



U.S. Wheat & Barley
Scab Initiative

MINUTES

Approved: 5/25/10

USWBSI Steering Committee Meeting
Wednesday, December 9, 2009 1:00-4:30 pm
Wyndham Orlando Resort
Orlando, FL

Co-Chairs: Art Brandli (Private Grower, MN) and Dave Van Sanford (University of KY)

Members Present: Jim Anderson (University of Minnesota), Bill Berzonsky (SD State University), Bob Bahm (National Assoc. of Wheat Growers, DC), Xiwen Cai (ND State University), Blake Cooper (Busch Agricultural Resources), Jose Costa (University of MD), Christina Cowger (USDA-ARS), Mike Davis (American Malting Barley Association), Jane DeMarchi (North American Millers Association), Ruth Dill-Macky (University of MN), Elias Elias (ND State University), Rich Horsley (ND State University), Fred Kolb (University of Illinois), CJ Lin (Mennel Milling Co.), Marcia McMullen (ND State University), Brad Miller (North Dakota Pasta Company), Ben Moreno-Sevilla (WestBred, LLC), Gene Milus (University of AR), Pierce Paul (OH State University), Jim Pestka (MI State University), Jay Romsa (General Mills), Steve Scofield (USDA-ARS, IN), Clay Sneller (OH State University), Jeff Stein (SD State University) and Frances Trail (MI State University)

Participating via Telephone: Louie Arnold (North Dakota Barley Council) and Ken Grafton (NDSU Agricultural Experiment Station)

Staff: Sue Canty (USWBSI-NFO) and Don Lilleboe (Lilleboe Communications)

1. Welcome and Introductions.

2. Approve 5-28-09 SC Meeting Minutes.

Motion: Motion made and seconded to accept the minutes as presented.

Discussion: None

Action: Motion passed.

3. Responsibilities of Steering Committee (SC) Members.

Dave Van Sanford addressed the group concerning the responsibilities of SC members as stakeholders.

❖ Two fundamental responsibilities of SC Members.

- To our commodity orientation or our disciplinary allegiances.
- To make decisions for the greater good; decisions that will maximize the overall progress of the Initiative.

SC members need to be respectful, be professional and take their responsibility to the overall goals of the Initiative seriously.

- ❖ Positive, respectful debate is encouraged and welcomed WITHIN the SC.
 - First and foremost, the debate of any issue being discussed or acted upon must stay within the confines of the Steering Committee.
 - Any conversations should be built around a premise that seeks positive ways to move the Initiative forward, rather than denigrating a specific research area or commodity.
 - We do not want to create the perception that there is infighting within the Initiative as this would likely result in very negative PR making the Initiative vulnerable to possible loss of funding.

The Initiative has a long standing very productive collegial, collaborative relationship between wheat and barley researchers. This teamwork had led to the funding for the Initiative, the genotyping centers and many other things that benefit both wheat and barley.

Remarks from Louie Arnold – Louie voiced his strong dissatisfaction with the process of setting the funding caps and discussed how the Initiative came about and reiterated Dave’s comments that the Initiative’s funding is there to eradicate FHB, and not to ‘feather the nests of a bunch of scientists. Let’s be honest, if the Scab monies goes away, so do a lot of research programs in our Universities.” Louie again said that the process that led to the FY10 funding caps was manipulated and as a result Barley research lost \$125K. “Barley cannot take a hit like that and will negatively affect the success of some research programs.” Louie thanked the SC for allowing him to voice his concerns.

Motion: Louie Arnold made a motion and which was seconded by Ken Grafton asking the EC to reinstate some or all of the Barley reduction.

Discussion: Mike Davis informed the group that when the SC looks at the recommended budget, Barley will be able to get the job done with the reduced resources. It is important for the Initiative to move forward and not look backward. However, in the next go around, individuals need to do what is best for the common good and not skew their votes to try to push the results in any one direction. Need to keep our eyes on the big picture. Mike ended with saying that what the EC will present will allow all grain classes to move forward.

Action: Motion failed (28-2).

