



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Annual Meeting

Miami Plant Inspection Station

Miami, Florida

January 31 – February 1, 2011

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers

CAPS Nat'l Program Manager

Terry Bourgoïn

ER SPHD

Julie Van Meter

CPB SPRO

Nancy Richwine

EPB SSC

Matt Royer

Director Pest Detection

Joel Bard

WR SPHD

Brad Lewis

WPB SPRO

Beth Long

SPB SSC

Brian Kopper

CAPS ER Program Manager

Piera Siegert

EPB SPRO

Avi Eitam

ER PSS

Laurinda Ramonda

CPB SSC

Kristian Rondeau

CAPS WR Program Manager

Joe Collins

SPB SPRO

Chris Pierce

WR PSS

Helmuth Rogg

WPB SSC

Rick Zink

CPHST Laboratory Director

Introduction/Basis for Meeting

The CAPS program is facing many important issues, including budget reductions, infrastructure and survey funding, data management, the role of volunteers, visual surveys, ISPM guidelines, and others, and may well be at a crossroads of deciding what the business model of the future will look like. It is important to begin discussing these issues and sorting out the most important for immediate or longer term action. The action items of this meeting are expected to develop a beginning and a path in which these issues can be addressed. By this time next year we may not have conclusions or resolutions, but we should know where we want to go with these issues and be able to address and defend our decisions.

CAPS Summary and Performance Measures

A summary of [CAPS statistics](#) for 2010 and 2011 was presented and discussed. The program uses these metrics to report on Pest Detection performance measures, which also were presented. This presentation can be found on the [NCC page](#) of the [CAPS Resource & Collaboration site](#) (as well as other documents in these minutes – login is required. *To facilitate the use of the links in this document, please login to the [CAPS R&C](#) site first*). Pest Detection and the CAPS program increasingly are becoming more reliant on the information submitted by the states in Appendix J-3 of the annual CAPS Survey Guidelines to report on performance measures. This is partly due to the timing of the request for performance measures by APHIS. Performance measure are usually due shortly after the end of the fiscal year, September 30, while surveys are still in progress and not all data has been reported. As a result, an accurate and complete record of a state's intention to survey needs to be submitted in the J-3 appendix. More about this later.

Action Items from the 2011 NCC Meeting

Action items from last year's NCC meeting in Raleigh were reviewed. The good news is that almost all the items were completed prior to the meeting or reported out and finalized during the

Note: A reminder to the NCC, please distribute CAPS updates, conference-call minutes, and other CAPS-related information to the constituency that you represent in a timely manner. Also, please bring their items, issues, concerns, and opinions back to the NCC for discussion. It is our responsibility that everyone is kept engaged in the CAPS program.



meeting. The remaining items are longer term or will be continuously ongoing. The [2011 action plan](#) is posted on the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site.

Pest Detection Line Item Overview

An overview of the Pest Detection allocation was presented for 2010-2012, and can be found in the [CAPS statistics](#) presentation. The Pest Detection line item supports Agency assessments (Regional offices and SPHD offices), approximately 144 PPQ staff years, cooperative agreements with Purdue (NAPIS, etc.), NC State (NAPFAST), and Georgia (Bugwood, etc), survey supplies, and state cooperative agreements, among others. Among state cooperative agreements, the total funding in FY11 was \$6.7 million split between \$4.4 million in Infrastructure and \$2.4 million in survey, resulting in an Infrastructure to Survey ratio of 64:36.

