



Annual National CAPS Committee Meeting
February 3 – 4, 2015
California Department of Food and Agriculture
Sacramento, California
Meeting Minutes



Participants

John Bowers	Joe Collins	Sherry Aultman	Umesh Kodira
Brian Kopper	Julie Van Meter*	Dale Anderson	Valerie DeFeo*
Rick Zink	Brad Lewis	Ian Foley	Kristian Rondeau
Terry Bourgoin*	Carol Motloch	Melinda Sullivan	Ken Bloem
Joel Bard	Lisa Ishibashi	Talitha Molet	Joe Deugwillo
Piera Siegert*	Saul Vaiciunas	Dan Mackesy	
Beth Stone-Smith ¹	Nick Condos ²	Mike Pitcairn ²	Debby Tanouye ²
Rudy Recile ¹	Dan Hamon ¹	Jason Leathers ²	

* Via conference call, Live Meeting, and webinars ¹ PPQ CA ² CDFA

State Welcome and Overview – Nick Condos, CA SPRO

Nick Condos welcomed the group to the CDFA Plant Lab facility, and gave an overview of agriculture in California. California has had four different fruit fly detections in California since December, which is highly unusual. Water is always an issue in the West. California is starting to look at regulating groundwater. Agriculture is the number one user of water due to the need to irrigate crops. There is very little to no rain from June to September. The limited rain over the last few years has really started to affect the crops produced in California. Growers only want to put water on crops that will give them a large return on their investment. Almonds, as well as walnuts and pistachios, are becoming increasingly popular because they need less water to thrive and are high value crops. Processing tomatoes and high value grape production have increased, as well as mandarins and vegetable seed production. Vegetable seed can be produced without disease and pest pressure that is present in other/wetter areas of the country. There is also a move from Valencia oranges to organic Valencia oranges and seedless mandarin oranges. Avocados are being pruned back each year. When water is available and added to avocado, they grow back.

California understands the need for early pest detection and is a user of pest detection funds. They have a diversity of agricultural hosts and geography. Just about any pest could occur in California, and finding those pests is the first step in the process.

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.



PPQ Welcome – Beth Stone-Smith for Helene Wright, CA SPHD

In California, crops are grown on huge acreages. California is experiencing longer seasons, which has led to some problems and secondary pest issues (e.g. the California red scale has been observed with an extra generation). California has 58 counties and each has their own agricultural commissioner. There are federal, state, and county (and sometimes industry) dynamics in play in California in regards to agriculture, pest detection, and response.

Meeting Overview

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss and review the CAPS program with committee members. Everyone in the program has an equal voice. The NCC is the forum where we want to discuss what we are doing well and what we need to work on. The group will need to work on a plan for the National CAPS Meeting scheduled December 2015, review changes for the 2016 CAPS Guidelines, and plan the direction the CAPS Program should go in the upcoming years.

NCC Bylaws Changes

Editorial Change: Farm Bill 10201 needs to be changed to Farm Bill 10007.

Representation and Terms

The NCC Bylaws governs how the committee operates. There were a few minor changes last year. The main change to the NCC Bylaws is the addition of a Farm Bill representative. The Farm Bill representative will have a two-year rotation with all members of the Farm Bill Management Team participating in the rotation. The current representative is Kristian Rondeau. Ken Bloem (S&T representative) also attended the meeting to get exposure to the NCC, CAPS, and current issues. Valerie DeFeo, (PM representative) participated by phone.

Question for group: Does the group believe that representation on the committee is adequate? Are the NCC Bylaws good as is?

- Group consensus is yes. The size of the committee is good; not too big or small. The monthly conference calls and yearly face to face is sufficient for the group. There is also a good mix of state and federal representation on the committee.

Question for group: Does everyone get feedback from their constituency? If not, is there a problem with engagement that needs to be addressed?

- Group consensus is sometimes. Most committee members only hear back from their constituency if the issue is related to funding. All reach out to their constituency; most assume that there are no issues when they do not hear back. They may not respond due to time issues; many likely listen, but do not have comments.



Julie currently acts as the National Plant Board, Board of Directors (BOD) representative. She sends updates directly to the NPB BOD. They like having a representative on the NCC that keeps them in the loop. They would like to have someone on the NCC to continue to do this in the future. Julie's term expires at the end of 2015. Based on the timing, the replacement likely would also represent the Central Plant Board.

Ian asked if the NCC should have a representative from Export Certification. So far, this has not gained traction. The CAPS Management Team reached out to stakeholders a while back and responses revealed that most CAPS survey work isn't being used to directly support export. This topic should be revisited at a later time. State CAPS Committees, however, should invite export specialists to their meetings. Getting some traction and introduction to CAPS at the state level may be beneficial in the long run.

