

**2013**

**National Cooperative  
Agricultural Pest Survey  
Program**



# **MINUTES OF THE NATIONAL CAPS COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING**

**Texas State Plant Health Director's Office  
Austin, Texas  
February 12 - 13, 2013**



Annual National CAPS Committee Meeting  
February 12 - 13, 2013  
Texas State Plant Health Director's Office  
Austin, TX  
Minutes



---

## Participants

John Bowers CAPS Policy Management	Joel Bard SPHD - AR	Avi Eitam PSS - OH	Laurinda Ramonda CPB SSC - KS
Brian Kopper CAPS Field Operations	Piera Siegert EPB SPRO - NH	Carol Motloch PSS - TX	Helmuth Rogg WPB SSC - OR
Rick Zink CAPS Science & Technology	Joe Collins SPB SPRO - KY	Saul Vaiciunas EPB SSC - NJ	Lisa Jackson CPHST CAPS Support
Terry Bourgoin SPHD - ME	Julie Van Meter CPB SPRO - NE	Sherry Aultman SPB SSC - SC	Melinda Sullivan CPHST CAPS Support

---

## PPQ Reorganization

PPQ has been reorganized into three Cross Functional Areas (CFAs) to provide efficiency to risk-based solutions for pest problems. The three CFAs are Field Operations (the Eastern and Western Regions have been combined into one administrative and functional unit), Policy Management (includes Plant Health Programs in Riverdale), and Science and Technology (includes the Center for Plant Health Science and Technology (CPHST)). Each CFA has an Associate Deputy Administrator and Executive Director. Organizational charts can be found on the CAPS Resource and Collaboration web site. For CAPS, the point of contact for each CFA is John Bowers for Policy Management, Brian Kopper for Field Operations, and Rick Zink for Science and Technology. These three are the core of the CAPS Management Team.

At the CAPS leadership level, this means that we have lost Kristian Rondeau as the Regional Program Manager for CAPS in the West. Kristian's main focus area now is Farm Bill. Kristian serves as a back-up to Brian, but is no longer involved in the day-to-day operations of CAPS. Matt Royer's former position, as Director of Pest Detection, will be filled soon.

Brian Kopper, John Bowers, and Rick Zink reviewed the organizational charts for their respective CFAs.

## Policy Management (PM)

Plant Health Programs and Emergency and Domestic Programs in Riverdale have been combined into one staff, Plant Health Programs (PHP). All domestic programs have been combined into two staffs, Pest Detection & Emergency Programs, and Pest Management. There has been a large reduction in PHP staff, and the long-term plan is that some of PHP's responsibilities may be supported by Science and Technology and Field Operations more so than at present.

---

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.



### Field Operations (FO)

Field Operations has undergone a great deal of change. The former Regions have been combined into one unit with hub offices in Raleigh and Ft. Collins. Eastern and Western Regions are no longer recognized as distinct working units. The group now has five Associate Executive Directors (two in Ft. Collins and three in Raleigh). Each Associate Executive Director covers a group of states as well as specific areas (e.g., SITC, imports, detection and response, etc.).

### Science and Technology (S&T)

The Science and Technology CFA includes CPHST and the National Clean Plant Network. The organizational structure within CPHST has remained mostly unchanged. The exception is that the former National Science Program Leaders are now Associate Directors. The labs and responsibilities of these directors have changed some, too. Russ Bulluck is now the Associate Director overseeing CPHST's support of the CAPS program.

### Cross Functional Working Groups

PPQ has instituted the cross functional working group concept for both long-term programs and short term projects. The idea is that each CFA will have representation as appropriate for the group. For CAPS and other pest programs, this group will be the management team. There is really no change here other than semantics as CAPS has practiced these concepts for at least the last 5-6 years. The Pest Detection Management Team is as defined in the NCC Bylaws. The CAPS program has been cited as exemplary in this regard.

### **NCC Bylaws**

It is a requirement that each cross functional working group have a charter to document their purpose and work. CAPS has the NCC Bylaws. The NCC Bylaws will be available to PPQ as our official charter.

The current NCC Bylaws list five permanent positions: Pest Detection Director, National Survey Coordinator, ER and WR Program Managers, and CPHST Representative. The remaining positions rotate on a staggered 3-year cycle: SPHDs (2), SPROs (4, one per each Plant Board Region), PSSs (2), and SSCs (4, one per each Plant Board Region). The Bylaws, however, are now out of date due to the recent PPQ reorganization, and need to be updated to reflect the new organizational structure. Most discussion revolved around the membership of the NCC going forward.

