. Currently there is no formal definition of the term 'commercial' in the Standards and thus it is taken to mean all potato fields not signed up for certification. Jeff further explained that the 300 foot isolation distance from 'commercial' was put in place prior to the Seed Law (requires all potato seed planted in Oregon to be certified) and prior to the wide-spread use of limited generation seed, thus at a time when an adjacent 'commercial' lot could have very high levels of virus and other diseases. Phil Hamm asked what the basis of the 300 foot isolation rule was. Answer, to help prevent disease spread from commercial lots into seed lots. It was generally felt that under many situations, cases B, C, and D shown in the diagram of the 'Background Section' should be allowed if the adjacent lots were reasonably clean of virus and other diseases.

Gary Chapman suggested that perhaps class status could be maintained for lots of G2 or G3 that fell within the 300 foot zone if additional leaf testing were done either in the field or WGO. Ed Macy suggested that the 300 foot isolation zone may not be necessary if a 'commercial' crop was managed like a seed crop in regards to controlling vectors that spread disease, though acknowledged that this may be hard to enforce or monitor.

One solution suggested was to amend the isolation rules such that the 300 foot isolation requirement would be against all potato fields planted with anything greater than G4 class (by Oregon Standards, i.e. G5 class). Isolation from G5 class seed would not suffice, because in Oregon, G5 class seed can have very high virus levels due to the inability to reject seed for mosaic in the winter grow-outs. Rob Lane raised the question as to how this rule would relate to 'situation A', where a neighbor planted a field of an unknown class next to a G3 producing field, would the seed field be in violation of the 300 foot isolation requirements? Answer – Yes, unless the grower was able to produce documents showing that the seed used to plant the adjacent field was at least G4 class. If this could not be obtained, a 300 foot 'isolation zone' would be required.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (James/Lane), **passed** unanimously to amend the isolation table on Page 13 of the current Standards (Part XI-D) replacing the wording following “Generation 2 & 3” (third line) to read
“300 feet from fields planted with seed higher than certified G4 class”

(1b) Isolation from ‘commercial seeds’ – Own Use Only provision

A letter prepared by Kern Rainbow Ranch requesting that the requirements of isolation from ‘commercial’ not pertain to seed officially sub-classed “Own Use Only” (OUO) was circulated to the committee. Within this document the problems inherent in the 300 foot zone were described. The argument was also made that as ‘own use only’ (i.e., not eligible for sale) the grower assumes any risk related to non-adherence to the 300 foot isolation zone between G3 producing seed and a ‘commercial’ crop. Steve James asked if OUO seed was certified (yes, same certification as other classes, but with an ‘OUO’ sub-class). The question was raised about why a grower of OUO seed would care if their seed was classed G3 or G4. Ed Macy replied that in some cases the commercial buyer specifies that a minimum class of seed be used to produce the commercial crop. Ed Stastny pointed out that a lot may have been downgraded to G5 due to a variety issue and thus would not actually pose an increased risk to the adjacent G3 seed. It was also clarified that this rule would apply to all seed growers with ‘OUO’ G2/G3 lots, not just the Kerns Rainbow Ranch.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Chapman/Lane), **passed** unanimously to amend the isolation table on Page 13 of the current Standards (Part XI-D) to add the following footnote to the line following the Generation 2 & 3 requirements:
“* does not apply to seed of ‘own use only’ sub-class”

Thus the table would look as follows:

XI. FIELD MANAGEMENT - D. Isolation

Classification of seed being produced	Isolation Required
Pre-Nuclear	Approved Greenhouse or Laboratory
Nuclear-Generation 1	Location of field should be approved by Seed Certification office
Generation 2 & 3	300 feet from potatoes planted with seed higher than Certified G4 class *
Generation 4 & 5	Distinct separation from commercial

*** i.e. must be isolated from fields using G5 class seed stock for planting; also does not apply if ‘own use only’ sub-class**

The definition of ‘commercial’ as “Any potato field not entered for seed certification” would also be added to the list of definitions in the back of the Standards.