Representation of NCC

Terms are for three years and staggered so the committee can continue to run smoothly. Members can serve up to two terms if the group that they are representing wants them to continue in the role. Joe Collins (2nd term), Carol Motloch (1st term), Sherry Aultman (1st term), and Saul Vaiciunas (1st term) all have expiring terms at the end of 2015.

Review of 2014 NCC Meeting

Items from the 2014 NCC meeting were reviewed.

- 1) Special topics NCC call to discuss term length and explore other options: Revisited at this NCC meeting.
- 2) Write up a proposal on a new Pest Detection structure and share with NCC: In progress.
- 3) Develop a definition and structure of what the Pest Detection program is and what it is not. Present the definition and structure to the PPQ management team and National Plant Board BOD: In progress.
- 4) Provide more detailed information on CR partial agreements (John, Brian).
Action: Work on communicating work and financial plan due dates to the field. Inform field that they can submit agreements at the CR funding level using multiple communication methods. There needs to be better coordination between PDMT and agreements staff. Brian will follow-up with the agreements staff on the best way to communicate this information. CAPS should not rely on any one method of communicating due dates (email, CAPS resource and Collaboration (CR&C) site, etc.). Brian will announce due dates and when funding is available using multiple methods.
- 5) Review work plan due dates. Work plan due date needs to remain as is due to management's request to have a draft budget by October 1, regardless of funding from Congress. There also are other factors affecting the timeline that include survey supply and identification preparation, etc. The date work plans are due to the FO hub office is specified in Appendix



K of the Guidelines. This is the date that all work plans should be uploaded to the SharePoint site.

- 6) Send out form email to each state after work plan has been approved or change Guidelines to reflect timeframe for sending corrections/changes: Under consideration.
- 7) Finalize the 2015 National Survey Guidelines: Complete. Published April 22, 2014 by PDMT and NCC; most changes were minor.
- 8) State cooperators cannot see data in IPHIS: Program will not use IPHIS for CAPS; IPHIS does not meet needs for CAPS; All survey data goes into NAPIS. States feel that they are getting mixed messages regarding the use of IPHIS. Accurate templates also are not available in IPHIS for CAPS surveys. CAPS does not have the program resources to support making new templates for IPHIS. States should follow PPQ guidelines for PPQ funded programs (EAB, Citrus Health, EAB, *P. ramorum*, etc.). Everything else funded with CAPS money follows CAPS guidelines. PPQ staff should share their data with the state so that CAPS-funded agreement data can be put into NAPIS. Farm Bill has a document that explains reporting requirements for their funded surveys (posted on CAPS R&C site).
Action: Develop program requirements documentation. This document was developed and submitted in July 2012. Much still holds true today. The document should be re-evaluated and re-submitted.
- 9) Follow up with Purdue to update the CAPS Accountability Report to reflect information in the Survey Summary Form and to incorporate new data fields in NAPIS. The idea is to better match survey agreements with results data to show compliance with the objectives of the agreement: In progress.
- 10) CPHST action items are all completed or in progress (see the minutes to the 2014 NCC Meeting).

CAPS Performance in 2014: Accomplishments and Measures ([View Presentation](#))

The presentation can be found on the CAPS Resource and Collaboration site by clicking on the link above. Several discussions ensued as different topics were covered. Several of these discussions are covered below.

The number of states and territories that participate in CAPS has stayed uniform over the past several years. Overall, there has been a drop in the percentage of priority pests surveyed for (from 80% to 75% from 2013 to 2015) in CAPS. This can be attributed to Farm Bill Goal 1 surveys, however. Some Priority Pests are only offered for survey using Farm Bill funding (grape, stone fruit, palm, solanaceous hosts, etc.). When you add Farm Bill in to these numbers, 85% of priority pests are being surveyed for each year on average. There are 17 to 18 pests that are not being surveyed for each year (may not be the same pests each year). CPHST will examine these pests to try to determine why these pests are not being surveyed for and if they are appropriate targets.



Action: Examine pests not being surveyed for and determine which pests should be removed from the priority pest listing.

Some of the survey names (forest survey, vegetable crop survey, etc.) are nebulous. It is not readily apparent what hosts are included in the survey. Requests come in to the Pest Detection Management team related to commodity surveys nationally and in a particular state. The survey names need to be more descriptive, or the NCC needs to come up with a better way of capturing this information.

Action: Determine how surveys are being named and develop recommendations to address vague survey names or how to capture commodity information.

