

- **TITLE OF REPORT:** Interim Report for CDFA Contract Number 12-0442
- **TITLE OF PROJECT: FIELD EVALUATIONS OF GRAFTED GRAPE LINES EXPRESSING POLYGALACTURONASE INHIBITING PROTEINS (PGIPS)**

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:**

Ann L.T. Powell  
Department of Plant Sciences  
University of California  
Davis, CA 95616  
alpowell@ucdavis.edu

**CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:**

John M Labavitch  
Department of Plant Sciences  
University of California  
Davis, CA 95616  
jmlabavitch@ucdavis.edu

**FIELD COOPERATORS:**

David Gilchrist  
University of California  
Davis, CA 95616  
dggilchrist@ucdavis.edu

Philippe Rolshausen  
University of California  
Riverside, CA 92521  
Philippe.rolshausen@ucr.edu

- **TIME PERIOD COVERED BY THE REPORT:** The results reported here are from work conducted from 1 March - 30 June 2015.
- **INTRODUCTION:**

The project was designed to establish two field sites with typical vineyard practices that would allow grape lines to be evaluated in order to assess whether polygalacturonase inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) restrict *Xylella fastidiosa* (*Xf*) spread and Pierce's Disease (PD) and whether expression of pPGIP impacted the performance and attributes of the vines.

This group and others had shown that the expansion of *X. fastidiosa* from the infection site throughout the vine, creates a systemic infection that causes PD and vine death (Krivanek and Walker, 2005; Labavitch 2006, 2007; Lin, 2005; Lindow, 2006, 2007a, b; Rost and Matthews, 2007). The grapevine water-conducting xylem elements are separated by pit membranes, pectin-rich cell wall "filters" whose meshwork is too small to permit movement of *Xf* (Labavitch et al., 2004, 2006, 2009a). *Xf* produces cell wall-degrading enzymes to digest the pit membrane polysaccharides (Labavitch et al., 2009b), opening xylem connections and permitting spread of the bacteria.

The *Xf* genome contains a polygalacturonase (*XfPG*) and several  $\beta$ -1,4-endo-glucanase (EGase) genes, whose predicted enzyme products could participate in the digestion of pectin and xyloglucan polymers in pit membranes and, thereby, facilitate PD development by the movement of *Xf* within vines. Labavitch et al. (2006, 2007, 2009a; Perez-Donoso et al., 2010) reported that introduction of PG and EGase into uninfected grapevines caused pit membrane breakage. Roper et al. (2006, 2007) developed an *XfPG*-deficient *X. fastidiosa* strain and showed it was unable to cause PD symptoms, so *XfPG* is a PD virulence factor.

The over-all research aim is to use plant PGIPs to limit *Xf* spread in grapevines. PGIPs are produced by plants, including in flowers and edible fruits, and are selective inhibitors of pathogen and pest PGs (Powell et al., 2000; Shackel et al., 2005; Stotz et al., 1993, 1994). Grapevines transformed by A. Dandekar's group to express the pPGIP-encoding gene from pears have reduced susceptibility to *Xf* and pPGIP is transported across the graft junction from pPGIP expressing grape and tomato rootstocks into wild-type scions (Agüero et al., 2005, Haroldsen et al., 2012).

Grafting pPGIP-producing rootstocks to scions, which do not contain an introduced pPGIP gene, is an opportunity to provide a beneficial plant fruit protein (i.e., pPGIP) without introducing a pPGIP gene into the scion itself. This project has been designed to scale up the grafted and own-rooted pPGIP expressing grapevines, plant them in field settings, and evaluate their agronomic performance and their resistance to PD in settings comparable to commercial fields.

- **OBJECTIVES:**

1. Scale up the number of grafted and own-rooted pPGIP expressing lines.
2. Plant and maintain grafted and own-rooted lines in two locations with different PD pressure.
3. Evaluate relevant agronomic traits of vines in two locations.
4. Determine PD incidence in pPGIP expressing grafted and own-rooted lines. Test for *X. fastidiosa* presence and, if present, determine the extent of infection.

