

2014

**National Cooperative
Agricultural Pest Survey
Program**



MINUTES OF THE NATIONAL CAPS COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING

**Division of Plant Industry, Florida Dept. of
Agriculture & Consumer Services**

Gainesville, Florida

January 28 - 29, 2014



Annual National CAPS Committee Meeting
January 28 – 29, 2014
Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services
Division of Plant Industry
Gainesville, Florida
Minutes



Participants

John Bowers	Joe Collins	Sherry Aultman	Umesh Kodira
Brian Kopper	Julie Van Meter	Laurinda Ramonda	
Rick Zink	Brad Lewis	John Kaltenbach*	
Terry Bourgoin	Carol Motloch	Lisa Jackson	
Joel Bard	Lisa Ishibashi	Melinda Sullivan	
Piera Siegert	Saul Vaiciunas	Kristian Rondeau	

* for Helmuth Rogg

State Welcome

Paul Hornby, the PPQ State Plant Health Director for Florida, and Wayne Dixon, Assistant Director, Division of Plant Industry, Florida Dept. of Agriculture & Consumer Services, welcomed the National CAPS Committee to Gainesville, and provided an introduction and historical perspective to Florida CAPS and Pest Detection efforts in the state. Due to its location, Florida is a high-risk state for exotic pests entering the United States via Caribbean pathways and faces many unique challenges. The location of the annual NCC meeting is designed to highlight the safeguarding continuum, for which Florida is one of the main states on the forefront of our battle with exotic pests. Florida's unique position was recognized and appreciated by the NCC. The NCC also would like to thank the Division of Plant Industry for graciously agreeing to host the meeting.

NCC Bylaws

Last year the NCC Bylaws were updated to reflect the reorganization of PPQ and the merger of the Eastern and Western Regions into one Field Operations. We also added the role of a Farm Bill member as a permanent member of the NCC. The Farm Bill Management Team (FBMT) was asked to choose a member. This is still under discussion. The FBMT is considering having a member from one of the three Core Functional Areas (CFA) serve on a one or two year rotation, then followed by a member from a different CFA whether formally or informally.

The group decided that the bylaws do not need further updating for 2015.

NCC Representative Terms

The NCC discussed the three year membership term, and that members are eligible to serve two consecutive terms. The pros and cons of the current term length were discussed, along with 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.



possibility of a longer term and other options. Also was discussed was where the current members are in the current terms. Those rotating off the NCC were encouraged to discuss with their constituency the value of participating on the NCC.

Action: Special Topics NCC call to discuss term length and explore other options.

Who: NCC.

When: June 2014.

Program Performance Measures and Statistics

John Bowers presented an array of measures and figures detailing and summarizing the Pest Detection and CAPS Program. The presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website at: http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/webfm_send/2304.

Strategic Plan

The Pest Detection/CAPS program is embarking on a journey to develop a strategic plan for 2015-2020. We really need to focus on what the Pest Detection/CAPS program looks like in 2020, and outline steps to get there. The goal is to have a draft document ready for the CAPS community to review and discuss at the National CAPS meeting in December. Thus, starting with this NCC meeting, we will devote 2014 to developing the plan.

To develop the plan, we will use the same process that PPQ uses for other programs. The Pest Detection Management Team (PDMT) will meet with Jane Berkow and Christina Lohs in late February to learn about the process and how best to proceed. PPQ management and the National Plant Board will likely need to be kept abreast of the development of the plan, especially if major changes to the program are suggested.

What is CAPS?

Defining exactly what is CAPS will form the basis of our strategic planning exercise. Still, CAPS means different things, and depends on who you talk to. To some, it is wholly and only a state program, and does not include PPQ. To others, it encompasses all cooperative agreements, because more and more, survey is done the “CAPS way.” What is CAPS role in Farm Bill surveys? Does CAPS support export and developing new markets? We all need to be on the same page as it is important for national coordination and oversight of program direction, activities, and funding, as well as messaging about methodology and data entry.

To date, the good news is that communication is increasing between the Pest Detection/CAPS and Farm Bill Management Teams, and that CAPS, Farm Bill surveys, and PPQ Pest Detection surveys are now utilizing the Survey Summary Form on the CAPS R&C website. This now starts to give CAPS management an overview of the surveys being planned. The bad news is the CAPS management still does not have complete insight or oversight into PPQ Pest Detection surveys and the cost of these surveys.



John Bowers presented an outline of a proposed new Pest Detection structure that encompasses all Pest Detection work and Farm Bill surveys. The proposed structure brings different processes into a single process for PPQ and state cooperators for both Pest Detection-funded and Farm Bill-funded surveys for national priority pests.

Action: Write up proposal on new Pest Detection structure and share with NCC.