4. **Update on the status of the FY10 Federal Budget** - Mike Davis provided an overview of the FY2010 Agriculture Appropriations bill, which was passed by Congress and signed by the President in October. He reported that no portion of the funding for the USWBSI was classified as a Congressional earmark targeted for elimination in the President’s budget proposal. It is now all contained within ARS base funding and none of that was subject to an across the board rescission in the FY10 bill. He stated that funding is now entirely dependent on the actions of ARS and therefore it is of critical importance for the USWBSI to address an important national research need as an integrated and coordinated program with accountability and a dynamic action plan. If these criteria are not met, ARS may redirect its funding to the many other research needs it faces and cannot address because of limited resources. In case not all SC members are aware of this, Kay Simmons is now Acting Administrator for ARS’ Plant Genetics and Grain Crops and Judy St. John has become Acting Associate Administrator for ARS’ National Programs.

Jane DeMarchi – additional comments – USDA-ARS talks often about five key areas of research which include Global Food Security, Nutrition and Biofuels. Some good news is that ARS seems to be talking more positively about research. Areas where we will see significant growth in funding from congress will be for more competitive research (NIFA includes what use to be CSREES) rather than intramural research (ARS).

- 5. Presentation of EC's recommended FY10 Research Plan & Budget** – While the documents containing the EC's recommendation were distributed to the SC, Dave Van Sanford began summarizing the proposed research & budget. He noted that in past years, the documents distributed to the SC had included the EC's recommendation for individual research projects. However, as it was discovered after last year's SC meeting that not all of the confidential documentation was returned before the meeting adjourned, this information would no longer be included in the printed materials. The SC was given a few minutes to look over the materials, after which Dave gave an overview of the distributed documents and provided SC members the opportunity to ask questions. One thing of note is that monies have been set aside in the NFO's budget to fund additional personnel to help with ScabSmart (managing information and expanding its capabilities) and assist with moving the Breeder's database forward (e.g. standardizing the data from the various research programs for incorporation into database). Both of these activities aim to improve USWBSI's communication with its stakeholders as well as coordination within the Initiative.

Motion: Motion was made and seconded to accept the EC's recommended FY10 Research Plan & Budget as presented.

Discussion: None

Action: Motion passed unanimously.

6. Group leaders report on Focused Group Discussions.

- ❖ Barley CP (Presented by Jeff Stein) – The group reviewed and updated their Milestone Matrix. They reviewed the Action Plan as it pertains to their CP. They also discussed ScabSmart as it relates to Barley. They hope to be able to add resistant varieties to ScabSmart sometime in the next couple of years. The DON forecasting model for Barley is expected to be launched in the spring of 2010.
- ❖ Durum CP (Presented by Xiwen Cai) – Growers, Industry Reps and Researchers all attended the breakout. Discussed getting pertinent information about Durum cultivars posted in ScabSmart.
- ❖ Hard Winter Wheat CP (Presented by Bill Berzonsky) – Began by discussing metrics including tracking acres planted with FHB resistant varieties, document the exchange of germplasm, and a regional DON survey (DON content in harvested grain) for the purpose of setting targeted reduced DON levels as a measuring stick. Discussed documenting and strengthening the area of disseminating the FHB performance information, particularly variety by fungicide trials. New this year for the regional performance trial is the addition of entries from three private companies. The group discussed changes to the HWW region including the addition of the HWW breeding program at NDSU. The group reviewed the Action Plan and as a whole did not see the need for any changes.
- ❖ VDHR-Spring Wheat Region (Presented by Jim Anderson) - There were only two PIs from the region that were present for the entire meeting, so this affected the focus of their discussion. One thing they discussed was the idea for more collaborative research, as well as doing a better job of demonstrating the areas of existing collaboration among the spring wheat region. A suggestion was made that the EC/NFO might consider developing best practices for the CP Committees to use in developing their final pre-proposal/funding request.
- ❖ VDHR–Northern and Southern Soft Winter Wheat (Presented by Clay Sneller) - The two groups first met separately and then together.
Northern - Discussed the review they received by the CPC and the external reviewers. They did not discuss the Action Plan or their Milestone Matrix. Clay did comment on the problem with using the number of acres planted to FHB resistance varieties as metric as surveying is

not done in his state. It was suggested that a survey on acres of different wheat varieties grown could be sent out to the members of growers group in states where organized groups (e.g. State Growers Associations) exists. Bob Bahm suggested NAWG might assist with contacting its state grower associations to assist with obtaining this information.