- **DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES:**

*Objective 1: Generate enough grafted and own-rooted grapevines for the field trials*

**Activities:** This objective was been completed in June 2013. It is possible that there is vine death due to PD or other causes, but no plans have been made to replace the vines. Table 1 shows the number of grafted and non-grafted vines of each genotype that were planted by June 2013 and shown in red are the number of vines that appeared to have died when the vines were analyzed 25 March 2015. In the Solano field, approximately equal number of own-genotype grafted vines of either variety with or without expressed pPGIP appeared dead. Interestingly, no transgrafted ‘Chardonnay’ vines were dead but the number of transgrafted ‘Thompson Seedless’ vines that had succumbed was equal to the number of own-genotype grafted ‘Thompson Seedless’ vines. The results in the Riverside field were quite similar. Equal numbers of grafted ‘Chardonnay’ vines with or without expression of pPGIP were dead by 2 June 2015; more, but equal numbers of control and pPGIP expressing, grafted ‘Thompson Seedless’ vines were dead. None of the transgrafted ‘Chardonnay’ vines were dead but the number of dead transgrafted ‘Thompson Seedless’ vines was approximately equal to the number of dead grafted and own-rooted ‘Thompson Seedless’ vines in the Riverside plots.

**Table 1.**

<b>SOLANO</b>		<b>‘Chardonnay’</b>								<b>‘Thompson Seedless’</b>							
	Strategy (Scion/root)																
Own-Rooted	Inoculated (2011-2013)		17 (7)								10 (3)			9 (3)			
	Non-Inoculated		8								2			5			
Grafted	Inoculated (2013, 2014, 2015)	9 (2)		8	9 (3)					9 (1)		9 (2)	9 (2)				
	Non-Inoculated	4		4 (1)	4					4		4	4				
<b>RIVERSIDE</b>																	
Own-Rooted	Natural Infections		13 (1)			11 (1)		6			9 (4)			12 (1)		6 (2)	
Grafted	Natural Infections	16 (1)		6	8 (1)		6		3	7 (3)		14 (2)	7 (2)		3 (1)		3

**Table 1.** Numbers of grapevines planted in Solano and Riverside Counties. The upper portion is scion genotype, the lower is rootstock phenotype; nongrafted plants have no break. Hatched fill represents pPGIP expressing rootstocks and/or scions; black fill is null-transformants (no pPGIP) controls; white fill is non-transformed controls. In Solano County, own-rooted vines were mechanically inoculated in the summers of 2011-2013; transgrafted vines were inoculated in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Vines planted in Riverside County had “natural” infections.

*Objective 2: Establish field trial sites*

**Activities:** The establishment of the field trial sites in Solano and Riverside Counties was completed in June 2013. The field plans of the Powell trial plots in Solano and Riverside Counties have been shown in previous reports. The vines satisfying our initial PCR analysis were hand-planted in a randomized block design with each block containing two or three individuals in the same treatment and genotype.

In Solano County on 25 February 2015, the vines were pruned by the PI and Mark Greenspan to maximize potential cane number for inoculations and to establish vigorous positions for future growth. The PI repruned the plots on 26 May, 2015. The activities in 2014 and 2015 at both field sites are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.**

Date	Location	Activity
14 March 2014	Solano	Visual scoring of symptoms from 2011-2013 infections at each year’s inoculation site on each grafted plant

19 March 2014	Solano	Visual re-scoring of symptoms from 2011-2013 infections (see above)
20 March 2014	Solano	Photos, light pruning since vines have buds that have broken; first pruning since 2013
4 April 2014	Riverside	Disease scoring of symptoms on each plant; photos taken (CJ UCD)
28 May 2014	Solano	Inoculate ca. 4 fresh canes/grafted vine for 2014; no pruning
9 July 2014	Solano	Visit field to assess disease on each plant
27 July 2014	Solano	Take cane samples of ca. 1 cane/ genotype/plot for qPCR of canes infected in 2014; prune vines again
29 July 2014	Solano	Count scorched leaves on infected canes; photos taken
3 September 2014	Solano	Disease assessment by D. Golino (UCD)
ca. 1 October 2014	Solano	Vines pruned again
6 October 2014	Riverside	Disease scoring of all plants by P. Rolshausen (PR, UCR)
9 October 2014	Solano	Count infected leaves
24 October 2014	Riverside	Disease re-scoring of all plants, photos taken by A. Powell (AP, UCD)
25 February 2015	Solano	Winter pruning of all vines by A. Powell and M. Greenspan
18 March 2015	Solano	Visual scoring and counting scorched leaves of inoculated canes (AP, UCD)
Late March 2015	Riverside	Disease scoring of all plants by P. Rolshausen (PR, UCR)
25 March 2015	Solano	Visual scoring and counting scorched leaves of inoculated canes (AP, UCD)
26 May 2015	Solano	Prune vines (AP, UCD)
27 May 2015	Solano	Inoculate ca. 4 fresh canes/grafted vine for 2015
2 June 2015	Riverside	Disease and herbicide damage scoring of all plants (AP, UCD)
17 June 2015	Riverside	Disease and herbicide damage scoring of all plants (Peggy Mauk, UCD)