The group noted that each individual on the NCC brings a unique perspective (small state/ large state, new to CAPS/ experienced CAPS member, tech-savvy, research background, responsible for multiple states, different region of the United States, etc.). If the group goes any smaller, we lose some of those unique perspectives. We will not be able to officially choose one SPHD and PSS from each of the two regions. On the last PSS call, the PSSs supported unofficially keeping one representative from each region to represent the diverse views of the two regions. The NCC



agreed. For SPHDs, it does not need to be one from the East and one from the West. It is more important that the states are different. It may be best to align with the NPB regions across the SPHD and PSS positions as a practical course of action. The group decided that no two NCC rotational representatives (SPHDs, SPROs, PSSs or SSCs) can be from the same state. Selection of Plant Board representatives, SPROs and SSCs, will remain with the respective groups. Follow-up discussion will take place on the next NCC call.

**Action Item:** John and Brian will update the NCC Bylaws, and present them to the NCC for final approval. **Who:** NCC; **When:** Before publication of the 2014 Guidelines.

The group noted that having all members attend the annual NCC meeting may become cost-prohibitive in the future. The group meets 11 months out of 12 via teleconference, and thus, the real cost issue is the annual meeting. The group discussed the possibility of sending only one representative for each of the rotational positions or reducing the group year-round. The group was in consensus that the size of the group at present is ideal and critical to bring different perspectives to the discussion for a “national” program. In a worst case scenario, not all members may be able to attend an annual meeting, but all current positions should be held for year-round conference calls. The group decided that if John is told he is not able to send all members to next year’s meeting, the group will decide on which members to send.

**Action Item:** If all positions are not approved to travel to next year’s NCC annual meeting, the group will decide on a smaller subset of individuals from the full NCC to attend. **Who:** NCC; **When:** January 2014

### Farm Bill

The group discussed whether the NCC needs to have a devoted Farm Bill representative. It was noted that on most NCC and PSS calls, there is a discussion/ update on Farm Bill issues. CAPS and Farm Bill are linked in terms of survey (FB Goal 1 Survey), and it is difficult to determine where one starts and one ends, or if they are one and the same. Currently, it is the same people developing similar guidance for both programs, reviewing the suggestions and work plans for both programs, and the same state people conducting the surveys. It is really just a matter of the funding source.

**Action Item:** The NCC decided that there should be a permanent Farm Bill representative on the NCC since the surveys are explicitly linked. John will inquire and invite the Farm Bill Management Team to select a Farm Bill representative for membership on the NCC. **Who:** FB Team; **When:** As soon as possible (after the publication of the minutes)

### **Review of the 2012 NCC Meeting**

This was discussed briefly. There were a few action items, and all have been completed. See the minutes from last year’s meeting for reference.



## **CAPS Performance**

John presented CAPS performance statistics and data for the last couple of years. The presentation is posted on the CAPS R&C site. As a measure of performance, the program is able to only offer certain statistics based on surveys conducted in each state as documented on the Survey Summary Forms (J-3 appendix). These include the average number of surveys per state, the average number of pests per survey, the percent of target pests that are CAPS priority pests, average cost of a survey, etc. It was acknowledged that this is a very difficult task for program managers, and does it really capture how well the CAPS program is performing. Since we put a lot of emphasis on negative data for exotic pests, the CAPS program is looking for suggestions on how to make a negative (negative data) a positive in terms of performance.

**Action Item:** The NCC was encouraged to discuss this with their constituency and explore alternate ideas for measuring program performance. **Who:** NCC; **When:** Ongoing discussion.

## **CAPS Future Discussion**

The current challenge for the CAPS program is to determine the optimum allocation of the limited resources that will be economically efficient, effective, sustainable, and defensible in order to meet our core function and mission. The Pest Detection line item has been reduced in the President's FY13 budget, with more cuts possible depending on the adoption of a final budget. The federal government is currently under a continuing resolution with uncertainty with what will come after March 27. Sequestration (an across the board cut) will be enacted, but how it will impact agreements is not yet known. Once we have a firmer grasp of the economic outlook, we will know which path(s) we will want to explore.

## Funding Agreements

To address budget reductions, several ideas were discussed:

- 1) If cuts need to be at 10% level, make across the board cuts to all states.  
If cuts need to be above 10%, make the 10% across the board and base remaining cuts on tiered system (clusters based on risk).
- 2) Use state risk basis to determine amount each state should receive. There were concerns, however, that the state risk maps still needs work before it could be used. States are not isolated entities and most pests come from other states or land borders with Mexico/Canada. States should be involved and be asked what they perceive as their top risks.
- 3) Ask states, what are top three reasons for surveying (export, early detection, etc.)?

The group agreed that funding the SSC position is critical. It is a priority to keep all SSC positions funded across the states. The problem is that in some states, the perception is that all or most of the funding goes to infrastructure, with little survey. The group decided that in order for the positions to be preserved, we need to justify that the SSC does more than just Pest Detection work. In other words, what other work is the state able to do or respond to because of the infrastructure being in place? Outreach is a large component, as are Farm Bill and program pest



(e.g., EAB) surveys. The group discussed the idea of having SSCs record their amount of time that is spent on each of several areas. Potential categories could include: 1) Field work: performing surveys, 2) Survey planning, 3) Data entry, etc. Several states already have to do this.