Some discussion related to Farm Bill surveys occurred. Some surveys being funded by CAPS would be a better fit for Farm Bill, i.e., specialty crops. There is some uncertainty with Farm Bill funding. States want some assurance that these surveys would be funded. Some states do not know if their surveys will be funded through Farm Bill and this affects what they apply for through CAPS. Farm Bill is a competitive process, not all suggestions are funded, and many suggestions are only partially funded. CAPS funding, though not guaranteed, is mostly assured from year-to-year. States need to assume a certain amount of funding will be available to complete their surveys regardless of the funding source. There also was discussion about requiring a specific pest target for some surveys and that there could be more flexibility to survey for national priority pests vs. a specific target (e.g., *Tuta absoluta*, *Lobesia botrana*, and *Plum pox virus*).

Action: Goal 1 Survey and Farm Bill Management team will revisit the Farm Bill guidelines related to specific pests being required for survey.

Action: Determine if Farm Bill surveys should have more of a requirement for National Priority Pests (i.e., Solanaceous surveys only require survey for *Tuta absoluta*, states can add on anything else they want and they do not have to necessarily be a National Priority Pest)

Action: Determine a way for states to guestimate how much money they should expect from Farm Bill each year for survey (money cannot be guaranteed, but perhaps a timely estimate would be possible).

Currently, a brief annual report is generated by John primarily for APHIS' Policy and Program Development (PPD) staff for budget reasons. PPD puts these reports into the Explanatory Notes to Congress for budget justifications. The annual report usually is due soon after the end of the fiscal year in October. Because of the timing, these reports do not reflect what was accomplished as much as what was planned. These reports use information from the Survey Summary Form for that funding year. Actual data entry will occur well into the new fiscal year as there is a lag time for catching up on identifications and diagnostics.



Questions for group: Do we create an annual report for the Plant Board knowing that we may not have a full and complete data set of survey results for up to a year and a half after the end of a particular survey season? Is this really useful or necessary? As an alternative, should we have an online template that is available to everybody 24/7? What information should be made available to everybody at all times? Brian Kopper suggests we keep the info simple and to the point.

Action: Determine what type of reporting that the CAPS community and Plant Board would like to see daily, monthly, or yearly. Work with Purdue to discuss feasibility.

FY15 Funding

The 2015 Pest Detection appropriation from Congress is the same as the 2014 appropriation. The budget has yet to come down to PPQ from APHIS yet, but the official numbers should be close to last year. Early indications are that there may be a deficit in the line item. The CAPS Management Team is working on this and has identified some areas that can or should be changed. Pest Detection is being charged more in line with actual costs for its internal accounting (overhead, indirect, etc.) which have put a strain on the budget.

The fate of the National CAPS meeting is still up in the air. John has a plan to pay for it over FY15 and FY16. The meeting is in FY16 (December 2015), so the costs will be factored into the FY16 budget for federal personnel. For state personnel, the FY15 budget will be used to pay for travel to the meeting by adding funds to existing agreements if money is still available. If state personnel need help paying for travel, they should be in contact with their NCC representative. Planning for the meeting will proceed until approval is denied.

FY16 Funding

John requested an \$8 million increase for Pest Detection. This money would support four individuals in CPHST for survey analysis. The remainder would go into agreements. The request cleared APHIS and is currently at the USDA level. John does not know if this increase made it into the President's budget or not. For now, expect the funding in 2016 to be similar to 2015. (Note: An increase for Pest Detection was not included in the President's FY16 budget request to Congress.)

There also was a funding request to be used for surveys to demonstrate Pest Free Areas to support exports. It was included in the FY15 and FY16 (?) budget requests. The budget request included extra funding for Pest Detection. We are not aware of the status of this request.

Cooperative Agreements Discussion

After the modernization and combining of the PPQ Regions, there have been a few issues with the way the old Eastern and Western Regions did their agreements.



- The old Western Region way was to track each work and financial plan individually. This creates a lot of work for the ROARs and ADODRs, because each agreement needs to be tracked and closed out individually. This potentially creates a lot of paperwork. This could make it a hassle to fund small agreements.
- The old Eastern Region way was to have the total Pest Detection amount for each state on a single agreement (not individually tracked; tracked on the total amount of funding). This method was not in accordance with RAB guidelines. This method also allows some flexibility, because funds could be moved around between work plans (changes of more than 10% or in agreements over \$100,000 required approval).

For FY15, all agreements should be completed in the old Western Region way. However, there may be some different options available for FY16.

Brian came up with a hybrid approach that was approved by the agreements' staff. There could be one overarching work and financial plan for each state and it would include appendices that would break out each individual work and financial plan. The agreement would be based on the total Pest Detection (PD) amount. The detail could either go in the overarching work plan or in the appendices of the work plan. The group needs to determine which method would be less burdensome.

- Pros: This method would satisfy RAB guidelines; it would be based and managed on the total PD amount (less paperwork); it may provide more flexibility with money so there would be less instances of deobligation.
- Cons: It may be difficult developing and communicating the new format to states.

Group discussion: With the hybrid approach, it may be harder for Western states to track their personnel if the different surveys had the same accounting code. States would still be able to do it individually if they wanted. The SPHD and SPRO may have the last say in what format suits their management of the agreements.