Who: PDMT

When: March/April

Action: Develop a definition and structure of what the Pest Detection program is (and what it isn't), and present this definition and structure to the PPQ Management Team and National Plant Board (NPB) Board of Directors.

Who: PDMT

When: late summer/early fall

There was some discussion about splitting some surveys away to Farm Bill. If the majority of a state's surveys are more in line with Farm Bill surveys (specialty crops, for example), there is a fear that the state could lose its Pest Detection funding for Infrastructure. The Farm Bill process is considered somewhat "competitive." In other words, funds are not guaranteed unless they can be carved out to cover some surveys and/or infrastructure. These details need to be worked out.

This led into a discussion on Infrastructure funding. The NCC discussed sending out a survey to the field to determine the minimum amount of funding needed for Infrastructure to fund the SSC position. The NCC could also try to determine the minimum amount of survey work that the SSC could support, and the cost of that work. For example, the program could develop a baseline amount needed to fund an SSC, and then use Cost of Living Allowance (CONUS COLA) to adjust for more expensive states. It also was pointed out that it is hard to accurately account for the percent time that PSSs and SSCs spend on Pest Detection/CAPS work, and that it varies from state to state. They work on pests from other line items as well, but the amounts of funding from other line items often fluctuate, get reduced, or disappear. Those funds cannot be relied on to fund the SSC position from year to year.

The discussion also touched on the need to determine the best return on our investment for the CAPS program. This applies to what we should fund in Infrastructure and Survey, as well as to linking these to performance measures and showing a return on our investment in terms of negative data. This should be part of our strategic plan, and we need to start working with economists in CPHST to flesh this out.

Pest Detection Line Item for FY14

Although a budget has been passed by Congress and signed by the President, the Program does not yet have a current allocation for Pest Detection, which is in a deficit situation awaiting resolution (as of the date of the meeting). It was not yet known what the final outcome would



be, and whether any increase in funding would be available for increases to cooperative agreements. If increases are available, the PDMT would like to increase cooperative agreements so that state personnel can travel to the National CAPS Meeting in December. The PDMT will keep the NCC updated.

Farm Bill

Kristian Rondeau gave an update on Farm Bill Section 10201. From 2009 through 2013, Farm Bill Section 10201 has funded over \$200 million in projects, with ~\$70 million going for Goal 1 Survey. For FY14, there were 472 suggestions requesting over \$88 million. Goal 1 Survey received 154 suggestions for ~\$24.5 million, yet only has an \$11 million budget. The FBMT intends to continue to coordinate with the CAPS Program for Goal 1 Survey direction and guidance.

In brief, there was a six-week open period using a new MetaStorm form to receive suggestions. Even with the government shutdown, the process overall was successful. At the time of the meeting, the suggestions were undergoing review by the goal teams. For FY14, there was a concerted effort to bring in more subject matter experts. SPHDs and SPROs also were asked to comment on suggestions from their state. Each team will rate their suggestions in Decision Lens based on alignment of the suggestion with the Farm Bill and the Goal guidance document posted on the APHIS Farm Bill website. The Decision Lens program assigns a value to each suggestion based on alignment with weighted criteria. The projects that are the best aligned are likely to receive funding, but the Decision Lens rating is only used as a guide and as another piece of information for the goal teams to use when developing their goal spending plan. Funds will be offered at the full requested rate or at a reduced rate. Each goal team is working on their draft spending plan. Spending plans are expected to be completed the first week of February. The final spending plan will be presented to the Deputy Administrator's office, APHIS administrator, the Undersecretary, and the USDA Secretary's office. In the past it has taken about a month to go through the approval process. Once approved, PPQ Field Operations (FO) will reach out to cooperators with approved projects and request work and financial plans. There are links to the survey work plan and budget template on the CAPS R&C site. The Survey Summary Form link will be re-opened once the final spending plan has been approved. National Operations Managers will not look at the work plans until the Survey Summary Form is filled out. An announcement will be made when the Survey Supply Ordering Database will be open to accept trap and lure orders for Farm Bill surveys. It could be as early as March when funds are released, but this is highly optimistic.

The FBMT is working to temporally align Farm Bill and Pest Detection/CAPS processes. The goal is to provide some stability for the timing of the suggestion period, as well as to have suggestions submitted earlier so that funded activities occur within the same calendar year. The FBMT has not yet decided when the FY15 Farm Bill guidelines will be published. A Farm Bill strategic planning meeting is scheduled, and if after that meeting it is determined that their



guidance documents will not change significantly, the Farm Bill and CAPS timelines for publishing guidance may be better aligned. This is a goal for future years.