2. North American Health Certificates – required with seed applications

The various reasons why the attachment of a NAHC to potato seed applications would be advantageous to both OSCS staff and the growers as reviewed (see ‘background’ section of the Agenda). In response to

some questions from the group Jeff clarified that this document must be signed by the certification agency in the state of origin (not the seed growers) and the colored blocks on the example handed out had no particular significance other than helping OSCS staff complete the form (were clarified upon printing). Jim Carlson questioned why the complete pedigree was needed on these forms, and Jeff noted that he will only fill in the blocks for which Oregon has specific records (i.e. not the history prior to seed being received in Oregon). Phil Hamm asked how we come up with a “% VERT + %FUSARIUM” for this form; Jeff replied that we don’t. Blocks that don’t pertain to our program are either left blank or a “NA” is inserted. Jim Carlson noted that he had received these forms with many of the blocks left blank.

In regards to requiring these forms be attached to the seeded potato applications, a question was raised regarding possible delays in turning in the applications if the seed seller was not prompt in getting this document to the grower, would this not penalize the grower? Jeff assured the group that applications were accepted as long as the necessary information needed to accept the lot at a particular class was documented. This rule would aid in that process and would not be applied so strictly that applications were not processed until the NAHC was received. As is currently practiced with other required documents like tags or certificates, growers should continue to turn in the applications in a timely manner and OSCS would work with them to obtain a NAHC if not accompanying the applications or acquire the necessary documentation elsewhere if possible. As long as the grower practiced due diligence in *trying* to obtain this document in advance, this rule should not be seen as an additional burden to the application process. Making the submission of the NAHC a *requirement* (as it is in most other states) should aid growers in obtaining it from the source grower/agency and greatly speed up the process of fully accepting a lot for re-certification. Ed Macy noted that this seemed like a good idea for Oregon, as long as Oregon growers are not unduly penalized if they have trouble getting the Certificate, but also encouraged us to do what we can to promote the use of this document among all states.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Lane/Chapman), **passed** unanimously to require that a North American Seed Health Certificate accompany all potato seed applications. A statement to this effect would be added to the end of Part VIII “Seed Stock Documentation” and to the Field Application.

Addition of ‘new’ varieties to required PVY testing list

A brief history of the latent virus testing program was given out noting that PVY testing is only required for known ‘latent’ varieties. New varieties of unknown symptom expression to PVY are not required to be tested for PVY at Nuclear or G1 class. Jeff pointed out that in the past when more PVY testing was done, it was often the comparison of PVY test results with field visual reading that aided in the discovery that a new variety was ‘latent’ to PVY. Without this testing, virus may now build up in a new variety that does not express symptoms, and thus act as a contamination source for adjacent early generation lots. Phil Hamm stressed the importance of some lab testing due to the new strains of PVY that may not express symptoms and seem to spread faster in seed lots.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (E.Macy/M.Macy), **passed** unanimously to require PVY ELISA testing of all Nuclear and G1 lots of varieties of unknown symptom expression to PVY

Specific change: Under Part XIII – A (page 15) add the following to sentence 3:

“Nuclear* and Generation 1 lots of PVY symptomless varieties (see B & C below) **or varieties of unknown symptom expression to PVY**, must be laboratory tested for PVY. Nuclear* and Generation 1 lots of varieties known to be latent for PLRV must be laboratory tested for PLRV.”

Minituber inspections – reducing to a single inspection.

After presenting the proposal as outlined in the ‘background’ section, Jeff explained that the intent of implementing this rule was not to do away with two inspections, but to avoid complications that can arise when one of the two inspections of a particular lot occurs at a sub-optimal time (i.e., the lot is either too young or in a die-down phase).

Solomon Yilma pointed out that the seed stock used to plant this material is thoroughly disease tested, so there is nothing to see (disease-wise) when it first begins to grow and that often on the first inspection some of the plants of certain lots/varieties are too small to make a meaningful inspection anyway.

Phil Hamm asked what the specific purpose of these inspections were; answer (1) to look for potential seed-borne diseases like virus, ring rot & erwinia, as well as any variety mix; and also to (2) inspect the facility to assure that it precludes as much as possible the re-introduction of pathogens/vectors. Steve James asked if the Oregon Foundation Seed Potato Project was the only producer of certified mini-tubers in the state (yes), and if this rule would apply to any other entities that may produce minitubers in the future (yes). It was acknowledged (upon review) that a single inspection rule might lead to a complication if Certification was not called in a timely manner to inspect all lots when at their peak, and that the current 2 inspection rule at least assured that one of the inspections was made at a time when the plants were at their best for expressing symptoms of disease. In addition, potential problems with the facility would also be more likely to be pointed out in a timely manner.