**Action item:** Laurinda and Piera already do this and have offered to share the current categories that they are using. **Who:** Laurinda and Piera; **When:** July 1, 2013

**Action item:** For this meeting next year, have a plan to present on this topic. What should our approach be to reduce infrastructure and survey cost that is in line with the agency's risk-based goals? **Who:** NCC; **When:** January 1, 2014

### **Farm Bill Update**

The Farm Bill Review Teams received over 530 suggestions via Metastorm to review and evaluate. The suggestions were reviewed by the individual goal teams and numerically ranked using Decision Lens. A draft spending plan was sent to the PPQ Deputy Administrator's office and the APHIS Administrator's office. The plan is approved at the APHIS level and is currently at the Under Secretary level. There will be official press releases when the spending plan is fully approved. We need to view March 27 as the deadline for getting as much of the funds obligated as possible. If we do not obligate the funds by this date, we may not have the authority to do so later. PPQ's current authority ends with the Continuing Resolution on March 27.

For the 25 Clearinghouse States that require a Single Point of Contact (SPOC) review, the SPHDs and SPROs need to work on the SPOC process to expedite the agreement process.

There are several approaches for renewing agreements:

- 1) Overlap agreements, but billing and objectives must be kept separate.
- 2) Choose a later effective start date (e.g., July 1, 2013).
- 3) If funds have been spent and accomplishments have been completed on the 2012 project, close out the project and start a new one.

### **2014 Guidelines**

The group discussed how some surveys are moving over to Farm Bill funding, and were listed as such in the 2013 CAPS Guidelines and in the Farm Bill Additional Guidance document. The group discussed possible surveys that could be funded by Farm Bill.

**Action Item:** Add Farm Bill surveys and accompanying pest list to the 2014 Guidelines in **Appendix G-1 Priority Pest List – Commodity and Taxonomic Surveys**. List the CAPS Commodities first in a section. List the Farm Bill surveys (Asian Defoliator, Grape, Palm, Solanaceous, and Stone Fruit) in a separate section within the same document. **Who:** CPHST; **When:** April 1, 2013



**Action Item:** For FY2014, the CAPS team will meet with the Farm Bill team to determine which surveys are more appropriate for Farm Bill funding in time for the CAPS 2015 Guidelines or FY14 Farm Bill, whichever comes first. **Who:** CAPS and Farm Bill Teams; **When:** before April 1, 2014.

We need to do a better job of reporting, especially the infrastructure agreements. A template for reporting Infrastructure agreements is included in the 2013 Guidelines, and is required for 2013 agreements, but the NCC would like to see it used for reporting on the 2012 agreements. This is a start, but perhaps more can be done. The group discussed the idea of having SSCs record their amount of time that is spent on each of several areas. Potential categories could include: 1) Field work: performing surveys, 2) Survey planning, 3) Data entry, 4) Outreach, etc. Several states already have to do this. SSCs would report out only on the time that is devoted to CAPS (e.g., if an SSC is paid with 80% CAPS funds, he/ she would report out on activities performed during 80% of his/her time). The purpose is to better document the return on the infrastructure investment that benefits the whole PPQ mission.

IPHis vs. NAPIS: The high level requirements for the CAPS program to use IPHis have been submitted to the IPHis team. There was some small scale IPHis pilot testing (CO, ID, ME) for some limited functionality. The testing was not meant to be a prelude to transitioning to IPHis as these tests in no way fully tested the IPHis system for use by CAPS. We will keep the same language in the 2014 Guidelines giving an October 1<sup>st</sup> decision deadline for data management in 2014. We likely will be using NAPIS for 2014.

The effect of sequestration and the uncertainty of the budget after the current CR expires at the end of March prevent the CAPS team from giving guidance on a state's budget for 2014 at this time. Language to that effect will be used in the 2014 Guidelines, and supplemented later when guidance and direction is given.

With the PPQ re-organization, all references to the "Regions" or any terms that are no longer in use need to be removed, and the current organization reflected in the 2014 Guidelines.

Other issues:

Theme Art: John is thinking about new theme art for CAPS. The NCC will accept submissions, but be aware that Joel Floyd has set a high bar.

Julie discussed the use of recipient vs. cooperator in the new cooperative agreements. CAPS is a cooperative program and cooperator should be used instead of recipient. Brian will look into it.

#### **AHP Prioritized Pest List Review – Lisa Jackson – CPHST**

Lisa Jackson presented information on the new procedure for how pests get on the CAPS Prioritized (AHP) Pest List. The Pest List Review was started in June of 2011 to address some concerns raised by the CAPS community and CPHST to review the process behind the AHP pest list. Five main questions were discussed in this group (John Bowers, Kristian Rondeau, Brian





Kopper, Rick Zink, Melinda Sullivan, Talitha Molet, Lisa Jackson, and adhoc members as needed), but most of the time concerned how pests get onto the prioritized list. The core group developed a new process for how pests get on the list: 1) a pre-assessment filter, 2) the AHP model, and 3) a post-assessment filter.