The new Farm Bill will combine sections 10201 (the funding we have been using) and 10202 (which funds National Clean Plant Network) into a new section 10007 (ten, double 0, seven). Current projections for the combined funding level indicate an increase to \$62.5 million for 2014 through 2017, and up to \$75 million thereafter. The new Farm Bill also provides a permanent 'fix' to a technicality that was preventing the 2008 Farm Bill 10201 program and the National Clean Plant Network from releasing Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) cooperative funding because of a conflicting provision that had limited the use of CCC funding for technical assistance programs.

Other goals for the FBMt include developing a 5-year strategic plan and updating the Implementation Plan. The FBMt and the PDMT need to consider how to increase linkages between the Farm Bill and Pest Detection Programs and processes to maximize the return on available resources. This will require a concerted effort to describe how Farm Bill and Pest Detection/CAPS interact and determine the best ways to ensure coordination between the two Programs. For example, some surveys are funded by both Pest Detection and Farm Bill (e.g., EWB/BB, Cyst Nematodes, and Mollusks). What is the most effective and efficient way of funding these types of surveys?

2015 Guidelines

The NCC reviewed the 2014 Guidelines. Other than what is listed below and changes to the pest list, the NCC did not recommend any major changes to the 2015 Guidelines.

There was a request to provide more information relating to Continuing Resolutions and partial agreements.

[Action: Provide more detailed information on CR Partial Agreements.](#)

[Who: John/ Brian](#)

[When: 2015 Guidelines.](#)

The administrative requirements and data management sections need to be updated (using NAPIS for 2015). There is confusion over the August work plan due date. Brian should only receive work plans that have been reviewed and approved by the SPRO and SPHD. The SPHD's office needs to have an earlier due date of when work plans are due to their office.

There was discussion on the due date. There were suggestions that the due date be moved back into September or early fall. Many cooperators preparing the work plans are in the field during and leading up to the current August deadline. Moving the due date back would allow more time to prepare the work plans. The current dates were implemented based on the time it takes to process agreements, especially since we have so many work plans coming in at the same time.



The PDMT will review this and see if there can be some flexibility in the due date (also see Agreements below).

Action: Review the work plan due date, and in Appendix K, specify the date of when work plans are due to the Field Operations hub (should be uploaded to SharePoint site).

Who: John/ Brian.

When: 2015 Guidelines.

The states would like to receive a note from Brian that their work plans have been reviewed and approved pending funding. An alternative was to add timeframe information to the guidelines (any suggested changes will be received by a particular date) or correspondence (if you haven't heard from me by X date, everything is OK).

Action: Send out form email to each state after work plan has been approved or change guidelines to reflect timeframe for sending corrections/changes.

Who: Brian.

When: After work plans are approved or 2015 Guidelines.

Helmuth Rogg offered to update the work plan/budget template. There appears to be difficult tabbing, inconsistent lettering, numbering, etc. Some suggested that there also are issues with Helmuth's template as well (incomplete boxes, etc.). Helmuth should send template to John for review and comparison. Much of what is in the current template is there at the advice of the Agreements Service Center because it is required by regulations.

Action: Send work plan and budget template to John.

Who: Helmuth

When: 2015 Guidelines

A draft copy of the 2015 Guidelines, including appendices, will be posted on the CAPS R&C site for the NCC to review before they are finalized. The web page will be restricted to the NCC during the review process until the 2015 Guidelines are finalized. Once ready, the page will be opened to the CAPS community and considered published on that day. The goal is to have the 2015 Guidelines published in mid-April.

Action: Edit, review, and finalize the 2015 National Survey Guidelines

Who: PDMT and NCC

When: Published mid-April

Agreements

The NCC discussed the pros and cons of the current agreements schedule and other timelines, agreement extensions, etc. Starting all agreements within a consistent time frame was discussed, as was as a tiered approach, e.g., southern states starting January 1st; northern states starting



March 1st. Discussed also was the need to synchronize the Pest Detection and Farm Bill agreements cycles. Pre-award letters and their function were discussed. Some states cannot start work until they have funds in hand; thus, pre-awards letters are not useful. Other states can use pre-award letters to initiate work. Additionally, there was discussion on the de-obligation of funds in an agreement.

The NCC did not come to consensus on these topics, but provided the PDMT a series of topics that need to be explored and incorporated into the discussion of the 2015 Guidelines and strategic plan. Resolution is needed, but it will take time to sort out all the nuances and come to a mutual agreement with all the states.

Action: The PDMT will review the agreements section of the Guidelines, and provide explanation and clarity as needed for 2015.

Who: PDMT

When: 2015 Guidelines

The PPQ Professional Development Center is organizing trainings related to Best Practices for Agreements. All should be encouraged to participate as much as possible.

