

2019 Potato Certification Advisory Committee

THREE RIVERS CONVENTION CENTER

Kennewick, WA 99336

Tuesday, Jan 22, 2019 at 9:00 AM

AGENDA

I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS – Scott Fenters

Membership: See <https://seedcert.oregonstate.edu/sites/seedcert.oregonstate.edu/files/potatomembers.pdf>

II. PRESENTING THE 2018 MINUTES

(see: <https://seedcert.oregonstate.edu/sites/seedcert.oregonstate.edu/files/potatominutes18.pdf>)

III. PROGRAM UPDATES

- A. Oregon Department of Agriculture (Elizabeth A. Savory)
- B. OSU - Crop & Soil Science & Seed Services Reports (?)
- C. Oregon Seed Certification Service (Andy Altishin)
- D. Winter Grow-Out Report (Terry Burr)
- E. Review of National Potato Certification Meetings

IV. OSCS ISSUES & UPDATES FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION

- Item 1: PHT - WGO vs. Lab Test only (Idaho & MN, MA situations)
- Item 2: Isolations from non-certified material (Experimental plots)
- Item 3: “Skip Row” with 4 foot beds
- Item 4: Generation system (N, G1, G2, G3... to FY1, FY2, FY3 system)
- Item 5: Necrotic Arc Inspections
- Item 6: Potatoes and Hemp Seed - Opportunities and Rotations

V. Other Business

VI. Election of new Vice Chair & Board Representative

VII. Adjourn

EXPANDED BACKGROUND INFORMATION

IV. OSCS ISSUES & UPDATES FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION

Item 1: PHT - WGO vs. Lab Test only (Idaho & MN, MA situations)

Background: On a national level there has been increasing interest in substituting the current winter grow-out (WGO) of post-harvest test samples with lab-based testing. The advantages of a solely lab-based testing regime could include receiving the results earlier in the testing season, increase sensitivity, and less subjectivity, than the visual ‘reading’ of winter grow-out plants. Another advantage is that testing on many post-harvest samples for diseases like Bacterial Ring-rot, Late Blight, and Dickeya sp. are already being done on tuber samples, so expanding the testing regime to test all diseases currently scored in a WGO could *potentially* decrease the overall cost. An additional advantage for most states (not Oregon) it that the risk of a WGO failure due to inclement weather or insects is minimized. The disadvantages of replacing a WGO with a lab-only system are that carry over chemical symptoms, off-types, and new viruses (or new virus strains) not detected in the lab tests would not be identified.

Currently there are 2 states and Canada that allow their post-harvest test to be based solely on lab-only testing as shown below.

States and WGO requirements (as of 12-02-2018)	
Alaska -	PHT not required, lab testing option being considered
Idaho -	Lab testing for PVY required, WGO other conditions, tuber testing being considered
Maine -	PHT uses ELISA only, required.
Minnesota -	Lab-only tuber testing
Montana -	WGO required, lab testing option being considered
New York -	WGO required, lab testing option being considered
North Dakota -	WGO required, special case status allows lab-only
Oregon -	WGO required, special case status allows lab-only
Washington -	WGO required, considering lab-only option
Wisconsin -	WGO required (for re-certification)
Canada -	PHT not required, Lab-only allowed if PHT conducted

Questions:

- (1) Should Oregon accept lots for re-certification if they are sent from a state or province that has a lab-only system of post-harvest testing?
- (2) Should Oregon consider a lab-only system of post-harvest testing as an option, or as a replacement, for our current WGO system?

Item 2: Isolations from non-certified material (Experimental plots)

Background: The 2018 Potato Standards (Table 4, page 14). require G1 and G2 producing lots be isolated 300 foot from ‘commercial’ (uncertified fields/lots). Material embedded within experimental plots, whether part of the OSU Potato Variety Development Program or a private grower, are not exempt from this requirement. This can be waived if the lots are declared Own-Use-Only (not for sale that year), however this was not a viable option for either grower.

Both appeals in 2018 involved seed lots of an acceptable seed source (Nuclear or G1) that were surrounded by experimental lines that were not certified. In both cases the grower had established that the surrounding material had been virus-tested and inspected as well, or better, than is required for material of a similar certified class as their lots, however not by an independent certification agency.

The appeals of both growers were accepted by an appeal panel with the caveat that following sentence be included on the official certification documents issued for the respective lots:

This material meets all the requirements of Oregon G1 class with the exception of the required isolation from non-certified material. It was grown within a block of disease-tested and rogued, but uncertified, experimental lines. (for the OPVDP lots)

and

This material meets all the requirements of Oregon G2 class with the exception of the required isolation from non-certified material. It was grown within a block of disease-tested but uncertified experimental lines. (for CSS Farms lots)

This is the second time the isolation requirement of early generation lines from experimental lines has been appealed.

