



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

July 19, 2012

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Piera Siegert	Laurinda Ramonda	Talitha Molet
Kristian Rondeau	Joe Collins	Helmuth Rogg	Susan Schechter
Rick Zink	Avi Eitam	Kathy Handy	
Joel Bard	Saul Vaiciunas	Lisa Jackson	
Terry Bourgoin	Beth Long	Melinda Sullivan	

CPHST/CAPS Work & Planning Meeting

Last week, the CPHST CAPS Support and PD/CAPS Management teams held a meeting in Ft. Collins to discuss the current CPHST projects in support of CAPS and what will be the future needs. A summary of the minutes will be posted on the CAPS R&C site when available. Some of the topics and issues discussed were:

- The PPQ reorganization and how it will affect the CPHST/CAPS relationship.
- Negative data and how it is used.
- Visual surveys in nurseries.
 - CPHST will develop a list of pests that are acceptable for visual survey in nurseries. A brief summary of how to conduct a visual survey will be inserted into individual pest datasheets. This will be done pest by pest and is considered a long term project.
- Otis, Beltsville, and Mission lab updates.
- IPHIS discussion with Dave Kowalski concerning CAPS needs and the new contract.
- Discussion on how projects should be requested from CPHST.
 - CPHST now has CPIA which is a project tracking database.
- Discussion on the revision of the current AHP model.
 - The new model could come into play by the 2014 Guidelines. The group also discussed the new pre- and post-assessments and how these will help justify what pests are included on the AHP list.
- Overview of the data analysis working group and what they do.
- Overview of NAPPFAST, Zonal Statistics, and the state risk ranking model.
- Overview of AGM modeling efforts and how this could be applicable to other CAPS surveys.
- New web-based manuals and datasheets for the CAPS program.
 - The goal is to make these more user friendly and easier to update.

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.



Negative Data

Negative data has been an ongoing discussion topic, and was discussed in length at the CPHST/CAPS meeting in Ft. Collins. Thanks to those that responded to the recent question on how negative data is used in the states. The responses greatly aided the conversation. It was suggested that the PSSs should start developing relationships with their state's export certification specialists in order to get more detailed information on the data needed or required for trade purposes. At HQ, we will begin to develop relationships with the export staff.

During the conversation, questions were raised regarding possible PPQ response to a pest detection; Does PPQ leadership have an opinion on what pests they will respond to if found? Will PPQ really respond to a bark beetle find? Should we survey for pests that we know/think that there will be no response?

Within CAPS, we should not base our survey targets based on *a priori* or presumptive decisions regarding possible regulatory response scenarios. We should not anticipate whether a regulatory response will or will not occur. Once a pest detection occurs several things are set in motion all aimed at arriving at a decision of what to do. The New Pest Response Group (NPAG) is notified, consultations occur, and recommendations are made to the PPQ Leadership Team. Every situation is unique, and decisions include evaluating the pest biology, location of the detection, climate, industries and trade that may be affected, as well as other risk (and sometimes political) factors. There are lots of unknowns. If a decision is made to not have a regulatory response, then that is important also. While a regulatory response may not be forthcoming from PPQ, other state and federal agencies (ARS, NIFA, etc.) may need to know about the new pest in order to support affected industries and agriculture through research and/or management strategies. While CAPS should not make decisions on PPQ's possible regulatory response, the program can decide not to survey for particular pests due to a lack of a diagnostics or identification support and/or capacity or the lack of an effective survey method.

Commodity Manuals

CPHST is currently working on developing a new web-based platform for the CAPS pest datasheets. The NCC should talk to their constituency to determine the preference for viewing these documents, how the datasheets are used, and how the information is distributed. Because some states print the datasheets, it will be necessary to look into including higher quality images for printing.

The new platform will allow states to customize datasheets based on their unique interest and need. It would also allow for easier, real-time updates of individual datasheets. CPHST should have a draft product ready for states to review in the next few months.

Additional Pests of Concern List (Appendix H)

The Additional Pests of Concern list has become a holding tank for miscellaneous pests (lower ranking from AHP, other program recommendations, etc.). The NCC needs to decide what type



of support these pests should have, whether it is approved methods or the ability to buy traps and lures through the program. This topic should be taken to the constituency for discussion, but remember that the CAPS program has limited resources.

For example, the following question was asked; How much support is there for pests of state significance in terms of traps and lures, for example, winter moth in Maine?

There are limited resources available to extend approved methods and trap and lure procurement to all pests of state significance. PPQ only supplies traps and lures that are listed in the survey supply database. These pests have approved methods and mostly are the Priority Pests. If only one or two states plan to survey for a pest of state significance, it is up to the state to procure that trap and lure. However, if the trap/lure is something that is or similar to what is in the database, the state should bring the issue up with Kristian or Brian. States can write in the cost of procuring traps and lures not offered through the database into their work plan, but the total funding for that state cannot exceed the maximum amount communicated to the state.

If taxonomic support is needed, this should be stated in the online Survey Summary Form (Appendix J-3). Once listed, Joel Floyd can determine if there are resources available to process the samples and where samples should be sent.

OPIS Pest List

The Offshore Pest Information Program (OPIP) has recently completed a process to reevaluate pests on the Offshore Pest Information System (OPIS) Pest List. The OPIS lists include pests not found in the U.S., and some PPQ program pests.

The new OPIS A and B Lists are broken down by taxon, and were evaluated by subject matter experts. However, an older version of the AHP model was used to rank the pests in the lists. There are a lot of pests on the OPIS lists that have not been evaluated by the CAPS program. The CPHST team will work on evaluating pests on the OPIS list which are new to the CAPS program and determine if they should be run through the new AHP model. John will send out the new OPIS list to the NCC members.

Volunteers and Visual Survey - Update

Avi is setting up dates for an initial conference call for individuals interested in working on the volunteer issue. An initial call will be scheduled soon, and there is still time to get involved. If interested, contact Avi (Avraham.Eitam@aphis.usda.gov). An open group on the CAPS R&C site is available to all once you log in, and contains comments and some previous documentation for review.

IPHIS Pilot - Update

Kristian is visiting Idaho this week as part of the IPHIS pilot to understand how IPHIS is used in the field. The purpose of the pilot is to test certain functionality in IPHIS and how it works when



entering CAPS survey data. Any issues will be brought up to the IPHIS team to help improve the functionality of IPHIS for the CAPS program. A new contractor is currently being brought on, and it will remain to be seen how much development in support of CAPS can be completed in IPHIS this year. A decision on whether to use IPHIS or NAPIS for the 2013 survey season will not be decided until October. Kristian will discuss his thoughts and experience dealing with the IPHIS pilot in Idaho on the next NCC CAPS call.

Other

The CAPS 2013 work plans are still due by August 15th to your regional office. The online Survey Summary Form should be completed by that time. Plan using your 2012 budget, but understand that changes may need to be made depending on the funding PPQ receives from Congress.

There are still some states that need to enter and submit their Farm Bill surveys into the Farm Bill Survey Summary Form. Please do this asap.

There will not be a Plant Board display for CAPS. However, John will give a CAPS update presentation at the National Plant Board Meeting. John will reiterate the changes that have been made in the Guidelines for 2013, the funding message, and the status of CAPS using IPHIS.

The next NCC call will be on Thursday, August 9, 2012, at 11:00 am eastern time.