NAPIS Data Entry

The NCC discussed the different surveys that are conducted via CAPS, PPQ, and Farm Bill, and the expectations for data entry. For 2015, data from Pest Detection and Farm Bill-funded surveys, with some other program exceptions, are to be entered into NAPIS. Summary data from PPQ Pest Detection-funded surveys should be prepared and shared with the state SSC as in the past. Currently, IPHIS does not support the Pest Detection Program. Therefore, the PDMT cannot support the use of IPHIS. If PPQ uses IPHIS for survey management purposes, the results of that survey must be prepared and shared with the state. Although this situation results in extra data preparation (e.g., data templates and required fields are different), it is necessary in order for all Pest Detection data to be in one location for effective and efficient management and reporting of Program activities and results.

Also, the data templates in IPHIS are not up to date with the current CAPS Approved Methods, and there are problems with the CAPS community being able to access information in IPHIS. For example, SPHDs cannot access state data from their own states. Much work would be required for the Pest Detection program to use IPHIS in a meaningful manner, and the resources may not be available to support that work.

Action: Bring this issue up on the Inter-SPHD call, that SPHDs, trading partners, and state cooperators cannot see data in IPHIS.

Who: Joel and Terry.

When: February/ March Inter-SPHD Call.



Survey Summary Form/Accountability Report

Presently, the Accountability Report draws on NAPIS data based on observation dates in a calendar year, and is based on the information entered in the Survey Summary Form for that year. The Survey Summary Form lists what states plan to do. If things change over the course of the year, and surveys cannot be completed, one survey is exchanged for another, or the survey observation dates extend into the next calendar year, then the Accountability Report is not accurate and is misleading. The question is how do we track changes that occur after work has started? What is the best method to go back and update the Survey Summary Form? We presently do not have a process to do this. The final accomplishment report contains this information, but that is time consuming and laborious to tease this information out for each state. Brian is notified via email of changes for the agreement file, but this often is not reflected in the Survey Summary Form. This is perceived as missing data in the Accountability Report. There should be a process for this situation. It will help the PDMT to be more accurate in reporting program progress to have ready information about the programs accomplishments and not just the survey goals for each season.

Action: Follow-up with Purdue to examine possibilities

Who: John

When: Summer 2014

Pest Prioritization Model Revision Project

Alison Neeley's presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website at: http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/webfm_send/2323.

At the request of the PDMT, CPHST is overhauling the model and process for producing a ranked list of pests. Alison Neeley and Trang Vo are leading the project. The present model is referred to as the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), and the resulting ranked list of pests the AHP Prioritized list. A new model will be based on different, more relevant criteria. A synopsis of Alison's presentation follows.

There are several disadvantages to using the AHP model for prioritizing CAPS pests including:

- Results often seem to depend on analyst/expert
- Comparison between pest groups is often suspect (e.g. Lepidoptera tend to always rate high, pathogens tend to rate low)
- Consequences of introduction (economic/ environmental impacts) are treated as an independent criterion, but are, in fact, are a *function* of the biology of a pest, so are completely *dependent* on the other criteria.
- No way to look at regional differences of pest risk
- Analysis based on scientific criteria is not separated from criteria based on policy
- Difficult/impossible to validate



For these reasons, it was decided to use a different model to prioritize plant pests. The new model is a predictive model based on PPQ's weed risk assessment model. This improves on the AHP in that it:

- Relates analysis of pest biology to potential economic and environmental consequences
- Minimizes expert bias
- Is appropriate for different pest types
- Can be tested and validated
- Separates analysis based on scientific information from that based on policy

We are building a model that predicts pest impact in the United States based on its biology and behavior outside of the United States. We started by identifying questions predictive of pest impact in the United States. We identified 100 non-native plant pests that have established in the United States. We are analyzing each of these pests using the questions that we developed by assessing the pest's known behavior in its native range. The results from this analysis will be compared to the observed impact in the United States for each pest to determine the predictive power of each question. In the final model, questions will be weighted based on their predictive power; questions with no predictive power will be removed. We will rank pests based on their likelihood of becoming a major/high impact pest in the United States. This year, the focus is on developing models for arthropods and pathogens. Next year, we hope to statistically validate the model and develop additional models for mollusks and nematodes.

2013 Accomplishments:

- Identified 100 arthropods to analyze for developing the model
- Finalized the set of initial questions for arthropod model
- Developed detail guidance for answering model questions in order to ensure consistency in answering questions
- Analyzed & reviewed just over 50 arthropods
- Developed work plan and position descriptions for research assistant (biological science technician equivalent) and statistician (research associate)
- Hired research assistant to begin organizing pest reports and data
- Advertised for statistician and selected candidates (interviews will begin as soon as NC State approves choices)

2016 and 2018 Prioritized Pest Lists

Lisa Jackson's presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website at: http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/webfm_send/2320.