Funding for Infrastructure and Survey

The question is how to put value and accomplishment to Infrastructure in order to properly reflect its value to the overall CAPS program and the Pest Detection mission. At first glance it would appear that approximately two-thirds of CAPS funding is going to the states with no metrics to show results or accomplishments, and that only one-third of the funding is going for actual survey. We realize that Infrastructure funding supports all surveys conducted in the states, not just Pest Detection / CAPS, and without this funding Farm Bill and other line-item funded surveys could not occur. There was much discussion around this issue. One suggestion was to combine Infrastructure and Survey into just one funding plan, but then the same issues would still be present in the form of a large sum of money for relatively little survey. We could better defend Infrastructure funding if we called it what it is, and develop a means of reporting accomplishments against it. Often, states cannot distinguish funding from different line items when reporting survey results due to overlaps and accounting systems. This may not be an issue if the full breadth of state funding for survey from multiple line items is considered in order to get the complete picture of the value of Infrastructure funding when reporting accomplishments, not just necessarily those from CAPS funding. This includes planning, monitoring survey progress, writing accomplishment reports, data collection/management, and other activities spread out over multiple funding sources. The issue is to properly account for infrastructure support in the form of accomplishments. The challenge is develop metrics that support continued infrastructure funding.

Action Item: Kristian will set up a conference call to begin to re-evaluate Infrastructure funding and how it is to be presented in the 2013 Survey Guidelines. If states receive Infrastructure funding to support the SSC position, what requirements will there be to report on activities? The group will evaluate metrics, such as organization and/or participation in surveys, training received and/or given, participation in outreach activities, etc. Chris and Julie have submitted a draft listing [potential metrics](#) for the group to consider. Those expressing interest in participating on this working group include Julie, Joel, Terry, Brad, Nancy, Beth, Brian, and others.

It was pointed out that the funding numbers presented above do not capture the state cost share, and that the total cost of the program is underestimated. It was noted that it is hard to capture state work because it is lumped in with other work, and that it is hard to tease out specific items. State cost share often is not documented so that it cannot be directly audited. On the state side it has become increasingly difficult to include cost share in the cooperative agreement because of



state rules and accounting practices. It might be easier to state cost share report separately outside of the agreement and financial plan. On the other hand, some states do not seem to have this issue, so there may be a wide variance on this issue. In the past, there have been requests from the Department for information on state cost share. This underlines our need to capture this data in some form.

Action Item: The NCC discussed the possible solution of adding a column/data field in the J-3 appendix outside of the agreement process to capture state costs. Nancy and Beth are going to examine the possibilities and make a recommendation to the NCC in time to incorporate the additional request for information in the 2013 Survey Guidelines.

In the present fiscal climate, future funding for Pest Detection and CAPS is uncertain. As a Program, we need to begin contingency planning for very real reductions in the amount of funds available for cooperative agreements with the states. If or when we do have a reduction in funding, how are we going to handle it? How do we continue to fund states and survey? These are important questions that we need to begin addressing now. The answers may change the way we do business. The President's budget contains a reduction to the Pest Detection line item. Funding for Emerald Ash Borer and Gypsy Moth also were cut. Will this further strain the Pest Detection line? We need to be prepared.

The NCC discussed several possibilities. Some may be implemented in the 2013 Guidelines, others not until 2014. No conclusions or definitive decisions were made, but it is important to begin this conversation.

State Risk Ranking Analyses

An important option to consider is to base funding proportionately on state risk. Should we put our money in the states with the highest risk? Do we cut proportionately or do we support the high risk states fully and cut the low risk states altogether? Or do we just cut the lowest 5 or 10 out of CAPS completely? All of these options were discussed with associated pros and cons.

Matt presented the current version of the state risk model being developed in CPHST with Farm Bill funding, and compared that with CAPS funding data. Other factors also were considered. The high and low risk states were naturally separate, but there did not appear to be much separation among the middle states. There are a lot of variables that can be compared and contrasted. Matt presented a [State Risk and FY11 Funding Correlations](#) analysis for CAPS data. The results of this analysis are posted on the CAPS R&C site. The question is one of how best to represent this data, and on what variables can funding be based. Regardless of the variables, the CAPS program will need to show the value of negative data, as well as, begin to match up our pests lists with those of export significance. A listing of Pests of Export Significance from the PPQ Phytosanitary Issues Management staff is posted on the CAPS R&C site in a [short](#) and [long](#) version. These documents list pests with references to country, the CAPS pest lists, and NAPIS data. Be aware that the documents only show a snapshot in time as phytosanitary requirements of the various countries can change. The list PIM provided is far too lengthy to be of any use by the field to select pests for which we should be gathering negative data to enhance exports. Perhaps the NCC should ask for a more realistic list, not of every harmful organism a country lists in their summary, but of pests these countries expressed an official concern about to PIM during meetings or via correspondence, etc.