**Table 2.** Activities at the Solano and Riverside sites for this project in 2014 and 2015.

*Objective 3: Evaluate relevant agronomic traits of vines in two locations.*

**Activities:** Because the vines have been dormant during the winter, no assessments were made of vigor thus far in 2015. However, during pruning in late February 2015, several dead vines were noted at the Solano site and were confirmed in March and May visits to the field. Vine death were recorded in the field assessments on 18 March and confirmed on 25 March 2015. Dead vines are noted in Table 1. At the meeting on 19 May 2015, it was noted that herbicide drift had damaged vines at the Riverside site. The PI visited the site on 2 June 2015 and scored the vines for apparently PD damage and for herbicide damage. Table 3 shows the damage assessments made on 2 June 2015 at the Riverside site.

**Table 3**

Genotype	Total number of vines	Severely compromised growth due to Round-up	Moderate growth due to Round-up	Minimal or slight impact on growth due to Round-up	Probably Dead	Dead
CC	13	0	1	0	0	0
CC/CC	16	4	3	3	1	0
wtch	6	0	1	0	1	0
wtch/wtch	6	3	1	0	0	0
329	11	0	2	0	0	1
329/329	7	0	1	3	1	0
cc/329	6	0	1	1	0	0
wtch/329	3	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Chard.</b>	68	8	10	7	3	1
TSC	9	1	1	0	0	4
TSC/TSC	7	2	1	0	1	2
wtTS	6	0	1	0	0	2

wtTS/wtTS	3	1	0	1	0	1
79	11	3	1	3	0	1
79/79	7	0	2	2	0	2
TSC/79	14	5	2	3	2	0
wtTS/79	3	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Total TS</b>	60	12	8	10	3	12
<b>Total</b>	128	20	18	17	6	13

**Table 3.** Observations of herbicide damage and vine death at the Riverside plot 2 June 2015.

*Objective 4: Determine PD incidence in pPGIP expressing grafted and own-rooted lines. Test for X. fastidiosa presence and determine the extent of infection.*

#### **Activities:**

At the Solano plot, the leaves/petioles with evidence of PD were counted 25 March 2015 including canes which had been infected in 2011, 2012 and 2013. Infected cane material will be collected during the summer of 2015 of 2014 and 2015 inoculated canes when other groups collect their samples. At the Riverside plot, assessments of disease were made 2 June 2015 and Peggy Mauk of UCR re-evaluated the vines on 17 June 2015. Her evaluations are included as Table 4.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1																				Healthy (PD)	Healthy (PD)	Stunt	Healthy	Healthy	Stunted
2														herbicide	healthy	healthy/herbicide/PD	healthy	herbicide	herbicide	herbicide	herbicide (dead)	herbicide	dead	dead	Healthy (herbicide/PD)
3	herbicide	Healthy (PD)	Stunted	herbicide	healthy	healthy	Dead	herbicide	PD	Healthy/Herbicide	Herbicide	Stunted	herbicide	herbicide	dead	dead	dead	stunted	PD	healthy/herbicide	PD	healthy	healthy	stunted	Healthy
4	herbicide	Healthy (PD)	dead	healthy	stunted/herbicide	dead	healthy	dead	dead	dead	dead	dead	herbicide	Healthy	Stunted	healthy	healthy	herbicide	PD?	healthy (stunt)	dead	healthy	healthy (herbicide)	Healthy	healthy
5	Dead	healthy	healthy	healthy	healthy	herbicide	Dead	Dead	healthy (herbicide)	dead	stunt	healthy	herbicide	Healthy	Stunted	Herbicide/PD	healthy	missing	herbicide	healthy	herbicide (healthy)	healthy	healthy (herbicide)	herbicide	PD?/herbicide?
6	stunted	PD	healthy	healthy	herbicide	healthy	healthy	Healthy/PD	healthy	herbicide	Healthy (PD?/Herbicide?)	healthy (herbicide)	healthy	dead	PD	healthy	herbicide	healthy (herbicide)	healthy	healthy (herbicide)	herbicide	healthy	healthy	dead	PD?/herbicide?

