



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

August 7, 2014

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Carol Motloch	Dan Mackesy
Brian Kopper	Sherry Aultman	Alison Neeley
Rick Zink	Adrian Barta*	Susan Schechter
Terry Bourgoin	Helmuth Rogg	Eileen Luke
Piera Siergert	Lisa Jackson	
Lisa Ishibashi	Kathy Handy	

* For Laurinda Ramonda

Budget (no change from previous month)

There are no current updates for the FY15 budget. While there is still some hope that an appropriations bill will be signed before the beginning of the fiscal year, the likely scenario will be that we will begin the year on a Continuing Resolution due to mid-term election activity. The FY15 CAPS budget will likely be the same as the FY14 CAPS budget. As individuals prepare their state work plans, they should plan using FY14 budget numbers.

Work & Financial Plans Due

Work and Financial plans are due to Field Operations by COB Friday, August 15. Please arrange for all internal state reviews to be completed by then since they have to be submitted to the FO SharePoint site by the SPHD office. Details are in the 2015 National Survey Guidelines on the CAPS R&C site.

Survey Summary Form

Remember to enter survey data into the Survey Summary Form as work plans are finalized in the state. Work plans will not be reviewed unless the Survey Summary Form is complete. Both the CAPS and PPQ Survey Summary Forms are open.

Accountability Report

When reviewing 2015 work plans, CAPS management will be looking at the CAPS Accountability Report for missing 2013 data. Everyone, with a few exceptions, should have all 2013 data entered into NAPIS. Work plan reviews will be delayed and continued funding questioned if data for target pests have not been entered. SPHDs have been notified by FO and SPROs notified at the National Plant Board meeting, but everyone should check to make sure all required data entry is complete for all target pests.

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.



Cooperative Agreement Seminar Series (see details following the minutes)

A seminar series is available to both PPQ and state cooperators. The series includes 13 modules covering various topics on the management of cooperative agreements. The live seminars have concluded, but the content and information is still available. Information on how to access the seminar series is included at the end of these minutes. Everyone who touches even a small part of a cooperative agreement or the cooperative agreement process is encouraged to take some time and go through the series.

Pest Prioritization Model Update

CPHST, PERAL currently is working on developing two models: one for arthropods and one for pathogens. Alison Neely presented an update.

For each model, we started by identifying questions that we think will be predictive of the impact an exotic organism is likely to cause in the United States based on the organism's biology, where it is likely to establish in the United States, and its behavior outside of the United States. We then identified plant pests (and pathogens), that have become established in the United States, but that are non-native to the United States. This past year we have been assessing each of these pests using the questions we developed. We will then compare the answers to these questions to the actual observed impact of the pests in the United States, in order to determine the predictive power of each question. In our final model, the questions that have the most predictive power will be weighted the most; questions with no predictive power will be removed from the model.

For the arthropod model, we have analyzed just over 100 pests using the questions that we developed, and are ready to start statically analyzing the questions. We are on track to complete the arthropod model by the end of the fiscal year. For the plant pathogen model, we have developed the initial set of questions, identified the pathogens we are going to use for developing the model, and started completing the assessments. We hope to be ready to start the statistical analysis phase by the end of the calendar year.

In 2015, we will start using the model to analyze the arthropods and pathogens on the current CAPS list as well as any organisms in the queue. We plan to have a final (revised) ranked list of arthropod pests by the beginning of summer, 2015 (end of May) and pathogens by the end of July, 2015. Pests will be ranked based on their likelihood of being a major/high impact pest in the United States; therefore, the arthropods and pathogens will be able to be compared to each other. In the second part of fiscal year 2015, we will complete the model for mollusks and will start statistically validating all models using a separate list of pests with observable impacts in the United States.

The prioritized pest list developed under the new model will not be available until after the 2016 Guidelines are published in April 2015. Therefore, the present AHP prioritized pest list will be used for the 2016 Guidelines. The new prioritized pest list will be unveiled in the 2017 Guidelines that will be published in April 2016.