CPHST will continue using the Pre- and Post-assessments with the new model criteria to develop the 2016 Prioritized Pest List. The Prioritized list is only updated every 2 years, and since the new model likely will not be completed by next year at this time (in time for the 2016 Guidelines), we will use the AHP process for 2016 if necessary. Since we will have new model questions, we will need to re-analyze our current pests. Using the developed questions, we will



only assess arthropods, plant pathogens, and nematodes. Analysis of weeds and mollusks requires a separate list of questions. We will roll over the current weeds and mollusks from the 2014 list into the 2016 list until they can be properly analyzed in the new model.

CPHST will also analyze pest suggestions from the CAPS community, recommendations from the New Pest Advisory Group, and the A List of pests from the 2012 Prioritized Offshore Pest List (OPIS List).

In August 2013, Melinda Sullivan and Lisa Jackson were asked to participate in the new PestLens online tracking database. PestLens is the merger of Exotic Pest Information Collection and Analysis (EPICA) and the Offshore Pest Information System (OPIS). PestLens sends out weekly emails with information on plant pests of U.S. quarantine significance. In the tracking database, leaders representing key PPQ groups review every new PestLens article and determine what, if any, safeguarding actions should be taken by respective groups. From August through December 2013 CPHST analyzed 40 pests; they will evaluate 14 of these for the 2016 Prioritized Pest List.

In summary, for the 2016 Pest List, CPHST received 34 suggested pests to be evaluated through the model: 8 from NPAG, 9 from the CAPS community, and 14 from PestLens. There are an additional 54 OPIS A pests to review. Due to the large number of pests requiring analysis for 2016, there will not be an open call period to the CAPS community as in previous years. In the future, there will be a formal request process.

Due to data security reasons, only individuals with a valid USDA or DHS e-mail address can get access to the PestLens web site. Those with both a USDA or DHS e-mail address and a GPDD or OPIS account can use those credentials to access PestLens.

In 2018, CPHST will analyze pests from the Additional Pests of Concern List that fell below the cutoff point when the list's size was reduced in 2010.

CPHST needs to ensure that all scientific names, synonyms, and common names exactly match those used in the Guidelines, Survey Summary Form, CAPS Approved Methods, and NAPIS Dictionary.

Action: [Ensure that all names match exactly](#)

Who: [Lisa/Melinda/Susan](#)

When: [2015 Guidelines](#).

The NCC discussed whether all new pest suggestions should be run through the new Pest Prioritization model. A discussion point was whether highly host-specific pests should be incorporated into a commodity survey, as has occurred in the past, rather than undergo analysis in the Pest Prioritization model. The NCC decided that all new exotic pest suggestions should be



run through the new Pest Prioritization model. However, pests of limited distribution and of high impact/ importance (for instance, NPAG suggestions), will be run through the Pre- and Post-assessment filters. If the pest passes both and fits into an existing commodity manual, it would be added to the manual in the next survey season.

Action: CAPS will have the same AHP list in the 2015 Guidelines as in the 2014.

Who: John.

When: 2015 Guidelines.

Action: When we announce the new prioritized list using the new model, we will need to develop a new name for the list (not the AHP anymore).

Who: NCC

When: 2016 Guidelines.

Another point of discussion was when pests should be removed from the list. There is a very detailed process for how pests are added to the list, but no criteria or process in place for removing a pest from the list. Some examples of this are PPQ program pests, pests that have a certain amount of positive records, or pests that states indicate are established. If these situations arise, what is the threshold for removing them? Should program pests remain on the Priority Pest List or should states wishing to survey for these pests bundle them into commodity surveys? A pest on the Priority Pest List requires updates to datasheets and methods to stay harmonized with the programs, and in some cases, the effort to maintain these pests on the Priority Pest List may no longer be warranted.

Additionally, we need to evaluate pests on the Priority Pest List for which no surveys have occurred in recent years. The reason that surveys have not been conducted should be determined, and dependent on the outcome, some criteria should be developed to remove these pests from the Priority Pest List.

Action: Develop criteria for removing pests from the Priority Pest List.

Who: NCC

When: Spring/Summer 2014

Action: Determine the reason that there are no surveys for some pests on the Priority Pest List. These pests should be re-evaluated and considered for removal if appropriate.

Who: CPHST

When: August 1, 2014

Tropical Pest List

The NCC discussed the possibility of having a separate Tropical Pest List. As CPHST evaluates new pests, they find some that are very specific to tropical crops. These may be significant pests to the crop but may not rank high in the model. We discussed whether to analyze these pests



with the new pest prioritization model or simply direct them to a separate list. We decided that it would be best to analyze these pests with the pest prioritization model as in the new model, the pest's impact is scored separately from the pest's host and geographic range. This allows identification of pests significant to tropical crops.