The pre-assessment filter addresses questions about the pest's pathway into the United States, pest status, damage, distribution, etc. This filter determines if the pest should even be considered as a CAPS pest. We used the Pre-assessment Process for all new CAPS pest suggestions for the 2014 list. Of the 29 pest suggestions for 2014, 19 passed the pre-assessment. Reasons that the remaining species did not pass the pre-assessment included: no demonstrated pathway of introduction, not enough info available on pest status, pest biology, or economic damage, and/or the pest was listed as non-reportable in AQAS database.

The post-assessment evaluates the survey and identification/diagnostic methodology currently available for a given pest. This assessment ensures that adequate survey and identification methods are in place before a pest is offered for survey. It also addresses whether or not the capacity and expertise to perform the identification or diagnostic currently is available. Pests will be excluded that do not have effective methods. These pests would not be listed in the final AHP list, but the pests would go to a research and development list for method improvement. We have a tentative 2014 pest list, but are currently conducting the post assessments. We anticipate completing the post-assessment process by the end of the March and for the new list to be available in the 2014 National Survey Guidelines.

The general process for how pests get on the list:

The AHP list is updated every two years.

- Year 1: Prioritization Process
  - Pre-assessments
  - Model
  - Post-assessments
- Year 2: Develop support products for new pests
  - Trap/lure procurement
  - Approved methods
  - Risk maps
  - Datasheets
  - Screening aids

**Action Item:** Post information on the new process (flowchart, example Pre- and Post-assessments, list of pests that were evaluated and their ultimate fate) on the CAPS website. **Who:** CPHST; **When:** July 2013





**Action Item:** Evaluate older, lower-ranking AHP pests currently on the Additional Pests of Concern list in the future. **Who:** CPHST; **When:** Long-term

**Alternate model for 2015/2016** – Alison Neeley – CPHST – via webinar

Alison Neeley presented information on a new pest prioritization model that is being developed to ultimately replace the AHP model. She discussed that the AHP model was started eight or nine years ago. At that time, the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) was one of the few published applications for making decisions (and ultimately a ranked list) based on qualitative or quantitative data. The disadvantages of using this type of model include: it is labor intensive and highly subjective; the criteria must be independent; it is not integrated with other PPQ risk assessment methods; and it is difficult to validate.

Currently Alison and Trang Vo, economists from the CPHST risk analysis laboratory, are in the process of developing a new model based on the PPQ Weed Model. Where the PPQ weed model is used to predict weed invasiveness, the new model for CAPS would be used to predict pest impact. A series of yes and no questions are currently being developed by groups of PERAL plant pathologists, entomologists, and botanists that may be useful to predict pest impact. These questions deal with pest biology, pathways, and host range. The questions will then be evaluated using statistical procedures to determine which questions are the best predictors of impact. Approximately 100 pests that are established in the United States have been selected for question testing and question validation to help us determine which questions predict impact.

The current plan is to deliver the first draft of the model by August 2013. The model would then undergo a validation process by the end of the year. This new model will likely be used to develop the 2016 CAPS Prioritized Pest List. This model will replace the AHP model step two described previously for developing a CAPS Prioritized pest list.

There was some discussion about how useful the climate data supplied separately would be without including host range. The climate layers that this model uses (precipitation bands, hardiness zones, and Köppen-Geiger climate classes) may be worth integrating into our current NAPFAST maps.

**Commodity Surveys and Other CPHST Updates** – Melinda Sullivan CPHST

CAPS Approved Methods: CPHST, Lisa Jackson and Melinda Sullivan, are continuing to update CAPS Approved Methods (CAM). This continues to be the best source for up-to-date information for approved survey and ID methods for CAPS pests. CAM allows us to make changes throughout the year and to communicate changes via the Forum (emails sent to all registered users). Even though it has capacity for real-time changes, CPHST does not expect surveyors to make method changes during a survey season. The changes go into effect the next year.



There was discussion about entering data into NAPIS once methods have been changed (especially for agreements that don't follow the calendar year). Lisa and Melinda were not aware of this issue. The group stated that if you call Kathy Handy or Susan Schechter they usually will be able to facilitate data entry for past years, depending on the circumstances. Melinda and Lisa are willing to assist if needed to help remedy a situation.

