



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

May 2, 2013

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Brad Lewis	Laurinda Ramonda	Joel Floyd
Terry Bourgoin	Avi Eitam	Helmuth Rogg	John Crowe
Joel Bard	Carol Motloch	Talitha Molet	
Piera Siergert	Saul Vaiciunas	Kathy Handy	
Joe Collins	Sherry Aultman	Eileen Luke	

Consensus Data

Consensus data will be discussed on the next NCC conference call. This will give everyone time to discuss the matter further. The original background document is attached at the end of these minutes.

2014 Guidelines

The 2014 Guidelines are almost ready for posting. John and Brian are currently working on finalizing the documents. John appreciates everyone's feedback and edits to the Guidelines. They are still working on the funding section. Once completed, John will post the finalized 2014 Guidelines. Sections may be posted beginning next week for the NCC, and once complete, published for the CAPS community.

FY13 Funding

The PPQ Fund Holders met about a week ago to discuss funding for the remainder of FY13. John and Brian are still sifting through the notes and figuring out what this means for the Pest Detection line item (which funds CAPS). As a result of different things (the reorganization, sequestration, budget reduction), the Pest Detection line item has a \$1.7 M deficit. John and Brian are determining how this will affect the CAPS program. If the deficit has to be made up largely through agreements, then the program is looking at a 20% reduction of agreements (infrastructure and survey) from FY12 levels. NCC members can tell constituents that there will be additional cuts made; however, the amount has not been determined. John and Brian will try and get the budget for FY13 worked out as quickly as possible. An announcement should be coming out by next week with more information.

Update: Decisions have been made on the funding of Pest Detection/CAPS agreements. All facets of the Pest Detection line were examined and where money could be saved in other areas, and arrived at the conclusion that all agreements, both infrastructure and survey, will be reduced by 7.8%. For example, an FY13 infrastructure agreement originally budgeted for \$72,610 is reduced by 7.8% to \$66,946. For the remainder of the year, states will have the reduced

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.



agreement amount minus what they received under the Continuing Resolution in the first half of the year. In the example above, the state received \$23,235 under the CR. This state now has $\$66,946 - \$23,235 = \$43,711$ for the remainder of FY13. Brian has sent more specific guidance to the SPHDs regarding the process to follow. State cooperators should hear from their SPHD soon. If you have any questions, please direct them to your SPHD, Brian, or myself. We are all going through difficult economic and financial times, but the CAPS community is resilient and we will work through this. - John

FY14 Budget

Only the President's budget has been released. It maintains FY13 levels for Pest Detection. This means that FY14 levels will be the same as (or less than) the reduced amount for FY13. The House and Senate have not addressed an FY14 budget yet. It likely will not include an increase in the Pest Detection line item. We will know more this summer.

Lure Procurement

If you are in need of lures, make sure you're working with your counterparts to ensure your state has what it needs. Otis currently is caught up on their lure requests.

Pacific Northwest Early Detection Network App

A new app called the "Pacific Northwest Early Detection Network" is now available for the iPhone and will soon be made available on Android phones. The app is targeted towards the general public, crop consultants, extension agents, etc., and can be used to report invasive species. The noxious weed list is currently uploaded, as well as eight insects. The app uses EDDMapS. Helmuth will send out more information when available.

NAPIS Conversion

The NAPIS conversion is going well. The group is working closely together to ensure that no major changes will need to be made. One of the benefits includes improving cost efficiency.

The next NCC call will be on Thursday, June 6, 2013, at 11:00 am eastern time.



Consensus Data in NAPIS

To enter consensus data into NAPIS, the State Plant Regulatory Official (SPRO) from the state department of agriculture or department of natural resources (or their representative), expert personnel from the state cooperative extension service, and the PPQ State Plant Health Director (SPHD) must concur that the subject pest/beneficial organism is present within a discrete set of spatial and temporal points. The State Survey Committee must be allowed to comment on the issue.

This represents a collective scientific opinion, general agreement, or consensus within the state that the organism is present, and therefore declares that there is no further need to conduct survey for the specified organism. This declaration also can be described as "common scientific knowledge." If a state chooses to reverse the "consensus determination," there must be the same concurrence of the expert personnel within the state, with a justification provided to the CAPS Management Team. Consensus can be used only for positive records.

Historically, the CAPS program has supported agricultural trade. Subsequently, the credibility of NAPIS depended on its ability to portray reality. Pest species which are widespread and may have impacted agricultural exports were to be represented across their range. There was no need to conduct survey for these species when it was generally known that they are present.

In the past, states entered consensus data into NAPIS for a particular year. Each year thereafter, upon agreement from the state, the user services specialist at Purdue would carry over that data to succeeding years. In early 2006 there was a change in personnel, and this process was interrupted. A few states (2 or 3) have continued to enter some consensus data yearly. The maps displayed in Pest Tracker (public interface for NAPIS) reflect consensus data. However, since the data is not automatically rolled over each year there is conflicting information displayed to the public and our trading partners giving the impression that the pest no longer exists in a county or state.

We are asking the NCC to reach out to their constituency to ask those states with recorded consensus data if they would prefer to have it automated each year. There would be a greatly improved IT process that would not be burdensome. Additionally, we welcome discussion or decisions regarding the entry of future consensus records.