Question: Should the isolation requirement of early generation lines from experimental lines be modified? If so, how, and what safeguards would be put into place to prevent the unacceptable exposure of such material to disease from the surrounding experimental lines?

Possible modification to Standards: Footnote *3 in Table 4 could be replaced with:

“This isolation requirement is waived if adjacent to experimental lines that can be documented as having the same, or higher, testing status as materials of a similar class to those being certified in the block”.

Item 3: “Skip Row” with 4 foot beds

Background: The Potato Standards (Section XI-B, page 14) state “A skip row is required between different varieties” . The main purpose of such a ‘skip row’ to prevent variety mixing at harvest. It has also been reported to help prevent possible variety mix during the growing season caused by stolen penetration of adjacent rows, or tubers movement during the cultivation operations. The original concept of a skip row applied to distinct rows of 24-36 inches. In the last few years the popularity of 4’ beds have increased.

Question: How should the ‘skip row’ concept be applied in the situation where 4’ beds are used? Would it be more appropriate to change this wording to specify a separation distance (i.e. no less than 36’ separation between different varieties)?

Item 4: Generation system (N, G1, G2, G3... to FY1, FY2, FY3 system)**From 2017 Minutes:**

Field Year System: At the end of the preceding seed grower’s meeting a discussion was held about the use of the Field Year System where FY1, FY2, FY3 (etc.) would replace the current terminology for class (i.e., Nuclear, G1,G2 (etc.) in Oregon). This system has been adopted by several other states (Maine, Michigan, Wisconsin, see <http://seedcert.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/potato/PIE/paaequivalencytable.pdf> for the most current equivalency table). Idaho is in the process of changing, but this will take about two years. McMorran related that one problem with the FY# system is that it can be a bit confusing when lots are downgraded, for example from FY1 to FY3 for exceeding tolerance for disease or off types. In such a case the “class” would be FY3 but the number of years in the field (which is listed on the NAHC) is only 2. He also noted that in some states that are currently using the FY# system (as well as some that use the “Generation system”) there is different class terminology reflecting the tolerances, such as “Foundation” “Registered” or “Certified” (Wisconsin) or “Class A” “Class B” (Colorado). Clear as mud? **No action was taken on this issue this year but McMorran promised to add it to the agenda for the 2019 PCAC meeting.**

From Alan Westra 9-28-2018:

Jeff,

This change will have to go through the legislature, so I would not expect it to become effective until the end of the next legislative session (sometime towards the end of March, 2019).

Alan Westra, SE Area Manager, Idaho Crop Improvement Association

Question: Should Oregon proceed with a FY system as being adopted* by Idaho this year?

* NOTE: Idaho’s Advisory committee and Dean have approved the change, but it still needs to be approved by the Idaho legislature in March of 2019. There does not appear to be any resistance to the change in Idaho. If adopted it should become effective in Idaho this summer.

Specific change. The tolerances for the proposed classes would not change, only the terminology used. Thus the “Seed Categories” (Table 2 page 13) of the Standards would look as shown below. Similar editing of class terminology would occur throughout the Standards to reflect this change.

<u>Seed Planted</u>	<u>Class Produced</u>	<u>Field Year</u> * ¹
TC Material	Pre-Nuclear	0-L
Greenhouse (Iso)* ²	Nuclear	0-GH
Nuclear	FY1	1
FY1	FY2	2
FY 2	FY 3	3
FY 3	FY 4	4
<u>FY 4</u>	<u>FY 5</u>	<u>5</u> * ³

*1 Maximum, may be less if previous lot down-graded

*2 If produced in an isolation GH as discussed in Part XI-A, and accordingly pathogen tested.

*3 May be extended 1 year for seed of varieties in very short supply as ‘special case’ with variety breeder/owner approval.

Item 5: Necrotic Arc Inspections

Background: The value of the ODA inspection of 400-tuber stored sample for internal necrotic acres, as required for out-of-state shipments under the Necrotic Virus Management Plan, has been questioned. See eMail below, page 6 for details.

Question: Should the requirement for inspection for internal necrotic arcs in out-of-state shipments be continued at a national level? Should it be modified in some way? Could virus testing replace the inspection?

Consideration: As noted on page 6, OPCS cannot in itself change this requirement. The discussion here is simply to give OPCS guidance in whether such action should be attempted on a national level, and if so, what track should the change take.

REVIEW: Necrotic Arc Inspections (eMail response to questions received)

Inspection for Necrotic Arcs.