Survey Protocols: CPHST has worked with the CAPS community to develop two new survey protocols. 1) Lisa Jackson co-wrote a *Cerceris* wasp survey protocol with Nichole Carrier (PSS). *Cerceris* are ground-nesting wasps that capture beetles in the Family Buprestidae. This family of beetles causes severe damage and tree mortality. The protocol includes information on how to plan a survey, locate potential *Cerceris* nesting sites, record data, and preserve specimens. The protocol is available on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration site in the information sheet for some *Agrilus* spp. 2) Melinda developed a visual survey protocol for kiwi canker, an exotic bacterial disease of kiwi caused by *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *actinidiae* with California (CDFA and CA PSS Jack Qiu). The New Pest Advisory Group (NPAG) recommended an early detection survey for this pest in California (~99% of U.S. kiwi grown) due to newly found potential pathway (pollen).

Datasheets: CPHST developed 21 new pest datasheets (8 insects, 9 pathogens, and 4 nematodes) and revised 8 pest datasheets over the past year.

Manual Updates: For 2013, the only new manual/survey developed was the Asian Defoliator National Pathway-Based Survey. This survey is a taxon-based survey (Asian defoliating moths) and the first pathway-based survey developed by CPHST. For 2014, the Palm and Solanaceous host commodity-based survey manuals will be delivered. CPHST also is working on a manual for the cyst nematode taxon-based survey that will make the methodology realistic and more consistent. For 2014, a few changes to the pest lists of the commodity manuals are anticipated. *Lymantria xylna* is planned to be added to the Asian Defoliator due to a suggestion from the CPHST Otis laboratory. *Hylurgus ligniperda* (recently deregulated) will be removed from the Exotic Woodborer and Bark Beetle and the Pine reference. *Hylurgops palliatis* (present in four states) and *Sirex noctilio* (present in three states) also will be removed from the Pine reference. The pests that are being removed are still available to be bundled into surveys with priority Pests.

New Format: We are developing an introductory document for each survey that includes specific survey instructions and considerations. This document will replace the commodity-based Guideline document (more simple and streamlined). We also will post individual pest fact and data sheets instead of combining all of this information into a large PDF document. Asian Defoliator is the first manual developed in this format. It is available on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website and everything is printable. All new manuals will be developed in this new format, and all existing manuals will gradually be converted to this new format.

New Manual Delivery Options:



A. Flip PDF: This format is being offered as an alternative to the large PDF files while we are transitioning to the new manual format. Flip PDF enables large PDF manuals to be viewed like a book. You can flip the pages like a book using your mouse or use arrows to flip the manuals. It is the exact same content but enables a faster manual download and you don't have to scroll with your mouse. You can zoom in and out and all files are searchable by keyword. The 2012 Stone Fruit Commodity-based reference, the 2013 Pine Reference, and the 2012 EWB/BB National Guidelines are currently available as Flip PDFs. Flip PDFs require flash to be viewed and, therefore, are not viewable on most tablets. However, the new format described in the previous section (an Introduction document and free-standing datasheets) will be the preferred format going forward. New manuals will be delivered in this manner and Flip PDFs for new manuals will not be created.

B. Fact Sheet Manager (FSM) and CAPS Information Delivery (capsID): We have been working with Terrence Walter's Identification Technology Program (ITP) to develop a new web-based delivery option for the CAPS manuals and datasheets. This will allow Melinda and Lisa to input datasheet content, images, and introductory manual content into web templates, and ultimately update the manuals and datasheets in a much easier manner and much more quickly. The information is automatically fed into capsID, a new website for CAPS manuals and datasheets. The pages are dynamically generated and all updates and changes in FSM, when made live, are automatically viewable on capsID. The CAPS community will have access to all manuals, and the manuals will be available as an Introduction and individual pest datasheets.

**Fact Sheet Manager/caps ID – Terrence Walters – CPHST via webinar**

Terrence gave a demonstration of Fact Sheet Manager and caps ID, two web-based products currently in development by CPHST to support manual developers and the CAPS community. He showed the NCC how to create a pest datasheet within FSM and how to make it live and viewable in caps ID. capsID allows end-users to easily navigate to specific documents of interest and print only the pages that are needed. He illustrated some of the features of capsID including the image gallery (dynamically generated by the collection of images from all manuals and pest datasheets) and glossary features.

The CAPS community would like to wait to roll this out until it is completely ready to go for use (i.e., all datasheets and manuals are available on the site). They don't want to have to go to multiple sites to get their information.

The potential path forward was discussed, and Terrence proposed having a demonstration available in the summer (June?) for the NCC to review. The NCC would review the site navigation and features (beta testing) and send comments back to Terrence. Lisa and Melinda will wait for now and not put too much material into FSM.



Rick brought up some issues concerning the path forward and funding for this project. The NCC did not want too much time devoted, at least initially, to making the site too customizable, especially if funding is an issue.

After Terrence left the line, Julie asked about the possibility of being able to add a state logo or state contact information to the bottom of one of the datasheets. We also may need to add some legal language concerning credit and what can and what cannot be used for certain purposes.

**Action Item:** CPHST will conduct a funding analysis, and the NCC will be informed as to whether or not funds are available to support this project now and into the future.