Another option would be to have one work plan for the infrastructure and then a combined (hybrid) work plan for all of the surveys (this would lead to two sets of paperwork vs. one set).

Action: Come up with an example and sample submission of the hybrid approach for the NCC to discuss

Who: John Bowers, Brian Kopper, Sherry Aultman and assistant, Nichole Carrier (suggested), Julie Van Meter, someone from the agreements staff. Brian will lead this group.

When: Before the release of the CAPS 2016 Guidelines on April 22, 2015.



Survey Summary Forms

The Survey Summary Form (SSF) should reflect what your state plans to do for the upcoming year. There are times when things change, but the changes are not currently reflected in the SSF. It would be useful to the CAPS Management Team if the SSF reflected what was actually accomplished and what was in the accomplishment report. Currently the CAPS Management Team does not have a good picture of what happens each year unless they go through the individual accomplishment reports and match them up.

To help streamline this process, a formal change request process will be instituted. If anything happens or changes within a survey, it will be reflected in the SSF. The change has to be justifiable and approved (PSS, ADODR, etc.), *i.e.*, a state could not survey for a pest because they did not receive the lure on time. The CAPS Management Team is not sure how this will work yet, but Purdue will work on it. It will likely be modeled after the Farm Bill change request. The FB process allows the change to be documented, and as soon as it is approved, the budget staff is notified. States will likely have to submit a request with justification to Brian; once approved, there will be a process for changing the SSF. In the end, the SSF should match what is in the accomplishment reports just as it matches the work plans when they are submitted.

Until this new process is implemented, all changes with justification should be sent directly to Brian so he can work with Susan to implement the changes. Do not send changes to Susan.

Action: Follow up with Purdue to institute a work flow process for changing the SSF forms after they have been submitted.

Farm Bill

2015 Update

Kristian reported on Farm Bill activities. The FB Management Team is working on finalizing the spending plan for FY15, which should be completed by the end of February. The official spending plan announcement should be coming out by March. The official press release will be coming from the Secretary of Agriculture's office. Subscribe to the Stakeholder registry to stay informed. Each SPHD will be sent an email showing what state projects were funded. The SPHD will then have to contact each Primary Investigator (PI) to determine if they can still complete the project. If they can, then they are asked to provide detailed work and budget plans. The goal is to align the Farm Bill and CAPS timelines a little closer each year.

This year, there is a 15% overhead rule. Each cooperator is allowed to charge 15% overhead on the **total** agreement amount (this information is covered in the FAQ section on the Farm Bill site).



Overlapping agreements

If a PI is getting funded for the same agreement, the PI can overlap their FY14 and FY15 agreements. Although they can run concurrently, they have to be separated (*i.e.*, billed separately; slightly different, *i.e.*, surveying in different counties, different pests, etc.). When the agreements are stacked end to end, it gives the appearance that the money is being parked. The FB Management Team hopes to fix this by overlapping agreements and starting earlier.

Action: The FY2014 Survey Data Requirements are no longer posted on the CAPS R&C site. Kristian will talk to Susan about posting these back as soon as possible, since the FY2014 surveys are still ongoing in many areas.

Process Review

The FB Management Team is in the middle of a Policy Program and Development (PPD) review. The group is looking at all of the processes and continuing to look at ways for improvement. One change that may occur is the tool used for submission. The Farm Bill team is looking at what system requirements are needed for Farm Bill. Metastorm may not be the same tool that the group uses in the future. The Agency is looking at Salesforce and this could provide an opportunity for Farm Bill to piggyback on that contract. It is very difficult to meet the demands of congressional reporting each year with the current system.

Action: The NCC is to provide any feedback (what has worked well, what tools would be useful, what needs improvement) to the Farm Bill Management Team.

A question was asked about if there will be an August deadline for obligation of funds again. The answer is that yes, there likely will be an early obligation deadline again in FY15 for Farm Bill agreements. More information related to Farm Bill can be found on the Farm Bill site and the CAPS R&C site.

Break for Tour of CDFA Plant Lab Facility

National CAPS Meeting Update and Planning

The CAPS management team is working on a developing a package of documents for official approval of the meeting. The package needs to include a justification with purpose and outcomes, a detailed cost analysis, and an agenda with full days. Three full days of meetings will be developed for the agenda. The justification is in final draft, and the cost analysis will be complete once the agenda is done so that anyone who needs to be on the approved list of travelers (from PPQ) can be added. However, PPQ attendance will need to be kept to the minimum necessary. Albuquerque, NM, is the tentative city for the meeting.