Pests that rank highly in the impact section of the new model can be placed on a separate list used by tropical states. This will be a short list of only high impact pests (~10). These pests will be considered Priority Pests, and CPHST will develop approved methods and datasheets for these pests.

Action: CPHST will reach out to the tropical states and territories to ask for potential pests to evaluate.

Who: CPHST

When: Spring/Summer 2014.

Action: For the 2016 Guidelines, CPHST will develop a Tropical Pest List of no more than 10 pests that have ranked highly in the new pest prioritization model.

Who: CPHST.

When: March 1, 2015.

Commodity Pest Updates

- 2014 Asian Defoliator
 - Added: Casuarina tussock moth (*Lymantria xyliana*) – CPHST Otis suggestion
- 2014 Exotic Woodborer/Bark Beetle
 - Removed: Red haired pine bark beetle (*Hylurgus ligniperda*) (deregulated)
 - Changed common name of *Trichoferus campestris* from Chinese longhorned beetle to Velvet longhorned beetle – CPHST Otis suggestion (more specificity was needed; there are a lot of “Chinese longhorned beetles”)
 - Added Black fir sawyer (*Monochamus urussovii*) datasheet (new 2014 AHP pests) – Listed under ‘Datasheets for Pests for Reference Only (no negative data reporting). The lure was thought to be available but is not at this time. CPHST Otis is doing research on this one as well.
- 2014 Grape
 - Added Honeydew moth (*Cryptoblabes gnidiella*), Flavescence dorée phytoplasma (*Ca. Phytoplasma vitis*), rotbrenner (*Pseudopezicula tracheiphila*) (new 2014 AHP pests)
 - Added updated pest datasheet for Australian grapevine yellows (*Ca. Phytoplasma australiense*)
- 2014 Pine
 - Added Pine sawfly (*Diprion pini*) datasheet. An attractant is now available.
 - Added Pine witches’ broom (*Ca. Phytoplasma pini*) (2014 AHP Pest).
- 2014 Soybean



- Updated Golden twin spot moth (*Chrysodeixis chalcites*) and Giant African snail (*Lissachatina fulica*) datasheets, updated the host range and distribution sections for many pests.
- 2014 Stone Fruit
 - Added *Monilinia fructigena* (Brown rot) (2014 AHP pest)
 - Updated *Monilia polystroma* (Asiatic brown rot) and *Ca. Phytoplasma mali* datasheet (apple proliferation) -find in Canada was not apple proliferation.
 - Deleted pest datasheet for Australian grapevine yellows (*Ca. Phytoplasma australiense*) – recent evidence shows find in peach was a misidentification

Weeds

Melinda Sullivan's presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website at: http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/webfm_send/2322.

The NCC discussed whether CAPS should be surveying for weeds/parasitic plants. Congress eliminated the specific line-item that funds Federal Noxious weeds. The discussion centered on whether weeds are appropriate targets among the many types of pests available to survey especially in the face of budget reductions. The NCC supported survey for weeds and noted that only a few weeds have been available for survey via CAPS.

The current process for pest prioritization is not compatible with weeds. Four of the six pre-assessment questions are not applicable or difficult to answer for weeds, particularly rangeland weeds that are not associated with a specific commodity/host. Melinda described CPHST PERAL Lab's Weed Risk Assessment. This is the assessment upon which the new pest prioritization questionnaire will be based. Melinda proposed utilizing this system (with some modification) to prioritize weeds for CAPS. The proposal was supported by the NCC.

Action: Melinda will work with Tony Koop (CPHST PERAL) to start working on weed prioritization

Who: Melinda.

When: 2016 Guidelines

Phytoplasmas

Phytoplasma identification is difficult. The diagnostic screening process involves phloem extractions and nested PCR. These assays are very prone to contamination. Confirmation of species, group, subgroup and the interpretation of results also is difficult.

CPHST has agreements in place to provide phytoplasma screening services. Clemson, Texas A&M, and PPQ plant pathology domestic identifiers Craig Webb and Grace O'Keefe all have had training from Phytoplasma expert Dr. Robert Davis (ARS) and CPHST Beltsville lab.



A real-time (qPCR) method for screening should be ready to roll-out to NPDN labs and State Departments of Agriculture soon. The diagnostic currently is being tested with real-world samples. More samples are needed to be thorough.

Agreements are also in place for confirmations to species, group, and subgroup level. In cooperation with CPHST Beltsville, Dr. Robert Davis (ARS) (all non-palm samples) and Nigel Harrison (University of Florida) (palm samples) are able to perform confirmations.