Ed Macy reflected the will of the group in saying that there did not seem to be enough reason to lower the Standards and to not require the two inspections. The advantages, including the meeting of the US Export requirements, tended to out-weigh any advantages of cost or convenience of requiring only one inspection.

No motion made on this proposal, minituber inspections will still require two inspections

Winter Growout Sample Size – using 400 tuber ‘standard’ sample

With the aid of the three graphs found in the ‘background’ section, Jeff compared the WGO sample size requirements with other states pointing out that (1) most states use some type of standards ‘samples size’, generally based on a 400 tuber sample; and (2) at the larger field sizes Oregon’s required sample size is way above any other state. Steve James asked if Montana followed a 400 tubers sample (it had been left off the list & graphs in the ‘background’ section); Oscar Gutbrod answered in the affirmative, saying there was an additional sample (step) required for fields larger than 40 acres.

Though there was some discussion of the advantages of a standard sample size of 400 tubers in regards to reducing potential handling errors among GH staff and growers, and in being more in step with other state’s practices, there did not seem to be an overall reason to change this aspect of the program at this time. However, the growers recognized the need to ‘cap off’ the number of tubers required to a reasonable amount. Phil Hamm asked what was the scientific basis of the current sample sizes used. Jeff indicated that he was un-aware of the original justification for the 400-tuber size samples or the system used. In Oregon, he noted that studies he had seen during the PVY & PMTV survey talks indicted little benefit in sample sizes above 400 tubers, assuming the sample was taken randomly among the lot. He felt one possible advantage requiring a larger sample size might be in helping to assure the sample was indeed randomly taken (rather than just representing the 1st 20 or 30 acres, or until the sample bags were full). Jeanne Debons noted that the sample is either random or isn’t, noting that whatever the samples size is the samples must be a true random sample to support the statistics used to justify the sample size.

At this point Rob Lane suggested that the program be left as it is in regards to the manner sample size is determined (i.e. 220 tubers + 20 tubers per acre), but the total number *required* be ‘capped off’ at 1,200 tubers. The issue of having a standards sample size would be dealt with at a later date.

<p>A motion, duly made and seconded (Lane/Chapman), passed unanimously to amend the sample requirements for the winter growout such that a maximum of 1,200 tubers be submitted (regardless of acreage).</p>
--

Specific change: Under Part XIV – C 3 (page 16) add the following to sentence:

“Sample size need not exceed 1,200 tubers regardless of acreage.”

NOTE: This change (if implemented) will also require a modification of the Fee charged for the WGO (under Fee item F of the 2007 Standards, page 7). Because 1,200 tubers represent 51 acres by the current formula, the maximum fee for a WGO sample would be \$625 (or \$765 after November 20th). The wording of this section would be changed to reflect this change.

D. UPDATES AND ISSUES FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION

Change in Format of Directory: Jeff briefly reviewed the reasons why OSCS would like to change the format of the Seed Directory from the current version to a more conventional 8x11" half sheet as outlined in the 'Background Section'. It was asked if the 8x11" format would be cheaper to print; Not known but likely because the current version is an off size (which is usually more expensive) and in addition not as many original copies would need to be printed because OSCS could simply print up a few more if supplies run low. There was no objection to changing the Directory format as suggested.

Change in Idaho Winter Test Policy: A copy of the revised Idaho rules that now require PVY ELISA testing of all WGO lots was handed out and briefly discussed. It was explained that Idaho had adopted this program to try to get a handle on mosaic in their lots, and that due to a variety of reasons, including the new PVY strains, they didn't feel that visual inspections alone were sufficient to identify high PVY lots. Jim Carlson asked if the % PVY was based on number planted or number tested; this wasn't known for sure, but believed to be based on number +PVY found divided by number of leaves sampled. Jeff explained that a pilot program was run this year with Mike Wagner (who ships all his lot to Idaho) in which a 400 leaf sample of each of his lots were sampled and sent to Idaho for testing. Based on the sampling time and expenses incurred in conducting this program, OSCS estimates that, if needed, a similar type sampling and testing program could be offered for 2008 lots in the WGO at a cost of about \$186 per lot. There was no further discussion of the Idaho rules, and no proposal to change the Oregon program was offered. OSCS will likely continue to offer the option of PVY testing of WGO lots to meet the Idaho rules (for an additional fee).