**Who:** CPHST; **When:** Spring 2013

**Action Item:** If continued funding and support is available, Terrence will contact the NCC (summer 2013) when capsID is ready for beta-testing. Terrence will use the Asian Defoliator manual as a demo. He will provide a demo of the different sections and features of capsID on an NCC call. The NCC will provide feedback. **Who:** Terrence Walters; **When:** June 2013

#### **Additional Pests of Concern** – led by Lisa Jackson – CPHST

The NCC discussed the purpose of the Additional Pest of Concern list and if it is of any use to the states. This list has become a dumping ground for CAPS pests (e.g., when pests move off of the AHP, lower ranking AHP pests, etc.). Nothing ever seems to be deleted from the list; pests just keep being added. Some of the pests are now deregulated. It does not make sense to fund pests that are deregulated for survey. Lisa went through the list and determined where the pests had come from. The pests that were recommended by New Pest Advisory Group (NPAG) ranged from exotic, to a limited distributed, to widely distributed in the United States. The majority of the other pests on the list is still exotic, but just did not rank high enough on the AHP. We needed to put them somewhere as to not lose them.

#### **NCC Decisions:**

1. Remove the Additional Pest of Concern list (hereafter referred to as the List) from the National Guidelines and from the CAPS website. States are not using this list to plan surveys since there is no host information to inform them of which types of surveys in which to bundle the pests.
2. CPHST will keep an internal list of all of the exotic pests from the List. Over time, CPHST will run the pests through the pre-assessment process.
3. Those that make it through the pre-assessment should gradually be run through the AHP or replacement model (in groups of 10 or so during each new AHP cycle, based on priority).
4. The exotic pests also will be considered for any new commodity manuals.
5. Many of these pests are of specific concern to tropical regions and surveyed for by Hawaii and/or Puerto Rico. Brian will maintain a listing of these pests.



6. Pests on the List that are established in the United States will be treated as any other bundled pest. States may add them to surveys, but CPHST will not provide approved methods and survey supplies will not be offered in the Ordering Database (unless there is still a supply; check with John Crowe on a pest by pest basis).
7. If approved methods exist for pests on the List, they will no longer be maintained. Approved methods and datasheets will still be available via older Approved Methods pages (i.e., 2013 and before) and may be used as a resource. However, the States will be responsible for verifying that the information is up to date and looking for any improvements in survey or diagnostic methods.
8. Once the pest is no longer on a Priority List (Commodities or Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance (AHP)), the approved method restriction in NAPIS for data entry will be lifted. Lisa and Melinda will work with Susan to remove the approved methods limitation from these pests for negative data entry. For instance, if a pest falls off the Priority List for the 2014 survey season, approved methods will be in place through 2013. For 2014 data entry, states should evaluate if the approved method is still the best method. If it is, they should use it. Otherwise, they should choose the best method available. There will be no approved method for that pest when the State enters the 2014 data.

**Action Item:** The Additional Pests of Concern List will not be included in the 2014 Guidelines. **Who:** John; **When:** April 1, 2013

**Action Item:** Melinda and Lisa will remove any pests from the 2014 CAPS Approved Methods page that were listed on the Additional Pests of Concern List. **Who:** CPHST; **When:** April 1, 2013

**Action Item:** Melinda and Lisa will ask Susan to remove any data entry restrictions for the 2014 survey season for pests that were on the Additional Pests of Concern List and are not listed on either of the Priority Pest Lists. **Who:** CPHST; **When:** August 1, 2013

#### **NAPIS / CAPS R&C site / Pest Tracker – Susan Schechter – Purdue University**

Susan presented a general update on where they are with NAPIS, the CAPS R&C site, Pest Tracker, etc. We have come a long way in the past few years. The website has improved dramatically from the old static site to the new dynamic pages.

There is a Survey Summary Form (J-3 appendix) glitch concerning how to match survey data from the Form to the proper or specific survey in the Accountability Report. What is the best way to deal with this? Should a new comment or other field be added for data entry to account for the survey name? The NCC does not want to make it too much work for the community. How important is it to match these up? As an example, if a state is looking for *Helicoverpa armigera* in corn, soybean, and cotton, how do you match up the data with each survey? A Survey column could be added to denote which commodity the survey was being conducted in.



There was some discussion of trying to match it up by host but most felt that this would be too difficult and would get messy (e.g., a forest survey targeting multiple tree species).

**Action Item:** Kathy and Susan will develop a written proposal on what to do in this situation. The NCC will then reach out to their constituencies. **Who:** Kathy and Susan; **When:** June 1, 2013

CAPS'opedia: Content may need to be updated and/or reviewed. It has not been updated in a while.

Outreach library: The view will be updated to be more of a catalog format. There was some discussion about getting an email/note when something has been added to the outreach library or adding a “what’s new” box.

Pest Tracker: Reviewed site visits, etc.