**Table 4.** Observations of herbicide damage and vine death at the Riverside plot 17 June 2015 by Peggy Mauk.

#### **Summary:**

All of the grafted plants necessary for the studies in Solano and Riverside Counties were generated, planted and inoculated according to the plans of the project. The genotypes of the grafted plants were confirmed. Initial infections in 2011 of the vines in Solano County produced no visible symptoms over a year. The second set of inoculations in Year 2 resulted in detectable *Xf* DNA in infected vines in November, 2012, and visual symptoms of PD in April, 2013. Mechanical inoculations with *X. fastidiosa* bacteria in 2011 and 2012 in Solano County resulted in the accumulation *Xf* DNA sequences only in the inoculated, but not in the uninoculated material. Symptoms of PD infection were visible on the inoculated vines beginning generally in the Spring of the year following the introduction of *Xf*. Inconsistent or atypical pruning schedules have made determinations of similarities of vine phenotype and vigor to commercially propagated fields difficult. However, the over-all performance of the uninfected own-rooted ‘Chardonnay’ and ‘Thompson Seedless’ vines in the field seems to be unaffected by the expression of pPGIP either in the scion or the rootstocks. Only 1 uninoculated vine died at the Solano site. The evaluations of vine death suggest that pPGIP expression improves resistance to PD, probably more in the ‘Chardonnay’ transgrafted lines than in the control or pPGIP expressing self-grafted lines and the ‘Thompson Seedless’ variety vines were generally more prone to die at both sites. Based on counting leaves with evidence of scorching in 2014, the ‘Chardonnay’ vines with pPGIP had fewer PD symptoms than the ‘Thompson Seedless’ variety when mechanically inoculated in Solano County. By using varieties grown for fresh fruit and for wine production in California, we are comparing the impacts of these changes using varieties which grow with different habits and which are important to different segments of the community of California grape growers.

- **PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS PRODUCED:** Results as of mid-December 2014 were presented in a poster at the Annual Pierce's Disease Symposium in Sacramento by Ann Powell.
- **RESEARCH RELEVANCE STATEMENT:**

Work in this project evaluates the performance of grafted grapevine lines that produce a protein that is a candidate for control of Pierce's Disease (PD). The vines have been established in vineyards in a manner that approximates typical commercial settings in Solano and Riverside Counties with low and high PD disease pressure, respectively. The CDFA PD and GWSS Board's Research Scientific Advisory Panel had established a priority to evaluate the potential commercial use of the strategy to deliver polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) from grafted rootstocks to control PD in the scion, fruit-bearing portions of grapevines. Established transformed 'Thompson Seedless' and 'Chardonnay' grapevines expressing a PGIP from pear fruit (pPGIP) showed reduced PD incidence when inoculated with *X. fastidiosa* (Agüero *et al.*, 2005). The pPGIP that was produced in the transformed rootstock was identified in samples of xylem exudate that were collected from grafted, but not transformed scions (Agüero *et al.*, 2005). Therefore, cuttings from these grapevines were grafted with non-pPGIP producing scions to make comparisons of the effectiveness and outcomes between vines producing pPGIP in grafted rootstocks, those producing pPGIP throughout the vine, and vines with no pPGIP.

- **LAY PERSON SUMMARY:**

Two vineyard plots containing own-rooted and transgrafted (rootstocks expressing pPGIP grafted to fruit producing scions with no genetic modifications that, thus, do not themselves produce pPGIP) combinations of Chardonnay and Thompson Seedless grapevines were established and the identities of the genotypes were confirmed by June 2013. Mechanical inoculations with *X. fastidiosa* bacteria were done annually from 2011-2015 in Solano County and natural infections were allowed to occur in Riverside County. Data describing the agronomic and disease traits of the vines have been collected. Since this trial evaluates grape varieties grown for fresh fruit and for wine production in California, we are testing varieties important to most California grape growers; these varieties have different growth habits and products so this trial examines the efficacy of pPGIP across wine and fresh sectors of the grape industry. The initial evaluations of the performance and productivity suggest that pPGIP expression in a table grape variety ('Thompson seedless') or a wine grape ('Chardonnay') improves resistance of vines to PD but does not otherwise affect vine growth or berry characteristics.

- STATUS OF FUNDS:**

	<b>Budget TOTAL</b>	February 1, 2013 – Jun 30, 2015	July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016
Personnel			
Professional, 8% Ann Powell, Feb 13 – Oct 13, 16% Nov 13 – June 14 (Monthly base \$7,741.67)	<b>35,547</b>	26,878.79	8,209.31
Lab Asst. I, 1 month (monthly base \$2,368)	<b>2,368</b>	4355.20	0
Student Asst., 150 hrs at \$10/hr	<b>5,100</b>	6,641.85	1,974.33
Employee Benefits (30.3%, 33.3%, 1.3%, 3.1%)	<b>13,910</b>	8,565.36	280.16
<b>SUBTOTAL</b> (Personnel + Benefits)	<b>56,925</b>	46,461.20	10,463.80
Supplies and Expenses	<b>13,907</b>	10,402.14	2,323.62
Equipment			
Travel	<b>3,000</b>	3,681.24	500.00
Computer Time			
Other			
Indirect Costs*			
<b>SUBTOTAL</b> (Supplies, Expenses, Equipment, etc.)	<b>16,907</b>	14,083.38	2,823.62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>73,832</b>	60,544.58	13,287.42

- SUMMARY AND STATUS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT:** None is relevant.