Most Farm Bill proposals indicated that they were planning to process phytoplasma samples in-house rather than utilizing these services per CAPS Approved Methods. States with phytoplasmas in their surveys need to utilize the trained screeners mentioned above instead of in-house screening. See Document: [Phytoplasma sample submission for Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey \(CAPS\) Program and Farm Bill Goal 1 surveys FY 2014](#) for more details.

Action: Mention phytoplasma diagnostic service and need for samples on next PSS call.

Who: CPHST.

When: next PSS Call.

Manuals

Melinda Sullivan's presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website at: http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/webfm_send/2321.

Commodity and taxon-based manuals have been offered as large PDF files in the past. There also were two different manuals: the Reference manual, a collection of pest datasheets, and the Guideline document that contained survey information. There were issues identified with this format: manuals are large, take a long time to download; Guideline documents are too complicated, and are difficult and cumbersome for CPHST to update. In 2013, we started offering manuals in a new format. We now offer each manual as a standalone Introduction and link to individual pest datasheets. The Introduction contains general survey information and replaces the guideline document. Each datasheet is linked as a separate file. The new format will allow one datasheet for each pest (some appear in multiple commodity documents) that is linked where appropriate. Therefore the update process will be more streamlined as only one datasheet will require modification.

To date, we have offered Asian Defoliator, Exotic Wood Boring/Bark Beetle, and Palm in this new format. Solanaceous hosts (tomato, potato, eggplant, pepper, tobacco) manual will be in this format. All of the older manuals will be updated and offered in this format. The team will work on the older manuals in order of use/popularity of survey. Thus, we are starting with Grape and Stone Fruit.

For 2014, Palm was offered as a new survey. The Solanaceous survey should be posted very soon. For 2015, we are working on manuals for Cyst Nematodes and Mollusks. There are no



new targets in these updates. We are offering pest datasheets for all pests and introductions with survey information.

There was a request to create a table in each manual that shows the time of year to survey for each target. CPHST will look into this as time allows. Any other suggestions are welcome.

Action: Consider developing “time of year to survey” tables in the manuals.

Who: CPHST.

When: Ongoing.

New Commodity Manuals

The NCC discussed if there is interest in CPHST creating new manuals. Have we covered all of the important crops? Many states still do not feel like there are commodity surveys of relevance to their states.

There is a need to keep the number of pests offered reasonable, both to keep a national focus and so that CPHST can effectively support survey efforts for these pests. There are currently 145 Priority Pests (between the AHP list and the commodity manuals) that are supported by a team of four CPHST scientists. In order to focus on the most significant pests, we may need to reduce the number of pests in the existing commodity surveys and/or remove pests of low interest for survey. For future commodities, we should focus on five to eight important, exotic pests to those commodities.

Ideas for future commodity manuals:

- Dry beans/ Peas, Pulse Crops: we need a list of exotic pests.
- Orchards (apple, pear): we already have many of the important exotic pests on our AHP list or in other commodities.
- Small Fruit (blueberries, raspberries, strawberries, etc.): we need a list of exotic pests.
- Sorghum/Canola: we need a list of exotic pests.
- Sunflower oil: we need a list of exotic pests.
- Cucurbits (squash, pumpkin, cucumber, etc.): we need a list of exotic pests.
- Sugarcane: this can be taken care of by the Tropical Pest List.
- Small Vegetables (lettuce, etc.) – small farms/limited acreage
- Nut Trees

Action: Decide on manuals to be developed next.

Who: NCC.

When: Summer 2014.



Action: Once the NCC decides which new manuals should be developed, ask the CAPS community to submit important, exotic pests of these crops for CPHST to analyze.

Who: CAPS community.

When: Open period for one month.

High-Risk Pest Survey Gap Analysis

The PDMT asked whether or not the Program is surveying for the highest risk pests in the highest risk locations. In other words, are surveys for high risk pests random or patchwork across the country, or on target? CPHST will conduct a survey gap analysis to answer this question. If there are apparent gaps, surveys for high risk pests may become more prescriptive to ensure we are doing the best possible surveys. The results may impact our strategic plan.

Action: CPHST will conduct a Gap Analysis to determine if many high-risk pests are not being surveyed for in relevant states.

Who: CPHST

When: Spring/Summer 2014

Training for States Starting a New Survey

There was a request for webinars/ videos to assist states when they conduct a survey for the first time. The NCC discussed the idea of a more experienced PSS/ SSC providing informal training/ assistance to other states interested in the surveys. This could be conducted in small groups over the phone, with the experienced state offering guidance based on their experience

Action: PSSs could provide informal raining for starting a new survey

Who: PSSs/ SSCs who have experience with a particular survey.

When: As needed.