There are several options to think about. If the total amount of funding for agreements is reduced, what will happen? What would be the minimum to keep some sort of infrastructure in place that would allow data from CAPS and other agreements to still be reported by the state? Should funding for surveys be reduced and focus on outreach? Should infrastructure be kept strong at the expense of survey? Do we use de-obligation of funding as a measure? If states have been historically turning back money, then can they be cut proportionately? However, we need to look over multiple years to get a good idea if there are historical trends.

If we base funding completely on risk, then what are our options? Basing survey purely on risk takes out any degree of randomness to assure any sort of coverage. Perhaps the big states should be cut so that more money is actually saved (not the low states that are relatively cheap). Perhaps everyone gets a baseline infrastructure, and then the survey would be based on the risk model? There are more questions than answers right now, but there are a few considerations that need to be taken into account. There was no support in the NCC to eliminate SSC/Infrastructure in some states based on risk alone; It would be difficult to bring states back in to the program in the future if they were cut completely; SSC/Infrastructure supports a lot more than just Pest Detection (CAPS); and we need to find a balanced amount for Infrastructure, and apply risk models to survey dollars.

Action Item: These conversations will continue throughout the year until an agreed-upon resolution is developed. It was important to start talking about these issues, and it is important to continue talking about these issues. The NCC should engage their constituency on these issues, obtain their thoughts, suggestions, and concerns, and bring them back to the NCC for further discussion. It is extremely important to keep your constituency informed.

CAPS Conference:

Holding a CAPS Conference is totally dependent on the FY13 budget. While we would like to have a Conference every 2 years, it does not look very likely to have one on schedule in December of 2012. The CAPS program will try to schedule for December 2013 (FY14), but approval will likely depend on what the final FY13 budget looks like and the future outlook for FY14 funding. This is a very important meeting, and we need to build support to have this meeting. Perhaps a CAPS meeting can be added on to the NPB Meeting? Most of the same people attend both. Regional plant board meetings may not have a CAPS breakout session(s). Eastern and Southern Plant Boards are planning to schedule CAPS breakout sessions for the SSCs. However, we do not know what the PSS travel approval and attendance might be. Having some attendance/presence at the regional plant boards may be vital if CAPS undergoes major programmatic changes due to the budget.

Action Item: The Plant Board representatives on the NCC will discuss with their respective regional Plant Boards the need to send a letter to PPQ in support of a National CAPS Conference in December of 2013.

CAPS Recognition

In the absence of a CAPS Conference in 2012, the NCC discussed the possibility of developing a virtual recognition process for the summer of 2012. The NCC discussed subgroups, how exclusive do we want to be yet be inclusive at the same time, and in off years, recognize accomplishments and not just peer groups.



Action Item: John will put together a CAPS recognition working group (awards committee) to outline a formal recognition program and process. The group will need to determine criteria, categories, descriptions for categories, nomination process, and review process by April 1st. Volunteers are needed for this group.

Farm Bill & CAPS:

Section 10201 of the 2008 Farm Bill has been signed into law, and there is no expiration date. It will continue until it is changed or removed by law. PPQ must request the funds each year. However, Congress could decide not to fund it. Announcement concerning the Farm Bill will be made through the [PPQ Stakeholder Registry](#). The CAPS community is encouraged to register and sign up for Farm Bill notices. Information on the Farm Bill for 2012 can be found on the [APHIS Farm Bill web site](#) and the [Farm Bill page](#) of the CAPS R&C site.

With budget reductions and possibly less money for cooperative agreements, can we continue to offer all the commodity surveys presently in the Guidelines through CAPS? Since the focus of the Farm Bill is on [Specialty Crops](#), could we leverage Farm Bill funding for those surveys that focus on specialty crops? These surveys, then, would not be funded through the CAPS program. Currently we offer the Grape and Stone Fruit Commodity surveys. Additionally, states have submitted plans through CAPS and the Farm Bill for orchard, Solanaceous, and other bundled surveys. If these were to be funded only through the Farm Bill, then CAPS would concentrate on the major agronomic crops, e.g., Corn, Cotton, Small Grains, the environmental niches, e.g., forest pests, and taxonomic groups. A delineation of surveys between CAPS and Farm Bill also would make it easier to determine accomplishments and performance measures from each program. While the data entry protocol would be the same, one could determine the data entered against CAPS or Farm Bill simply by the type of survey.