John would like to have the package completed by early March. In order to do this, the group needs to come to a consensus on the agenda for the meeting. The CAPS team is working with the facilitators and PDC to draft the first version of an agenda based on feedback and input from the NCC. The NCC will then have an opportunity to comment and make suggestions. This will be an iterative process.

The meeting may have everyone meet in the morning with breakout sessions scheduled for the afternoon. Feedback from the last meeting suggested more time for the breakout groups. The group thought it was helpful to have a white paper on each breakout topic ahead of time. It helped keep the conversation focused and structured.

The meeting will have two PDC facilitators. If there are breakout sessions, we would likely need some more people that have had the facilitator training to facilitate during the breakout sessions. It may be necessary to have a facilitator training before the meeting.

The CAPS Fair will be incorporated into the meeting as this was given very positive feedback from the last meeting. Many constituents have expressed interest in having hands-on demonstrations to develop skills that they could use for their work (training, skill improvement) presented at the meeting. The second day may focus on field level and hands-on training.

There likely will not be a registration fee. If the group would like to have a banquet, it would be a pay upfront deal. The dinner would be a social event held outside of the meeting.

Some possible topics that were discussed by the NCC include:

- A panel discussion of the potentially new bundled (hybrid) work plan/financial process.
- Lisa Kennaway and Tim Gottwald's modeling work would be a good topic for the CAPS fair.
- Breakout group focused on agreements for ROARs and ADODRs.
- Session focused on agreements in general; provide a flow sheet for FB and CAPS on what happens when an agreement is submitted.
- A panel discussion on audits; invite an auditor, include individuals that have gone through an audit. Discuss what they were hit on and what they have done since then to improve; this is being done at the NPB, but SSCs are not at this meeting so it would likely still be useful.
- An update on recently found pests (Spotted Lanternfly in PA, Old World bollworm in Puerto Rico)
- Discussion on what the process is when a new pest is found. What goes on? Who makes the decisions; could have both federal and state participants, either as a panel or breakout session.



- Session dedicated to Farm Bill coordination (how to submit a FB proposal, the process, FB management would also like feedback on the process).
- CAPS101 on the first evening, possibly as a breakout session; a lot of individuals seem to be interested in this.
- Discussion of the prioritization model.
- Address the guidance on data entry (IPHIS vs. NAPIS); discuss what has been decided between now and then.

Group consensus: The group does not want to touch on everything lightly; it would be nice to pick a few of the big topics and focus on those in more detail.

Action: A subgroup will discuss the draft initial agenda, and send to the NCC for feedback

Who: John, Brian, Rick, Kristian (FB), Joel (SPHD), Joe (SPRO), Ian (SCC), Yolisa (PSS)

CAPS 2016 Survey Guidelines

There were not a lot of changes from the 2014 to 2015 Guidelines. There likely will not be any major changes to the 2016 Guidelines. If anyone has any questions about the 2016 Guidelines or thinks there is a change or update needed, contact John and Brian.

Action: Amend the agreements chapter to include options that are developed by the agreement subcommittee

Who: CAPS Management

When: Before 2016 Guidelines are published

Question for group: Can the \$3,000 limit for out of state travel be removed? One of the PSS's wanted to participate in an ID training event out of state and this would put the individual over the \$3,000 limit.

- States should prioritize what travel is really important for their position. One of the reasons the limit was imposed was because there was a lot of out-of-state travel going on that was not really related to CAPS Pest Detection. The \$3,000 limit should be enough for an individual to take 2 out-of-state trips per year.
- A suggestion was to move the travel limit back to \$5,000. The CAPS management team will take this suggestion into consideration before the Guidelines are published.

NAPIS Topics ([View Presentation](#))

Susan will be presenting a webinar in two weeks on CAPS R&C, NAPIS, and Pest Tracker topics (February 19th at 1 ET/10 PT).



Day 2 Welcome (Jim Houston, CDFA Undersecretary)

Jim welcomed us the CDFA facility and expressed his appreciation of the work that CAPS does for California and the nation.

CPHST Survey Support

Rick gave a brief summary of the activities that CPHST is doing to support the CAPS program (risk mapping/ pest prioritization, geospatial support, datasheet and manual development, pest list development, approved methods, trap/lure testing/ development, etc.). The meeting that CPHST had in Otis, MA in September also was briefly discussed.

Summary of CAPS Pest Lists ([View Presentation](#))

The pest prioritization process was revisited. The CPHST CAPS support team first completes a pre-assessment to ascertain if the suggested pest is indeed a pest, if it causes damage, what its current distribution is, if it is reportable at the port of entry, and if there is a pathway into the United States. If the pest passes the pre-assessment, it then goes into a ranking model. If the pest ranks in the top 50 or so pests, the pest is then run through a post-assessment. The post-assessment examines whether there are survey and identification methods available. If the pest passes the post-assessment, it goes onto the rank CAPS Prioritized pest list. If it fails, it goes onto a research and development list.