Handling of Heirloom Varieties within the Oregon Seed Certification Service: Jeff reviewed the changes to the way OSCS is now handling some variety categories as outlined in the 'Background Section' noting that the major change is that OSCS now 'officially' recognizes 'Heirloom' varieties as a variety 'type'. He also pointed out the new time limitation of 7 years on 'experimental' varieties that are not in production, and the cancellation of several 'pending approval' varieties for which no paperwork was received. He explained that these changes were largely a result of changes needed in the database due to the implementation of the new 'proprietary variety' rule passed last year.

Proprietary Varieties and “Approved Grower” Lists: Jeff gave a quick update on how this new requirement was implemented in 2007, noting that it went fairly smoothly. The bulk of the effort was in the establishment of ownership and the re-configuration/updating of the OSCS database and computer programs to help automatically indicate a grower who had not been approved by the owner for production of certified material. Jeff indicated that in such cases, both the grower and the variety owner were informed, and inspection reports were held until the situation was resolved. In all cases in 2007, these initial variety issues were resolved by the second inspection.

Appeals Process used by OSCS Potato Program: Scott Cheyne asked about the appeals process used by OSCS and wondered if there were always as many as occurred in 2007. Jeff outlined the 'appeals process' and the general makeup of the 'appeals committee' and noted that in general there are only 1 or 2 appeal cases a year. All seemed satisfied with the fairness of the process used.

ODA Update:

(1) **MOU/SNHP:**

(a) Status: Jim Cramer passed out a sheet that outlined the current status of the MOU/SNHP and noted those states that had signed (OR, CO, ID, NB, TX, and WA), those that have had their 'Quality Manual' approved (OR, WA, CO) and those who had their submitted manual pending review (MN, W.VA, PA). The 'threshold' of state participation for implementation the SNHP has been met.

(b) Inspections at Shipping Point: He noted that the required inspection at shipping point (part of the SNHP) only applies to lots shipped out-of-state, and that this program was functioning well (when growers call) and only involved the inspection of tubers for necrotic arcs, not a full grade inspection. Growers should submit two 200 tuber samples to ODA for inspection. They can be either delivered or, if preferred, inspected on site (for an additional fee).

(c) Grower Audits: Another part of the SNHP was the requirement that all seed entering a state meet the terms of the SNHP. Jim passed out a form ("Survey of Growers") that will be used to audit "5-10%" (5% most likely) of the potato growers to assure they are complying with this rule.

- (2) **Nematode Situation**: Jim also updated the group on the Alberta & Idaho 'Potato Cyst' or the 'Pale Cyst' Nematode situation (see handout for details). He noted that APHIS is requiring a mandatory sampling of all fields involved in the trace forwards from the infected Alberta fields found to have Golden Nematode (GN) cysts. This will begin this spring. Commercial growers would have to go back 1 year, seed growers 3 years. (i.e. a seed grower will need to be able to identify the exact location that a potential nematode-infected lot had been planted for the past three production years). Growers who can not do this, risk having their individual farms quarantined until all fields are sampled. This situation is complicated in that seed brokers often receive seed in one state, but then move it into another, confusing efforts to do a 'trace forward'. The sample will include a 1 lb sample of soil from each acre of the field and involve 900 to 1,300 acres in Oregon alone. Originally, APHIS wanted a 10 year trace back, but Jim pointed out that under Oregon law and the Federal Seed Act, seed growers are only required to keep records to three years, and Oregon is sticking to that (for now anyway). If the nematode is found in ANY of the fields, Oregon will be in the same situation as Idaho found itself last year when the PCN was found in Eastern Idaho. Jim, however, pointed out a field would probably have to have at least a ten year history of potatoes (after PCN introduction) to allow for detection of PCN using the sampling techniques used, and that under the production practices used by NW growers (rotation & fumigations) visually detecting GN in any field by foliage symptoms in the PNW would be very unlikely.