NAPIS: The plan is to update NAPIS to an open-source platform. The current platform is getting expensive to maintain each year (licenses, etc.). Once implemented, only one password will be needed for the suite of sites Purdue offers: NAPIS and CAPS R&C sites. NAPIS on the new platform will retain familiarity and features, but should streamline reporting. It should have improved response time as well. The current plan for implementation is in late April. Susan needs volunteer testers.

**Action Item:** Sherry, Helmuth, and Laurinda tentatively volunteered to help with testing the new updated site. **Who:** Sherry, Helmuth, and Laurinda; **When:** Spring 2013

Data elements: Since the update is occurring, are there data fields that you would like to add for later retrieval? Now is the time to add it to NAPIS.

**Action Item:** The NCC should discuss with their constituents the need for additional data fields in NAPIS, and send the requests to Kathy for review. **Who:** NCC; **When:** June 1, 2013

### **TrapMan – Helmuth Rogg - Oregon**

Helmuth demonstrated an iPhone application, called TrapMan, which was developed in Oregon and is used for recording survey data in the field. It uses FileMaker Go to create a database of the information. Oregon is currently using barcodes to help keep track of traps (weather resistant). It utilizes many preloaded pull downs but data can be entered by hand as well. A scanner can be incorporated into an iPhone. Each trapper has a specific ID number. Each trapper can customize their pest list. The type of information that can be recorded includes: date, target, host (you can develop a preloaded host list for each target), type of survey (delimiting, detection, etc.), site info, notes, etc. For the site info, there is a GPS built in, there is a space for the latitude and longitude. You can also pull up a Google map and drop a pin at the location.





When you service the trap, you can scan the trap's barcode and this will pull up the info from the last visit. This makes it easier for a surveyor to fill in for another surveyor (can easily find the location). To set up a trap for the first time, it will only take 1-2 minutes to load the information. The PSS or SSC can enter all of the background information (pest, host info, dropdown choices) in the office before sending the surveyor to the field. This takes a few hours to perform. The high-end cost to develop this system is around \$10,000 (not including iPhones). Right now, OR is keeping the paperwork as a backup until they have full confidence in the system. They will then move away from paper copies. Web address for demo is:

<https://files.oda.state.or.us/Login/?trapMan/TrapMan.mov.zip/>

#### **IPHIS Update – Nancy Leathers – APHIS PPQ – Via Phone**

Phase One was awarded the new contract for IPHIS at the end of fiscal year 2012. They had a sixty day transition period to familiarize themselves with the system and code. The first priority is to stabilize the system and move to virtual servers at NITC. The second priority will be to synchronize data access issues (who can access what). After that, they will start to address bugs that have not yet been fixed and required enhancements. The contractors will work with APHIS to develop a list of what has and has not been resolved and start prioritization. However, the budget is an issue because certain funds are frozen.

A CAPS business analysis is planned. This will be conducted by an outside party and will look at what NAPIS currently does (data validation, information, templates, archival/data storage, pest lists, etc.). It will examine which features IPHIS can absorb and which features will never be able to be absorbed (pest information sheets, etc.). A gap analysis will follow. Field users (those closest to NAPIS) will likely be contacted. Nancy anticipates something will be completed by the summer (August) and that we will know by the end of the fiscal year (or before) if IPHIS can be used for CAPS in 2014.

PPQ and Phase One also are looking at the ALBES (ALB Eradication System) business requirements and what can be brought into IPHIS or otherwise absorbed by current functionality.

PPQ is looking at mobile electronic data collection issues and software application development that will enable data to go from the field to the database. In terms of mobile systems, PPQ is not looking at building mobile systems, but are looking at developing standards and protocols for states to develop their own data collection systems (e.g., TrapMan). A number of ideas for criteria have been offered, including anything that is not platform specific, app development, an off the shelf product, etc.

Nancy is attending a meeting to look at how other government agencies have handled mobile data collection and were successful. She anticipates that this may not completely translate to the CAPS program due to cooperative nature of the program (state people and the federal government).





Some questions from the NCC to Nancy involved how slow the system is and how it will handle more users when it is rolled out. Nancy thought that this would be resolved by stabilizing the system.

There also were questions concerning ad hoc reporting and how this was going to be made better. Nancy implied that these issues were on the list and would be addressed. First in country and first in state records also are a concern.

### **CAPS Recognition** – Chris Pierce –via phone and Julie Van Meter in person

There was discussion about the timing and frequency of awards. Should it be stand alone or tied into a meeting (National CAPS meeting, plant board meetings, etc.)? Should it be tied into existing PPQ awards? Should there be limitations on how often you can win?

Since a national CAPS meeting is not a guarantee and there are considerable changes to travel and budgets, the working group proposed a yearly set of awards. Although nominations may be submitted for each award each year, The NCC should not have to grant the award if the nominees do not meet the criteria or requirements. The NCC should have flexibility to not give an award.

