

NTEP LISTENING SESSION
February 24, 2007, Anaheim, CA

Review of Feb. 2004 Listening Session Issues & Actions

A series of subcommittees were appointed to investigate each issue, recommending actions for the Policy Committee to discuss and consider. Following are the results of their activities:

Issue Raised at Listening Session	Policy Committee Actions
More information needed on entries including genetic background, lineage, Kentucky bluegrass classification, etc.	Uncertain as to how to best achieve this -Will request input (proposal) from Turfgrass Breeders Association on best approach
Trials needed involving saline soil/water and effluent water	Agreement – Ancillary trials have been established for Ky. Bluegrass & tall fescue at Las Cruces, NM
Trials targeted to important pests	Agreement – NTEP has interacted with entomologist and pathologist groups to gain a better understanding of the research needs and how we might work together
Trials of other species currently under develop for turf but not being evaluated under NTEP, use of blind testing procedures, number of test sites per location	We will initiate a seashore paspalum trial this year; considered the use of blind tests (entry names unknown to evaluators) but found this to be impractical considering the use of NTEP trials in marketing; reduced the number of official trials per state to one.
Hardcopy reports should not be eliminated	Agreement - hardcopy reports are available (upon request) with a generic NTEP cover for a fee that covers expense of printing
More information on management and conditions of trials needed	Agreement – more detailed information, possibly including digital images, on the trials will be made available through the website
Seedling vigor data confounded by after-ripening dormancy factor	Agreement – 1 st rating of data for trials is rate of establishment (%) rather than seedling vigor (as is already done for some species)
Availability of trials to university breeding programs, yet not available to commercial breeding programs	Considerable discussion has taken place on this issue. The Policy Committee is still considering this issue, but at this time, sees difficulty in either completely eliminating official NTEP trials at universities or allowing trials to be at any breeding location (public or commercial). However, we recognize the sensitive nature of this issue and the ramifications of any decision made, therefore, we are open to solutions that can be universally applied to all trials, locations, etc.

Issue Raised at Listening Session	Policy Committee Action at February 2004 Meeting
Mean data for entries should be ranked based on two significant digits (i.e., one decimal point) rather than 3 or 4 significant digits	Considered this action, also the need for the appendix table. Decided to consolidate the appendix table to include only
Shorter (2-yr) screening trials needed as compliment to longer term (4-yr or more) commercial trials	A preliminary test proposal was developed, with input from breeders, seed companies and cooperators. Thus far, the Policy Committee has not decided to move forward with the proposal.
Report endophyte levels present in NTEP entries	NTEP collects endophyte data from Rutgers and reports on the NTEP web site.
Number of entries in some trials is too large for cooperators conducting trial	Trials have become smaller recently, reducing the concerns of large trials by cooperators.
More seed industry representation is needed on NTEP Policy Committee	Policy Committee voted to add an additional member representing the Oregon Seed Trade Association, Pacific Seed Association and allied associations.
Time (years) of trials need to be greater; lengths of 5, 6, and 7 years suggested	The Policy Committee decided to increase the length of trials from four to five years; with a year in between trials; see attached schedule