The Canadians are claiming that, because seed from the affected farms has been shipped all over, Golden Nematode has likely been shipped all over also, thus the border should be open. APHIS is not buying this argument, and will insist that the terms of the Potato Cyst Nematode Plan be followed, in part to protect our overseas markets for fresh and seed potatoes as well as any soil borne nursery products. This makes up a substantial portion of the Oregon Ag economy according to Jim. Jeanne Debons asked how the PCN is dealt with in Europe where it is commonly found; Jim replied as a managed pest. Jim also noted that he had heard that some Alberta seed had been transported to Saskatchewan (presumably before the restrictions), and he was asked if such seed could now be legally imported into the US. This has not been resolved.

- (3) **PVY Survey**: Sid Sedegui reviewed the results of the PVYn Survey (see handout) that has taken place over the last three years and is now at an end. It involved testing over 5,000 tubers, first at ODA for PVY, then in NY for strain identification. The results of this study will be forthcoming as an article in Plant Disease. Sid noted that the various strains of PVY have been found in Oregon, but that Oregon's results were not substantially different than other states. He felt that the PVY strain concern was going to disappear as a national issue and be replaced by simply managing PVY as a virus (not trying to manage individual strains of PVY). A "PVY Management Task Force" has been set up to look into options of managing this disease. Some of the strains, including the 'necrotic strain', may not show up visually in field or WGO. Thus, one of the options being considered is to require mandatory PVY testing in the WGO. Bill Brewer noted that Canada and the US have participated in this survey, but Mexico did not, and feared under NAPPO agreements the data generated might be used against specific states to bar imports. Jim Cramer replied that state-specific results have not been publicly released so this (hopefully) shouldn't be a concern.

Oregon Foundation Potato Seed Project: Solomon Yilma referred to the report found in the packet, noting that much of the discussion of the OFPSP in the previous Grower's Meeting. Basically, they would be limiting production in 2008 to 900 lbs of minitubers (1 full greenhouse), and at a much increased price (\$25-\$33). Jeanne Debons noted that the increased price was still competitive with other sources. Solomon reviewed the 'priority list' for the distribution of minitubers in 2008 noting that they are likely not to get much lower than priority #3 (Oregon new releases) on this list. Jim Carlson asked if a grower could order more minitubers and increase the production; the answer was no, due to financial constraints on the OSU system and need to devote more efforts to research and away from 'service' minituber production. Jeanne noted that some commercial sources such as Summit Labs in

Colorado would produce minitubers of any variety provided a minimum order (? 300 lbs) was made, giving growers an option to team together to place a group order if this seed was not available from OSU.

OSU & Crops Science: Russ Karow passed around a CSS update. Russ also commented on the rationale behind the price increase and limited production for the minitubers. He noted that upcoming budget reductions/uncertainties on both the Federal and State level were a major concern for the potato program right now. It appears that the potato program will need to find a way to operate on a 75% reduction in overall funding levels.

OSCS/Seed Service: Dan Curry passed around a "OSU Seed Services" update noting that the seed lab is doing well and only had a 3-5 day 'turn around time' for samples in 2007 which is what the grass seed growers had requested. Dan explained that the new Manager of OSCS, Dennis Lundeen, was not able to attend this meeting due to an OECD audit of the certification program occurring on the same day.

F. OTHER BUSINESS –

Chemical situation in the 2007 WGO: (this item was added at the request of Ed Macy as a result of discussions during the preceding Oregon Seed Potato Grower's Meeting.

Jeff McMorran handed out several documents at this point, including a Summary of the 'Chemical' problem in the WGO, a table showing affected lots along with some particulars of each lot, several photographs of the affected plants (as well as having several on display), a statement from Dennis Lundeen regarding OSCS position on scoring the affected plants, and letter prepared to explain the situation to potential buyers. After reviewing the situation (see summary sheet), Jeff re-emphasized that because this is a lot-limited situation where symptoms were observed in the WGO, and it is unknown at this time if those symptoms will also appear in the subsequent fields planted with this seed, OSCS will have to formally report the 'chemical damage' on the final reports.

Ed Macy noted that one of his lots from a previous year that had shown chemical injury in the WGO did not express symptoms in the subsequent planting. Jeff questioned the value of even scoring 'chemical' injury if what is observed in the WGO is not indicative of a tuber-borne problem in the subsequent field planted with this seed. The conditions in the GH are radically different than those found in the field in late spring, thus severe symptoms in the GH might only result in very mild symptoms in the field. Oscar Gutbrod confirmed that no other state (to his knowledge) even scores 'chemical' during the WGO. Phil Hamm noted that there was little information published on how the observation of mild chemical damage observed in young plants affected yield or quality of the subsequent crop of potatoes.