If anyone has any questions, please feel free to contact Alison at Alison.D.Neeley@aphis.usda.gov

Commodity Surveys (continued discussion)

As mentioned in the minutes to the June NCC call, in order for new commodity surveys to be developed, the proposed survey will need a Champion. CPHST CAPS Support currently does not have enough resources to produce the commodity surveys without help from the field. The Champion will work with CPHST CAPS Support (Lisa, Melinda, Talitha, Dan) to scope out the survey.

To help everyone know what will be expected, Lisa has drawn up some draft guidelines. Please review these guidelines and provide us with some thoughts as this will be discussed at a CAPS / CPHST Support meeting in early September. We hope to finalize the guidelines and put them to the NCC for approval as soon as possible. Remember, the guidelines below are just a draft and can be modified.

Suggested criteria for a new survey manual

- There needs to be at least 6 (?) exotic pests in the manual. In developing an appropriate pest list, the pests should be exotic to the United States or of limited distribution.
- There needs to be at least 5 (?) states who would participate in the survey. There needs to be enough interest in the survey, not only in their state, but other states as well in order to justify the time and resources spent on developing the documentation, datasheets, approved methods, etc.

Suggested responsibilities of the “Champion”

- Reach out to all other states for their interest in the survey (through PSS, SSCs, SPHDs, and SPROs). Provide us with a list of states that would be interested in participating. A commitment would be even better. Check NASS data and reach out specifically to states with highest acreage as a way to gain interest.
- Reach out to university extension for **exotic** pests of concern.
- Reach out to industry for **exotic** pests of concern.
- Add in a few pests of limited distribution or pests that are limited to one region of the country that may impact the commodity.
- *Note: all pests must still be vetted by CPHST and go through the proper analysis (pre-assessment, post-assessment). These pests should be considered suggestions until CPHST completes its analysis.

Combining Different Commodity Surveys (continued discussion)

Several states are conducting stone fruit, apple, pear, and general orchard surveys with Farm Bill funding. Since an apple/pear survey appears to be of interest, do we think about developing a



separate commodity survey, or do we combine it with stone fruits under an orchard umbrella? Another example is a potential small fruits survey. We already do this with the small grains survey. Is this the way forward, or would separate commodity surveys be best?

The general consensus within the NCC in July is that combining related commodities under an umbrella survey should be acceptable. For example, many states have mixed orchards, so it would make sense for them to be combined. Other states will focus specifically on one commodity or another. An umbrella survey also may be appropriate if the issue is logistics and having one agreement instead of two. However, does the umbrella survey mask the commodities of the survey for management and/or reporting purposes? PPQ is often asked about surveys in specific commodities. By lumping surveys we may lose some granularity around commodity reporting. Although there have not been any issues around the Small Grains survey, but when we start talking about high dollar specialty crops, then that may be another story.

Today's discussion also focused on the pests in the survey, and that the specific combination of pests may provide a way forward. If the pests listed for a commodity survey are specific to that commodity, then it may make no sense to include that survey in an umbrella survey. However, if the pests listed are not specific to a commodity and span a range of hosts, then it may make more sense to develop an umbrella survey instead of individual specific surveys.

Another way of looking at this issue is to develop commodity surveys where the pest list has the "lowest common denominator." State can then either survey at the specific commodity level or roll up surveys into the larger umbrella survey. Some states have large acreages in one commodity, e.g., stone fruits or apples, where a specific commodity survey makes sense. Other states may have much smaller acreages but a variety of orchard crops. In this case it may make more sense to survey under the umbrella. Ultimately, we want to do what is useful and beneficial for the CAPS community.

Realize also that all of this is an artificial designation for management and reporting purposes, and that conducting the actual surveys will not necessarily change, regardless of what the survey is called. Note, however, that these are very real considerations as we are reporting results to those who may influence the funding for our program, and reporting on commodities is more understandable than reporting on individual pests.

One option to designate surveys and still get at reporting could be:

- Orchard
- Orchard – Apple
- Orchard – Apple/Pear
- Orchard – Stone Fruit
- Orchard – Mixed
- Etc.



The NCC should talk to their constituency to get the perspectives and suggestions of the CAPS community, and send any thoughts, comments, or suggestions to the CAPS management team.