Southern (Presented by Jose Costa) – The group did review the action plan as it pertains to their CP. They discussed expanding their scab nursery with additional lines particularly those lines containing native resistance. They discussed ways of increasing the collaboration among their group; one area would be phenotyping. They also discussed the idea of creating a double-haploid center possibly linked to the Genotyping Centers although this would be a very large investment by the Initiative. One suggestion as a possible metric would be that any new varieties released included a comparison rating to an existing resistant variety.

- ❖ FSTU (Presented by Jim Pestka) – It was a fairly small group that met. There has been significant progress on goal number one of the Action Plan (Provide analytical support for DON/trichothecene quantitation for Initiative’s stakeholders). The DON labs are moving into maintenance mode for capacity. Also discussed was the need for analysis of other toxins/trichothecenes. Some of the DON labs are already doing this, but Initiative needs to decide if providing testing on other toxins is needed and warranted. The group discussed whether keeping the performance measure on [DON] inhalation risk is still relevant as there doesn’t appear to be money available to fund this type of research. A suggestion was made by Jim Anderson to send a reminder annually to the FHB group on safety for handling DON contaminated grain (wearing gloves, a mask, etc.).

Action Item: Establish subcommittee to create standard operating procedures/protocol for handling DON contaminated grain and post on Scab Website.

- ❖ PBG (Presented by Frances Trail) – Their group spent quite a bit of time reviewing the Action Plan and where they are at in reaching their goals. Projects that are currently being funded are addressing each of PBG’s goals. For the last hour of the allotted time, PBG group met with the GDER group. Focus of the discussion between the two groups was GDER taking outputs from PBG research and moving it forward.
- ❖ GDER (Presented by Steve Scofield) – They reviewed their action plan, and felt they were right on track in working towards their goals and did not see any need to make any changes at this time. The group discussed approaching the private sector for additional financial support; especially as it will likely be private industry that has the resources to move the technology into the commercial sector. Scientists from Canada and the UK also expressed an interest in collaborating with the USWBSI on research.
- ❖ MGMT (Presented by Christina Cowger) – Reviewed status of several of their coordinated projects (integrated management, fungicide trials, residue studies, forecasting, epidemiology). They then discussed metrics that would be relevant for their area: 1) determine how effective small grain workers are in getting out timely information and also teaching growers about scab management; 2) determine the best venues (i.e. field days) for providing information to producers; and 3) use state by state surveys (NDSU will provide a template) to get info on ‘1’ and ‘2’. The group also discussed the possibility of developing a multi-state, multi-PI collaborative project on Training, Education and Outreach. Regarding the status of Biocontrol research, the group discussed developing a white paper on status to date; David Schisler volunteered to take the lead working with a February deadline. Last, the group discussed adding fungicide x variety to the integrated management studies.

- 7. Appointments of Executive Committee and Research Area Committee Members.** Dave Van Sanford apologized for the delay in starting the SC’s voting on the EC member appointments and the RAC member elections. The commodity groups (Durum and Winter Wheat) will work to select the

nominee for their rep on the EC over the next few weeks, and then the NFO will start the voting on both the EC appointments and RAC election early in the New Year.

- 8. Discussion of two-year model for FY11 Research Plan & Budget Process** - The EC is recommending the USWBSI move the RAs to a two year funding cycle where the RAs and CPs are on the same cycle. To do this, it is recommended the RAs submit one year pre-proposals for FY11 and then in FY12 the CPs and RAs would submit two-year based pre-proposals.

Motion: Motion was made by Mike Davis and seconded by Steve Scofield to accept the EC's recommendation as presented.

Discussion: Discussion revolved around the possibility of moving to all multi-disciplinary coordinated projects. There was much discussion with both pros and cons, but since it was not part of the motion, the topic was tabled. It was noted that if the motion passed, the timing of RAC and CPC elections may also need to be changed.

Action: Motion passed.

- 9. Spring '10 Steering Committee meeting.**

There was general consensus among the SC to hold the meeting in St. Paul/Minneapolis. The NFO will survey the SC, after the EC appointments and RAC elections have been finalized, on possible dates for spring meeting looking at late April

Meeting Adjourned at 3:55 PM

Minutes recorded and written by:



Susan M. Canty, Manager
USWBSI's Networking & Facilitation Office