Action Item: The NCC will discuss this proposal with their constituency. Are there any concerns with dividing surveys between CAPS and the Farm Bill? How would this affect your state's staffing? Would CAPS just fund infrastructure and then just survey through the Farm Bill if a state wanted to do only specialty crop surveys? What about nursery surveys or EWB/BB pathway or environment surveys? Do we start with just a few, and then re-assess?

CAPS Survey Guidelines

As of this meeting, the CAPS Survey Guidelines will remain similar to the previous year's Guidelines. However, there may be some changes that will be implemented based on continuing discussions as presented above, especially in the areas of infrastructure funding and accomplishment reporting. The 2013 budget will be a driving force behind any changes with respect to funding cooperative agreements. The pest lists will be slightly updated, as per the webinar described below, and some surveys may not be supported via CAPS, but through the Farm Bill instead. Some of these issues may be implemented for 2013, others may be for 2014.

Over all, the 2012 J-3 appendices submitted by the states were terrible. There were misspellings and an overall poor attention to the approved methods and other details throughout. The impression is that states are just copying from past J-3s without updating or other thought, and promulgating mistakes from year to year. As an example, there were 7-10 different spellings of *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* in the 2012 J-3s. This takes time to correct. Also, CPHST reported that approximately 75% of the pests did not have the approved method, trap, and/or lure listed



correctly. This is a very important document that serves a variety of purposes, including CAPS program performance measures, populating the CAPS Accountability Report, preparing the IPHIS CAPS complex, trap and lure planning and ordering, planning diagnostic needs, as well as other function in addition to being a ready source of information for management. This document needs to be treated seriously and with thought each year.

To improve the quality of the information submitted on the J-3 spreadsheet, we will investigate the possibility of developing an online interface with pull-down menus, pests linked with the Approved Methods, and locked cells so information not aligned with CAPS policy cannot be changed.

Action Item: John and Kathy will explore the possibility with Purdue of developing a J-3 interface on the CAPS R&C site. If this can be done within the current terms of the cooperative agreement, then we will proceed with a deadline of July 2012 so that states can prepare their J-3 online in preparation of submitting work plans and other required documents to the Regions in mid-August.

IPHIS

John briefed the NCC on the CAPS program's requirements that need to be implemented in IPHIS before the CAPS program will support the use of IPHIS. These requirements have been discussed in detail among the CAPS management team, and have been communicated to the IPHIS team. These requirements are summarized in the presentation [CAPS Requirements for IPHIS](#) posted on the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site. Until further notice from the CAPS program, NAPIS will continue to be the repository of Pest Detection/CAPS survey data.

Action Item: The NCC will discuss these requirements with their constituency, and send their thoughts and/or the results of their discussions on this issue to Matt.

IPHIS Pilot States

A few states will pilot IPHIS for CAPS in 2012 to test certain functionality that has been incorporated into the system. Lisa and Melinda will compile a list of pests to be included in the CAPS complex from the combined J-3 spreadsheets. From this, survey templates for Corn, Small Grains, and a blank template will be published to the system pre-populated with the list of pests in that commodity survey. States will test the ability to add pests and remove pests from the commodity templates, and use the blank template to custom build a survey template. Naming conventions will be considered, and philosophy on how to define locations vs. sites and what reports will be needed will be developed.

Action Item: Kristian will coordinate IPHIS pilot testing with various states, and report back to the NCC on results.

CPHST Support for CAPS

Rick presented an overview of the CPHST staff and how they relate to the CAPS program. A [CPHST CAPS Support Chart](#) is posted on the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site.