Suggestions for awards:

1. Lifetime service award.
2. General “outstanding contribution to the CAPS community” (maximum of 3 per year). This would replace the awards for SPHDs, SPROs, SSCs, and PSSs. This would eliminate the problem of not getting a qualified applicant for each group. We don’t want to move through the pool of exceptional applicants too quickly.
3. Group award or cooperator award.
4. Committee award.
5. Special recognition award (someone not in the traditional fold – not a SPHD, SPRO, SSC, PSS).

The NCC will need to develop well defined criteria for the awards. Criteria should have a high bar. There is already some guidance in the white paper that Julie Van Meter and Chris Pierce developed. Julie and Chris are willing to work up some criteria. They may need help adding management activities that would more encompass the SPHD role (Joel and Terry to assist).

Information about awards should be put in Guidelines. Awards will continue to be the silver Pest Detection Coins. NCC members are not eligible to receive awards.

Suggested timeline: Make an announcement soon after January 1, 2014 for awards reflecting 2013 accomplishments (pest detection and CAPS activities only) with nominations due March 15<sup>th</sup>. Supplemental information could be requested. The award program should be announced in



the Guidelines (new appendix?). The NCC or a subgroup will review the nominations since they are not eligible.

**Action Item:** Develop policy and criteria for awards for 2014 Guidelines. **Who:** Julie, Chris, Joel, Terry; **When:** April 1, 2013?

**Action Item:** Develop guidance and nomination form for announcement. **Who:** Julie, Chris; **When:** December 1, 2013?

### **Volunteer Working Group – Avi Eitam**

The working group had some difficulties getting started and found it useful to create a charter to lend direction to the effort. The group decided to use Asian Longhorned Beetle (ALB) as the template for designing a volunteer survey. The group brought in different people as needed to work on survey design and sampling methodology.

They looked at how a CAPS volunteer detection survey would differ from both delimiting surveys and current volunteer surveys that do not report negative data. They had to develop the minimum criteria that they could use with any group of volunteers. There was some discussion about the statistical significance of surveys. This could be used but was thought to not be necessary for CAPS.

The thought was that if data is collected by volunteers versus trained CAPS people, you may see a lot of false positives (e.g., oviposition sites). They spent time discussing how much time that you need to look a tree (at minimum). Two minutes was decided at minimum with 10 trees being the minimum to examine. If the tree is large or frass and other symptoms were observed, then a longer period was recommended.

Using GPS coordinates or marking and providing a description of how to get there was suggested.

After concluding its work on survey design, the group put together the first draft of a document that includes also sections on general guidelines for use of volunteers; recruitment and retention; training; and reporting. These sections still require additional work.

John discussed that the group needs to regroup and discuss general guidelines that are applicable to all sorts of volunteer surveys. The survey details may change with every pest but we need to know the legal requirements (waiver forms, state and federal liability issues, how to share data, etc.). The validity of the data also needs to be addressed. How do you ensure that volunteers have been adequately trained? Helmuth mentioned that he has set up an ALB “training course” in Oregon. In Oregon, both volunteers and CAPS surveyors must pass the test before they are allowed to conduct surveys. We may need to have proficiency testing, simulations, and other methods for testing the volunteers’ skills. We need to have documentation that the volunteers



have been trained. The people part of the project still needs to be addressed. The group may need to reach out to new members who are familiar with the legal ramifications and address; can federal funds be used to cover volunteer expenses, who is liable if someone gets hurt, what if a volunteer damages the property, and other important questions.

### **ISPM 6 Standards Meeting in Korea – Brian Kopper**

Brian attended a meeting in Korea for the implementation of ISPM-6, the Guidelines for Surveillance. This meeting in particular dealt with FAO AAAPC, an Asian region. The group met to brainstorm how to implement ISPM-6. There was a huge knowledge gap identified. The group was split into three groups: operational guidance, technical guidance, and managerial guidance. Most people had expertise on operational guidance. Brian facilitated the group dealing with managerial guidance (how to convince people in higher levels than you are that your work needs to be funded). The groups successfully developed an outline or framework of what should be included in an implementation manual. The manual will be actually written by FAO and will be established by mid-2013.

### **Nursery Surveys – Lisa Jackson**

In recent years, at the end of the survey season, some states have asked Kathy and Susan to allow negative data entry for visual surveys in nurseries for pests that did not have visual as an approved method. John had heard from the states that nursery owners did not want traps hung in nurseries and surveyors felt like visual surveys were their only option. All of the PSSs and SSCs on the NCC said that they dealt with this issue by placing traps near the nurseries or on right-of-ways. Visual data is currently allowed if the approved method is visual. The NCC felt that visual data should be allowed as negative data only if it is listed as an approved method.

**Action Item:** It should be stated clearly in the 2014 Guidelines that nursery surveys must use the approved survey methods, just like any other survey. **Who:** CPHST/ John;  
**When:** April 1, 2013