We are currently working with the CPHST Plant Epidemiology and Risk Analysis Laboratory (PERAL) to develop a new ranking model. There will be separate models developed for each pest type. The models for arthropods and plant pathogens are close to completion (see the notes below).

Since the ranking model is still being revised, we will use the 2015 AHP pest list for 2016.

However, we are adding two new pests for 2016:

1. *Candidatus Phytoplasma solani* (bois noir, stolbur phytoplasma)
2. *Phytophthora kernoviae*

Both of these pests have a very broad host range, are spreading rapidly through Europe, and have methods available for survey/identification.

For 2017, we will be analyzing 95 pests through the new arthropod and plant pathogen models, including 56 of the current pests on the AHP Prioritized pest list and 39 new pests. Due to the large number of pests and a new pest prioritization model, we anticipate that the 2017 Prioritized Pest List could look quite different.



Summary of CAPS Manuals ([View Presentation](#))

Format

All new manuals will be in the new format (standalone introduction with links to individual pest datasheets). All old manuals will eventually be put into this new format. The Grape Manual was just updated and put into this format. The next manual updated will be Stone Fruit.

Tropical Pest List

The only new survey/manual for 2016 will be the Tropical Pests. This manual is intended to provide American Samoa, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands with a pest list due to their unique climate and crop species. Datasheets will be made available as they are completed and the manual should be completed no later than August 2015. Out of 26 suggestions, 6 passed the pre- and post-assessment:

- 1) *Aspidiotus rigidus* (none, an armored scale)
- 2) *Ceratocystis manginecans* (mango sudden fungus decline)
- 3) *Conogethes punctiferalis* (castor capsule borer)
- 4) *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4 (Panama disease tropical race 4)
- 5) *Gymnandrosoma aurantianum* (macadamia nutborer)
- 6) *Paratachardina pseudolobata* (lobate lac scale)

Action: Send an email to the tropical suggestors showing which pests passed and failed. Of the ones that failed, show at what step.

Who: CPHST CAPS Support

Proposed New Process for Manuals

In the future, manual suggestions will require a ‘champion’ to sponsor it. The champion will be required to help CPHST CAPS Support identify exotic species to be included on the list. They will also have to ensure that there are at least 4 to 5 states that would be interested in the survey.

Question for group: Do the suggested responsibilities of the ‘champion’ make sense? Is there agreement?

- Group consensus is that the suggested responsibilities are going to be a bit much for anyone to do on their own. The champion should help identify exotic pests, but this responsibility is ultimately the job of CPHST CAPS Support. However, it makes sense to put some of the responsibility on the ‘champion’.

Possible New Manuals

- 1) Apple and Pear Commodity Manual: There is a lot of interest in this. This should be the first priority (after Tropical is completed).

- 2) Berries/Small Fruit: There is a lot of interest in this one. This should be the second priority.
- 3) Dry Bean/Pea/Pulse Crops: This could potentially be combined with the Soybean manual to become a broader legume survey manual. If legumes are targeted then it would need to cover soybean, bean, pea, peanut, and other leguminous crops. Should the focus be limited or not?
- 4) Vegetable Seed: This is not a CAPS commodity. This suggestion will be tabled for now.

Question for group: Can we have too many manuals? How should the manuals be prioritized? What about rotating manuals?

- Group consensus is that after the suggested manuals are completed, CAPS should hold off on developing any more manuals. If this is done, manual rotation may not be necessary. The CAPS Program covers a lot of crops already and the group feels that most of what is needed is covered in one way or another.

Pest List Changes

Changes to the manual pest lists occur on a yearly basis. If substantial changes are made, a new version is created and changes are noted in the draft/revision log. As CPHST CAPS Support updates all of the older manuals, pests are run through the pre- and post-assessment filters to make sure that they are still appropriate.

- 1) 2015 Grape: removed *Adoxophyes orana* (summer fruit tortrix moth) and *Diabrotica speciosa* (cucurbit beetle), both are unlikely to be found in grape; updated all datasheets and put in new format.
- 2) 2016 Grape: adding *Lycorma delicatula* (spotted lanternfly) and *Brevipalpus chilensis* (Chilean false red mite), new pests of concern.
- 3) 2016 Soybean: removing *Adoxophyes orana* (summer fruit tortrix moth) and *Heteronychus arator* (black maize beetle), both are unlikely to be found in soybean.
- 4) 2016 Oak: removing *Ephiphyas postvittana* (light brown apple moth), unlikely to be found in oak.
- 5) 2016 Small Grains: removing *Adoxophyes orana* (summer fruit tortrix moth), *Peronosclerospora philippensis* (Philippine downy mildew), *Spodoptera litura* (cotton cutworm), and *Heteronychus arator* (black maize beetle), all are unlikely to be found in small grains.
- 6) Addition of *Candidatus Phytoplasma solani* (bois noir, stolbur phytoplasma), likely added to grape, solanaceous, corn, and stone fruit manuals.
- 7) Addition of *Phytophthora kernoviae* (no common name), likely added to oak manual.