Demonstration of NAPIS 3.0

Susan Schechter's presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website at: http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/webfm_send/2324.

NAPIS 3.0 is a new version, built and coded on a new platform. A concerted effort has been made to keep aspects of NAPIS that are familiar to users, but at the same time, allows for the addition of new features, including:

- Excel upload files (data templates are linked from the CAPS site Data Entry menu).
- Single record entry creates a validated excel template with one row of coded data.
- New data elements (funding year, funding source, survey name) ensure that funding source will be correctly associated with survey results in the CAPS Accountability Report.
- Single login for NAPIS and CAPS R&C site.

The NCC can review NAPIS 3.0 at <http://napis-test.ceris.purdue.edu>.



Implementation Timeline:

- User acceptance testing in February 2014. Susan needs Beta testers now to test reports, maps and data entry (2013 or 2014 data).
- Training webinars will be scheduled in March 2014.
- Implementation: April 1st 2014.

Contact Susan directly to help with beta testing. Susan would like at least 6 people. She will work with you one-on-one. It would be nice to have at least one person from each plant board.

Consensus Data

Consensus data will roll over from year to year. There is a process to establish consensus data and a process to revoke consensus data (involves State Dept. of Ag., Extension service, etc.).

Action: Inform the CAPS community of when we will implement consensus data.

Who: John.

When: soon

Volunteer Working Group

The group is working with the Office of General Counsel (OGC) to determine if volunteers would be covered under Workman's Compensation, and the federal tort claims act. The group also is investigating other aspects of liability. Another area of emphasis is protecting the confidentiality of survey information. The group is working through these difficult issues and could use some help and/or perspective from those with experience in these areas.

There was some discussion regarding generation of negative data from volunteer surveys.

CAPS Recognition roll out

An email was sent through the NCC requesting nominations for CAPS Recognition. A subcommittee for reviewing the nominations was formed: Joel Bard (SPHD), Julie Van Meter (SPRO), Sherry Aultman (SSC), and Carol Motloch (PSS).

National CAPS Meeting Update & Planning

A National CAPS Meeting is being planned for December 9-11, 2014, in Albuquerque, NM. This will be a working meeting with three full days and no frills. There will not be a banquet, as in the past, and any registration costs will be minimal. The PDMT is working with PDC on meeting design and facilitation. There will be opportunities for peer breakout sessions as well as topic-orientated sessions. As a condition for supporting the meeting, the PPQ DA requested time for PPQ to meet. A corresponding time for the Plant Board to meet will be offered. The popular CAPS Fair will return. There are no other details yet, but logistic planning is progressing. The PDMT will be checking in April regarding planned attendance.



The NCC discussed possible agenda items, listed below, and was asked to discuss with their constituency what they would like or need to get out of the meeting. Suggestions, comments, and ideas are welcome.

Potential Agenda Topics for National CAPS Meeting

1. State CAPS Committee
 - How it works in each state.
 - Coordination (or lack of) between PPQ and the States.
 - Should be consistent across states.
2. Breakout Sessions/ Training Sessions
 - Phytoplasmas Workshop (Bob Davis—hands on)
 - Using Social Media
 - Agreements Training/ discussions
 - Audits: How do we claim reimbursements?
 - Outreach: people from Don't Move Firewood website
 - Panel of folks who review work plans: Top 10 things they do NOT want to see
 - Mark Hitchcox: ALB training
3. Talks for Whole Audience: need to be relevant to everyone
 - Alison Neeley: update on Pest Prioritization
 - Field case studies: novel ideas for survey
 - Farm Bill: innovative projects
 - Farm Bill Goal 1 survey/CAPS coordination – timelines, etc.
 - Tribal collaboration: success story (e.g., biocontrol)
 - Cerceris wasp
4. CAPS Fair
 - Joe Francese (CPHST): talk about new traps, hot melt traps, etc.
 - Julieta Brambila/ Kira Metz (Domestic ID)
 - Steve Passoa (Lep ID)
 - Folks want to see real specimens of targets

The PDMT also has received numerous other suggestions from the states forwarded up through the NCC. We appreciate and thank everyone for their interest and help.

After 2 full days, the meeting adjourned, and was followed by a tour of the facilities, biocontrol work, and the impressive insect collection at the DPI location in Gainesville. The NCC would like to thank to folks at FDACS, DPI for their offer to host the meeting and their gracious hospitality.



2015 Annual NCC Meeting

Thinking ahead to next year's meeting, the PDMT chooses locations to highlight the safeguarding continuum. Past meeting have been held at PPQ Hub offices, The National Detector Dog Training Center, the Miami Port Inspection Station, and the Texas State Plant Health Director's office. Please contact John or Brian if you would like to offer to host an NCC meeting at your facility in late January.