National Confirmation of New in U.S.

At times data is submitted to NAPIS that is labeled as new to the U.S. However, some of these pests have not been confirmed by the National Identification Services, a NIS-recognized national authority, or that NIS was even aware of the pest detection. This is just a reminder that per the cooperative agreements and MOUs with the states, all pests new to the U.S. need national confirmation and should be forwarded for national confirmation before the data is entered into NAPIS. A general policy is to enter the data within 24-48 hours after confirmation, not before it is confirmed nationally. A 391 form also needs to accompany the submission. Contact Joel Floyd for direction.

CAPS Recognition

CAPS Recognition at the National Plant Board Meeting went well. Brett Laird and Leroy Whilby were able to attend and receive their awards in person. By making this a public event we hope to encourage others to nominate a worthy individual for CAPS Recognition. The call for nominations for work completed in 2014 will go out in January 2015.

Native Pollinators in Traps

Several states (esp. Utah and Minnesota) have raised concerns about pollinator by-catch from using the tri-color bucket traps. Some states have observed high numbers of bees in the traps. There is some literature on the comparison of trap color for bucket traps. In some studies, there has been a small decrease in the number of pollinators in the all green version of the bucket traps. However, in some cases, there is also a reduction in the number of target moths. Helmuth said that his survey team observed that yellow Japanese Beetle traps fill up with bumblebees quickly, and green traps not so much.

CPHST has approved the bucket traps for several CAPS targets due to the effectiveness of the trap over other trap types, and also due to identification needs. For these reasons it may not be beneficial to go back to using sticky traps.

CPHST has established a trap trial project with an ARS scientist in FL this summer. He is testing traps for native *Spodoptera* moths in the tri-color traps, all green traps, sticky traps, and also some experimental, non-sticky traps in different colors from the CPHST Otis Lab. He will compare moth and bee captures across all trap types. After this study has been completed, we can re-assess the approved traps for pests currently using the bucket traps.

EDDMaps

Joel Bard reported that some EDDMaps from the University of Georgia contained wrong or unverified information for Arkansas. Joel will talk more about this and his attempts to rectify the



information on the next NCC call. Everyone should be aware of information that is accessible by the public about regulatory pests in their state that has not been verified by the regulatory authority in their state.

The next NCC call will be held on Thursday, September 4, 2014, at 1:00 pm eastern time.

Please forward to your NCC representative any agenda topics for discussion on the September call.

PPQ Cooperative Agreements Seminar Series

Training Description

This seminar series includes 13 training sessions covering various topics associated with PPQ cooperative agreements management. The series is offered as electives, allowing the intended audience to choose from among modules in a customizable approach to improving performance in managing and monitoring cooperative agreements. The target audience includes cooperators.

Seminar Modules:

Module 1	Introduction to Seminar Series
Module 2	How to Complete a Detailed Work Plan
Module 3	How to Complete a Detailed Financial Plan
Module 4	Reviewing a Cooperator Accomplishment Report
Module 5	Federal Funding and the Budgeting Process
Module 6	Rules and Regulations Associated with the Notice of Award
Module 7	Substantial Involvement in the Cooperative Agreements Process
Module 8	Oversight and Monitoring Cooperative Agreements
Module 9	How to Manage Changes with Cooperative Agreements
Module 10	How to Report De-Obligations and Extensions
Module 11	How to Complete Closeout Reporting
Module 12	How to Maintain Agreements Files
Module 13	How to Prepare for an Audit

Application Instructions

Step 1: Connect to this link in your web browser: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/668FVW2>

Step 2: Provide the contact information requested in the survey and select “next.”

Step 3: Select the boxes next to the seminar(s) you wish to participate in and select “next.”

Step 4: To complete registration, select “done.”

Once you have registered, you will be contacted by PPQ’s Professional Development Center and provided access to the virtual classroom where the materials are housed.



For questions about registration, please contact Kyle Hegamyer
(kyle.c.hegamyer@aphis.usda.gov or 240-529-0259)

For questions about the seminar series, please contact Melissa Thornton
(melissa.r.thornton@aphis.usda.gov or 240-529-0263)