



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

June 14, 2012

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Terry Bourgoin	Saul Vaiciunas ³	Talitha Molet
Brian Kopper	Piera Siegert	Laurinda Ramonda	Joel Floyd
Kristian Rondeau	Brad Lewis	Kathy Handy	Susan Schechter
Rick Zink	Rachel Braud ¹	Lisa Jackson	Dan Borchert
Joel Bard	Greg Buntrock ²	Melinda Sullivan	Charles Pierre

¹for Avi Eitam, ²for Chris Pierce, ³for Nancy Richwine

WPB and CPB Review

Kristian presented an update on the CAPS program at the Western Plant Board annual meeting in May. The update included the 2013 Guidelines, survey coordination between Pest Detection and Farm Bill, the IPHIS pilot, and other topics. The funding situation also was discussed. Feedback was generally positive. John will be presenting the same information to the upcoming National Plant Board meeting in July.

There was some concern about the state risk model CPHST is developing. Kristian clarified that this tool is not currently being used by CAPS, but that the tool is being considered by the program. It is important that the best tools are utilized when making funding decisions. However, Infrastructure funding is still a priority and is currently not being considered for reduction or elimination. An extensive review was completed on the risk model process and the report has been sent out the Plant Board members for comments. Webinars for the members of each regional Plant Board have been scheduled for June 27 and 28. If you would like the review document or the interim risk assessment, contact Dan Borchert for a copy.

Daniel.M.Borchert@aphis.usda.gov

Volunteers and Visual Surveys

This topic was previously discussed on the last NCC call. Avi Eitam has taken the lead for this working group. There is an open group set up on the CAPS collaboration site called “Volunteers and Visual Surveys” which can be used to enter comments and gather useful information (this is open to anyone who can sign onto the site and is found under “Open Group” on the bottom right of the page). If interested in joining this group and participating in the discussions please contact Avi. Avraham.Eitam@aphis.usda.gov

There was a previous effort that concentrated on visual surveys (led by Adam Silagyi). This led to the development of the visual survey protocol for *Agrilus biguttatus*. At that time it was decided that development of visual surveys likely would have to be on a pest-by-pest basis

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.



because of the different biology and life cycle of the various pests. Also, we would need time to determine if the visual survey protocol for *A. biguttatus* was effective and reasonable.

The question now is what role do volunteers have in CAPS visual surveys, if any, assuming that a proper visual survey can be or is defined for the pest(s) in question. We are not likely to ask volunteers to hang, monitor or service traps, so the visual survey thrust is the most logical to pursue. Thus, the two topics, visual surveys and volunteers, are intertwined, but we need to separate them out if we are to make any progress in either area. The group needs to define exactly what constitutes a volunteer, and at what level of engagement and oversight the volunteer needs to have. This is important depending on the objective of the engagement. Is it general surveillance for reporting possible positive detections, or is it structured enough for reporting negative survey data? All of these types of questions need to be answered.

The purpose of this group is to come up with some sort of resolution on where CAPS stands on using volunteers, and what type of guidance the CAPS program can or should provide. If the use of volunteers or volunteer groups is a viable method to help states complete surveys, then some type of standardized guidelines may be beneficial. It all depends on the parameters the group feels fits the CAPS mission. The group needs to keep in mind the December 2003 document “Guidelines for the Volunteer Utilization Initiative and the Caps Program and Pest Detection Surveys” found on the [APHIS, Pest Detection](#) website.

Piera Siegert has provided some thoughts for the group to consider and sent examples on when volunteer surveys worked and when they did not. Examples like these could be a good opportunity to improve our policies/methods when dealing with volunteers. Kathy Handy was asked to look over the examples that Piera provided and determine the ramifications of what the program would have to do from a legal basis when volunteers are used, and to provide some ‘learning moments’ from the example where results were not too good. Kathy’s response has been posted on the “Volunteers and Visual Surveys” open group.

Zonal Pest Selection Tool

Dan Borchert (CPHST) gave a presentation on the newly developed “Zonal Pest Selection Tool.” This tool could potentially be useful for states when planning surveys, and can be customized by state. Over the past several years, CPHST has been releasing maps for CAPS pests through NAPFAST, including host, climate, risk, and Pareto maps. The Zonal Pest Selection Tool incorporates all the information that goes into the maps by pest, and puts it into an interface that lets survey planners glean risk information for their state for pests of interest. Simply, the Tool provides customized pest risk information for individual states using the data found in each of the pest maps. Dan demonstrated the use of the Tool in a webinar to the NCC.

The Tool uses zonal statistics to calculate the mean risk value for each pest in each state and summarizes it in a table. States can use the information via an interface to determine which pests pose the greatest risk to their individual state. This can help states make a pest list based on risk



values. The table can be used as a quick way to decide and compare which pests are important to your state. Dan can send the flash files to each state if interested and can provide help if needed. Daniel.M.Borchert@aphis.usda.gov

Any feedback on the project is greatly appreciated. A webinar for PSSs and SCCs can be arranged to go over the tool. There is interest to go over this tool with SPHDs and SPROS as well (Brian will bring this up on next SPHD call).

Future Webinar for PSSs and SCCs

Terrence Walters recently released a lucid tool entitled “TortAI: Tortricids of Agricultural Importance”. There is going to be a webinar for the PSSs and SCCs on the new tool, possibly on the next PSS call for the WR. The ER will likely be included on this webinar as well.

Remaining Agenda Topics

The remaining topics on the agenda will be carried over until our next call on July 19.

CAPS Recognition

Additional Pest List

Approved Methods? Lure support?

IPHIS

Negative Data

Who and how are states using negative data generated through surveys?

John sent out the following email request for information on June 21.

We have a need to know how or for what purpose negative survey data is being used, if at all, in the states by both PPQ and state agencies. Also, where do the states go to obtain or reference negative data? Is this internal data, NAPIS, or other data sources? This will help us in discussions we will have early next month before our next NCC call. Please discuss this issue with your constituency, and provide their comments, insights, and other information to me (cc Brain and Kristian) before July 4. It is really important to have this information as it will guide us on how to proceed on several fronts. Thank you for your cooperation.

Next NCC calls will be on Thursday, July 19, and August 2, 2012, at 11:00 am eastern time.