Jeff reminded the group that they (with Board approval) had the ability to change the tolerance table in regards to how 'chemical injury' is handled in the Standards, noting that they could increase the tolerance or do away with it altogether. He noted that unless the Standards were modified in this regard, his group would have no choice but to continue to score all such plants observed in 2008 WGO. Richard Macy suggested a program change, and Rob Lane suggested the chemical tolerances in the WGO be 'waxed' so this wouldn't be an issue in upcoming years. Ed Macy asked if reference to chemical injury would even appear in the comment box if the tolerances were removed from the table in the Standards; answer – no, unless the presence of chemical induced symptom/injury affected the ability to read some other scored disease or trait (as is done during the field inspection where the note "wide spread current season chemical injury may have masked mosaic symptoms"). Ed felt that the growers should be notified if significant chemical injury is observed in their lots even if it is not scored or noted on the final report. Jeff assured him that they would be.

A **motion**, duly made and seconded (Lane/M.Macy), **passed** unanimously, to remove any reference to "Chemical injury" from the tolerance table for the Winter Grow-outs.

Specific change: Under Part XIV – C table after D (page 16) "**WINTER TEST TOLERANCES**" remove the two lines "Chemical injury: Severe" and "Chemical injury: Mild" and accompanying foot note "c".

Several growers also expressed their concern on how this situation was handled, noting that in some cases growers were not notified of the situation until they got their final report, and that some out-of-state comments were made about Oregon having a 'big problem' before they were even aware of it. OSCS staff explained that the nature of 'chemical' readings are such that they often don't know a lot will be downgraded (or even scored) until the last reading because they try to give the lot time to 'grow out' of the symptoms before scoring, but promised to keep growers more apprised of the situation of their lots during the readings in up coming years. Ed Macy (speaking on behalf of the previous grower's meeting) suggested in this situation, no final reports should have been printed until all concerned could have a chance to review the situation and have the opportunity to view the affected plants before removal.

Besides the re-sample and re-planting of several of these lots in the WGO (currently taking place) Oscar Gutbrod suggested that samples from these lots also be included in the Hermiston Seed Lot Trial for further evaluation. OSCS will also pursue chemical analysis of the affected plants to help identify what the agent of concern might be. Brian Charlton suggested a protocol be developed to address this type of situation (i.e., wide spread chemical injury) should it re-occur in the future.

Protocol for receiving WGO samples: Jim Carlson felt the protocol/procedures for receiving the WGO samples should be improved. He cited times when he delivered the samples and no one was present to help unload, when the space provided was inadequate to put his lots in and he had to clean out another section, and concern about the integrity/safety of leaving the lots in the hallway. Richard Macy echoed this and noted that even the greenhouse folks don't like those smelly tubers being left in the GH hallway so long. The OSCS staff promised to look into the space and integrity problem (perhaps with plastic totes or alternative storage locations), but also reminded growers that a simple call to the OSCS office at the time of delivery will bring several inspectors to help with the unloading process (provided we have a heads up as to your approximate delivery times).

Manner that Variety Contamination is Noted in WGO: Richard Macy felt that the way variety contamination is reported is ridiculous in that a single 'off type' found in a lot might result in a score that distracts from the value of the lot, especially when the 'off type' might have been the result of a error in the GH handling. Ed pointed out that in their case 1 single off type resulted in a 0.07% "off type" score showing up. He felt there should be some type of a 'cut off' level for reporting off types. Jeff commented that the way the Standards are written leaves no room for dismissing even a single score no matter how 'insignificant', and that OSCS can't put a "0.00" in the off-type column if 0.07% are found. Changes to the Standards could be made to say something like "*for G3-G5 a single off-type plant will be noted in the comment section but scored a 0.00% , unless 1 plant exceed a 0.25% level*". This item will be added to the 2009 Agenda for further discussion at that time.

G. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

George Rajnus was unanimously elected vice chair of the Advisory Committee.

H. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 12:25 PM

Submitted 2-7-08 by Jeff McMorran

~~~~~

These minutes will also be available at: <http://www.oscs.orst.edu/advcom.html>