Summary of Pest Prioritization Model Revision Update - Alison Neeley (PERAL)

Developing a New Model for Ranking CAPS Pests ([View Presentation](#))

Why do we need a model for ranking pests?

The reality is that we have more pests on the current CAPS list than we can survey for given our limited resources, and more are suggested every year:

- **Arthropods:** 36 (current list) + 19 (new suggestions) = 55 total arthropods
- **Plant pathogens/nematodes:** 20 (current list) + 20 (new suggestions) = 40 total pathogens

We want to make sure that the pests and pathogens we survey for actually represent those that pose the greatest risk.

How should pests be ranked?

Three criteria are important for determining the risk that exotic plant pests and pathogens pose to the United States:

1. Likelihood that they will be **introduced** into the United States & then spread
2. Likelihood that they will cause **serious impacts** upon introduction & spread
3. Political and human value-based considerations

What's wrong with the current model for ranking pests?

- **Highly subjective** – assessment results highly dependent on analyst
- **Questionable applicability for pest types** – questions tend to be “arthropod-centric” so that comparison between pest groups is suspect
- **Uncertainty** cannot be handled explicitly
- **Not transparent** – policy not separated from science & unclear which is driving pest ranking
- **Inflexible** – no way compare risk by region or host
- **Shortcomings associated with applying AHP to this purpose:**
 - Requires independent criteria
 - Weightings of criteria determined by experts rather than data & evidence
 - Cannot be validated

New model

The new is a predictive model based on the model used for PPQ's weed risk assessments. The new model improves on the AHP in that it:

- Does not require that criteria are independent; Relates analysis of pest biology to potential economic and environmental consequences
- Is objective and asks specific questions designed to minimize expert bias
- Is appropriate for different pest types



- Weights the criteria based on the predicative power rather on expert opinion
- Can be tested and validated
- Separates analysis based on scientific information from that based on policy

We are currently in the process of finalizing the arthropod and plant pathogen models.

The models will rank pests on their likelihood of causing serious impacts in the United States, based on pest or pathogen biology and behavior outside of the United States. We started the development of each model by identifying questions that we thought would be predictive of pest impact in the United States. Then we then identified 100 arthropods and 75 pathogens that have become established in the United States, but that are non-native to the United States. We analyzed each of these pests using the questions that we developed, based only on how the pest is behaving outside of the United States. Our answers to these questions were then compared to the actual observed impact of the pests in the United States in order to determine the predictive power of each question. Questions that have the greatest predictive power are given the largest weightings; questions with no predictive power have been removed from the models.

This year, we focused on developing and finalizing the models for arthropods and pathogens. We will next use the model to analyze arthropods and pathogens on the current AHP list. The final rankings will be completed by summer.

Future work for FY 2015 will focus on statistically validating the models for pathogens and arthropods, and on developing an additional model for mollusks. In FY 2016 we plan to develop a model for analyzing entry potential, developing a model for explicitly analyzing political and policy considerations, and on developing a system for stakeholders to easily use the model for looking at pest risk by host and region.

Pest Profiles versus Pest Alerts

Pest Profiles are short outreach documents the CAPS program started publishing for pests of imminent threat (published as CAPS documents). The PPQ Pest Alerts are usually released after something has happened (a new pest find, etc.; published at the PPQ level with no mention of CAPS). These are very similar documents and CPHST CAPS support would likely be tasked to help with the Pest Alerts anyway. The Pest Profiles allowed for a shortened LPA process (it took about 1 month vs. about 5 months to publish a new document). This process appears to have been lost in LPA when our champion in LPA took another position.

Question for group: Do we want to continue to publish Pest Profiles when PPQ is pushing out Pest Alerts?

- Group consensus is that this is a policy issue and could be dealt with on a case by case basis. Some states do use these and do not seem to care if CAPS is listed on the document, as long as it is a USDA document.

Summary of High-Risk Pest Survey Gap Analysis ([View Presentation](#))

Dan Mackesy gave a presentation of Survey GAPS analysis project that was done by the CPHST CAPS core team. The purpose of this project was to determine whether or not pest survey activity is consistent with the states' vulnerability to pests based on host presence and climate. A representative sample of 8 high priority CAPS pests was analyzed for survey activity going back to 2010. The study is preliminary and was not meant to be all-inclusive.