**REFERENCES CITED:**

Agüero CB, Uratsu SL, Greve LC, Powell ALT, Labavitch JM, Meredith CP, Dandekar AM. 2005. Evaluation of tolerance to Pierce's Disease and *Botrytis* in transgenic plants of *Vitis vinifera* L. expressing the pear PGIP gene. Mol. Plant Pathol. 6: 43-51.

- Haroldsen VM, Szczerba MW, Aktas H, Lopez-Baltazar J, Odias MJ, Chi-Ham CL, Labavitch JM, Bennett AB, Powell ALT. 2012. Mobility of transgenic nucleic acids and proteins within grafted rootstocks for agricultural improvement. *Frontiers in Plant Science*. 3: 39.
- Krivanek AF, Walker MA. 2005. *Vitis* resistance to Pierce's Disease is characterized by differential *Xylella* populations in stems and leaves. *Phytopathology* 95:44-52.
- Labavitch JM. 2007. The pit membrane barrier to *Xylella fastidiosa* movement in grapevines: Biochemical and physiological analyses. *Proceedings of the 2006 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 280-282.
- Labavitch JM, Backus EA, Matthews MA, Shackel KA. 2004. Linking the model of the development of Pierce's Disease in grapevines to an understanding of the dynamics of glassy-winged sharpshooter transmission of *Xylella fastidiosa* to grapevines and grapevine gene expression markers of Pierce's Disease. *Proceedings of the 2004 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 15-18.
- Labavitch JM, Backus EA, Morgan D. 2006. The contribution of the pectin-degrading enzyme polygalacturonase (PG) in transmission of *Xylella fastidiosa* to grape and the use of PG-inhibiting proteins for transgenic resistance to Pierce's Disease. *Proceedings of the 2006 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 287-289.
- Labavitch JM, Powell ALT, Bennett A, King D, Booth R. 2009a. Optimizing grape rootstock production and export of inhibitors of *Xylella fastidiosa* polygalacturonase activity. *Proceedings of the 2006 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, 167- 173.
- Labavitch JM, Sun Q, Lindow S, Walker A, Lin H. 2009b. Do cell wall structures limit *Xylella fastidiosa* distribution in inoculated, Pierce's Disease susceptible and resistant grapevines? *Proceedings of the 2006 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 174-180.
- Lin H. 2005. Characterization and identification of Pierce's Disease resistance mechanisms: Analysis of xylem anatomical structures and of natural products in xylem sap among *Vitis*. *Proceedings of the 2005 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 39-42.
- Lindow SE. 2007a. Assessment of the process of movement of *Xylella fastidiosa* within susceptible and resistant grapevines. *Proceedings of the 2007 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 148-151.
- Lindow SE. 2007b. Management of Pierce's Disease of grape by interfering with cell-cell communication in *Xylella fastidiosa*. *Proceedings of the 2007 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 152-161.
- Perez-Donoso AG, Sun Q, Roper MC, Greve LC, Kirkpatrick BC, Labavitch JM. 2010. Cell wall-degrading enzymes enlarge the pore size of intervessel pit membranes in healthy and *Xylella fastidiosa*-infected grapevines. *Plant Physiology* 152: 1748-1759.
- Powell ALT, van Kan J, ten Have A, Visser J, Greve LC, Bennett AB, Labavitch JM. 2000. Transgenic expression of pear PGIP in tomato limits fungal colonization. *MPMI* 13:942-950.
- Roper MC, Greve LC, Warren JG, Labavitch JM, Kirkpatrick BC. 2007. *Xylella fastidiosa* requires polygalacturonase for colonization and pathogenicity in *Vitis vinifera* grapevines. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interactions* 20:411-419.
- Rost TL and Matthews MA. 2007. Mechanisms of Pierce's Disease transmission in grapevines: The xylem pathways and movement of *Xylella fastidiosa*. Comparison of the xylem structure of susceptible/tolerant grapevines and alternate plant hosts. *Proceedings of the 2007 Pierce's Disease Symposium*, p. 274-278.

#### FUNDING AGENCIES:

Funding for this project was provided by the Pierce's Disease Control Program, California Department of Food and Agriculture.