Lisa and Melinda presented a [Pest List Review](#) webinar on several aspects of their work in support of the CAPS program; the review of the AHP process, changes to the commodity pest lists, and the status of the new Asian defoliators and Palm taxon/commodity surveys.



A [proposed new process](#) for deciding what pests should be run through the AHP model was presented. Changes include the development of both a pre-assessment and post-assessment. A pest would have to pass through both before being recommended for survey. An example AHP [pre-assessment for *Argyresthia pruniella*](#) was presented. The NCC generally thought that this was a good process to develop.

[Pest List Working Group](#) issues and recommendations for changes to the commodity and taxon pests lists were presented for NCC approval. Lisa and Melinda will make the necessary changes as discussed by the NCC in time for publication in the 2013 Guidelines.

An update on the status of the proposed [Asian Defoliators and Palm Commodity](#) surveys was presented. The Asian Defoliator pathway survey will be included in the 2013 Guidelines, while the Palm Commodity survey may have to wait until 2014 unless several issues are resolved before April 1.

Action Items: Lisa and Melinda will update the commodity and taxon pests list, and will prepare the web-based Asian Defoliators pathway survey for the 2013 Survey Guidelines. They also will work on the Palm Commodity survey, but this may not be finalized in time for the 2013 Guidelines.

Outreach and Metrics

This discussion was intertwined throughout the meeting. It touches on Infrastructure funding and accomplishment reports, visual surveys by volunteers and the CAPS community, appropriate negative data, data reporting, exports, and other issues. One of the overriding questions is, “How do we validate outreach and visual survey methods?” Mark Hitchcox presented a [webinar](#) on a very structured outreach/volunteer program that he is developing. He proposed the terms “specialized observation” as opposed to “casual observation.” The difference is the level of training or expertise the reporting entity holds. Is this what a base or standard program would look like? Is this one where the CAPS program can start to give some direction, and what would be the standards for reporting negative data? For exports, what is sufficient data? Should volunteer data be coded separately from regular CAPS data? These are very difficult questions, and the NCC did not arrive at any definitive answer, but the questions were asked and the conversations started.

Action Item: The NCC will develop a draft of what this issue will look like so that we can move forward. Otherwise we may just continue to rehash the same old ground. The NCC will send their thoughts to John so that he can compile the first draft. We need to define who can report and who has oversight of the data. How is the data qualified in NAPIS as visual versus trap? Specialized versus casual? Re-visit ISPM 6 & 8 and the “general surveillance” definition.

Terry submitted a draft of a potential white paper on the use of [volunteers in exotic pest surveys](#). We will use this as a base to bring our thoughts together.

CAPS'opedia

At the 2011 NCC meeting in Raleigh, The NCC discussed the development of a ‘CAPS 101’ or something similar that would be a source of information on CAPS to those new to the program and those not-so-new to the program. Over the past year, a working group led by Kay Kromm



investigated what this would look like, and resulted in CAPS'opedia. Kay and Susan Schechter presented a [webinar](#) on reshaping the CAPS R&C site into CAPS'opedia as a multi-path source for information on the CAPS program. While the webinar completed an action item from last year's meeting, the working group decided that this was a continuing effort, with the goal of providing needed information for the CAPS community, and that twice yearly conference calls would be scheduled to keep the effort going.

Action Item: The CAPS'opedia working group will schedule twice a year conference calls to continue the effort to provide information useful to the CAPS community through multi-path avenues on the CAPS R&C site.

Developmental Assignment

Kristian oversaw a Developmental Assignment with the goal to get a handle on an estimate of the [cost to hang a trap](#) over a range of states. It was hoped that this would ultimately lead to the development of a tool to help states estimate costs when developing work plans and in agreement reviews. The EAB program did a cost analysis to cap the cost per trap at a certain level (approx. \$90/trap). The CAPS program is a bit more difficult because there are more variables compared to those surveys that are looking for only one pest. The result was that it would be very difficult to determine the cost with a one-size-fits-all dollar amount for CAPS. Bundling surveys may be the best way to help keep costs down.

Topics Not Yet Addressed

Visual surveys for nursery surveys (ties in somewhat to negative results for outreach work)