FYI... I have received several questions concerning the tubers set aside for necrotic arc inspection conducted by ODA on out-of-state shipments, such as

“Every year I set we pull 2 – 200 tuber samples that go to O.D.A. in the spring for testing {i.e, cut and inspected for necrotic arcs}. In my 11 seasons here I have never received any results nor have I ever been asked about them. Is this a part of our certification process and is it something that needs to be continued?”

or

“If I am going to send all my seed in-state, do I need to have ODA do a shipping point inspection for internal defects {necrotic arcs}?”

My reply

“Is this required for in-state shipments”

No, to comply with Oregon certification rules, only out-of-state state shipments are required to have 'shipping point inspections' (or more precisely an inspection at shipping point for necrotic arcs).

However, you may want to be sure the buyer is not expecting this to be done because it is common practice among our surrounding states (as I understand it).

"Is this a part of our certification process"

Yes and no, see page 19 of the Standards (last paragraph after "NOTE"). Your lots are fully certified in Oregon after passing the Winter Grow-out. However if shipped out-of-state the Necrotic Virus Management Plan (of which Oregon is a signatory to) stipulates this this sample be taken and examined for internal necrotic arcs (which indicate the presence of one of the "tuber necrosing viruses").

The WGO sample can't be used for this because (1) the tuber samples must be stored under the same conditions the rest of the lot is for at least 1 month (as I recall); and (2) ODA must cut the samples. In other states the cutting is done as part of the official 'Shipping Point Inspection' which is required for each load, but Oregon does not require a SPI, this the work-a-round.

"Is it something that needs to be continued"

Well, that is not solely an Oregon matter, because the NVMP was approved on a national level, and is incorporated into the "**National Seed Potato Harmonization Program**" which all seed potato producing states are supposed to sign. If Oregon 'ops out' of the NSPHP or NVMP, I can still certify all your lots, but other states may not (or should not) accept them as certified.

What happens if you don't take a sample..... Nothing from OSCS standpoint, I don't receive the results of this test either, however the receiving state may refuse to accept them. I haven't heard of this happening however. The only other risk is that Oregon might be 'out of compliance' with the NVMP and lose our ability to have our certification tag accepted out of state.

Question: Should the requirement for inspection for internal necrotic arcs in out-of-state shipments be continued at a national level? Should it be modified in some way?

Item 6: Potatoes and Hemp Seed - Opportunities and Rotations

From Jay Noller: *“We need to talk about the number of hemp acres showing up on potato ground? Of the commodities in Oregon, potato farmers seem most eager to grow hemp. We need to do research on certified potato rotations involving hemp.”*

Other Business:

A. Facilitating PVY detection via peptide insertion Goyer Aymeric (HAREC)

“This is a new method that facilitates the identification of PVY-infected plants during potato seed fields inspection by accentuating foliar symptoms and accelerating their appearance. This method is based on foliar application of a small peptide.”

B. Demonstration of On-Line sign-ups and mapping options for seed potatoes (Jeff McMorran)



Jeff McMorran
Oregon Seed Certification Service
Oregon State University, 31 Crop Science Bldg.,
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
T 541-737-4513 | F 541-737-2624 | Jeff.McMorran@oregonstate.edu

To: Potato Certification Advisory Committee
From: Jeffrey P. McMorran, Secretary
Subject: January Meeting – ‘Heads up’ & Call for Agenda Items

A meeting of the Potato Certification Advisory Committee is scheduled for the morning of **Tuesday, January 22 from 9:00 to 11:00 AM at the Three Rivers Convention Center**, 7016 W Grandridge Blvd, Kennewick, WA 99336. As required by the bylaws, it is being held in conjunction with the 2019 Washington-Oregon Potato Conference.

This meeting will be immediately preceded by the **Oregon Seed Potato Growers** meeting starting at 8:00 AM in the same room.

Information on the conference as a whole can be found at the conference web site: <http://www.potatoconference.com/> or by calling (509) 737-3700.

Agenda Items: A preliminary agenda for this meeting, and some background materials, has been attached. Additional agenda items will be accepted through **January 9th**. All proposed motions should be as concise as possible; contain some background information, a purpose statement, and source of origination.

The 3-year terms of the committee members expire at the *end* of the advisory meeting for the year posted, and generally two terms are allowed before replacement. The current roster is enclosed. I have extended those that expired after the last meeting. Please advise me of any changes or errors.

A copy of the 2018 PCAC minutes can be found at: <https://seedcert.oregonstate.edu/sites/seedcert.oregonstate.edu/files/potatominutes18.pdf>