Overall, we found that states are doing a pretty good job with selecting surveys. One notable exception is corn producing states and their lack of survey activity for corn pests. These states are 'scouting' for pests, but is scouting equal to pest-specific survey? Several of the exotic pests look very similar to native pests. It is doubtful that a scout would recognize the exotic as something new or different. Additionally, very few surveys are happening in potato (with the exception of cyst nematodes). This appears to be an industry issue.

A flaw in this preliminary GAP analysis work came up when the OWB was found in Puerto Rico shortly after the GAP analysis was completed. Originally, Florida was ranked low on the list of states that are vulnerable to OWB based on host and climate information alone. Pathway information was not considered, because states previously were not asked to consider it by CAPS. Now, Florida would be considered a high risk state based on pathway information.

CPHST identified a few internal issues that could be improved. The CPHST commodity matrix that is supplied in the AHP pest list appendix could be updated to include a broader range of hosts, separate out shrubs and trees, and cover all pests in the commodity manuals and AHP Prioritized Pest List. There were many primary hosts that were not being targeted by states that could be emphasized in an improved matrix. CPHST also found issues with several of the NAPPFAST maps. CPHST is working on a solution to replace most of the NAPPFAST maps.

Brad Lewis from the New Mexico Department of Agriculture made a good point that his state does some surveys based on the vulnerability of neighboring states to certain pests. This is a factor worth considering with future GAP analysis work. Sherry would like for CPHST to share some of this information at the state level. We are not quite ready for that yet, as this information is still preliminary but will do so at the discretion of the PDMT. Saul pointed out that New Jersey has previously surveyed for OWB but not since 2010. Information may look different if we go back farther than 2010.

Action: Analyze a few more pests for GAP analysis to be sure the trends we found will hold up.

Who: CPHST CAPS Support

When: June 2015

Action: Finish updating the Commodity Matrix

Who: CPHST CAPS Support

When: April 22, 2015 for the 2016 Guidelines

New Mapping Strategy (to Replace NAPPFAST) ([View Presentation](#))

At the 2015 NCC meeting, Lisa Kennaway and Gericke Cook of the CPHST Fort Collins Lab's, Applied Geospatial Technology program presented new ideas for CAPS mapping support. The previous support platform, NAPPFAST, is no longer functional. Building upon what was working, and using knowledge gained from the recent CAPS team gap analysis, new ideas are emerging including: expanded data sources, enhanced analytical methods, new visualization tools, and a centralized catalogue of geospatial products. Discussions will continue with the CAPS team to ensure that CPHST continues to provide scientifically sound and valued support to enhance decision making and state level surveillance.

1. Overview of past mapping support
 - a. NAPPFAST
 - b. Host combined with climate (and sometimes pathway), to equal overall risk of introduction and/or establishment
2. Ideas for future mapping support
 - a. Work closely with CAPS team to identify appropriate input data, accepted assumptions, and visualization goals
 - b. Implement standard procedures
 - c. Store and access everything in-house
 - d. Be dynamic and transparent
3. Proposed approach for support
 - a. Develop a catalog of agricultural and forest data and maps
 - b. Keep the data/maps separate to allow dynamic access
 - c. Use normalized combined host density maps
 - d. Develop a catalog of pest climatic thresholds maps with focus on multiple life stage models
 - e. We will evaluate needs to combine host and biology into one map either cartographically or analytically
4. Test case #1 – Old World Bollworm
 - a. Host data only
5. Test case #2 – False Codling Moth
 - a. Host and climate data exploration
6. Last discussion item

- a. For climatic threshold analysis, do we rely on literature only, or consider recent climate trends?

Discussion Summary

1. Overall, feedback is positive to new data and techniques. The talk intended to present ideas for future support and to start a conversation.
2. Changes proposed for host data analysis (normalizing host area by overall county area) are the most straightforward and easy to accept.
3. Changes proposed for the climate analysis are more complex and suggest a significant change to how things were conducted in the past. Early testing suggests that the new methods may significantly impact representation of risk. More discussion is needed.
4. These new approaches may improve decision making and surveillance support within the CAPS program. Furthermore, the new approaches may offer a useful tool for resource allocation, aligning available funds with states/counties that are at highest risk for an exotic pest's introduction.
5. Basal area will be explored vs. presence absence data for forest hosts (where available)
6. Once new methods are approved, priorities need to be set for CAPS maps updates. This will include an examination of available staff resources, and any shortfalls to meeting CAPS support requirements.

Action: Group blue from map (0.5 acres) with the next lowest rating

Action: Consider colorblindness when picking color scheme

Who: Lisa Kennaway and Gericke Cook

Action: Send or post a united message on why NAPPFAST link is no longer listed on the CAPS R&C site.

Who: CAPS Management Team

When: ASAP

Vectored Pathogens ([View Presentation](#))

Melinda walked through some issues that CPHST is having with vectored pathogens. Many vectors are small and non-descript, do not have specific survey methods, and do not cause much damage on their own. They are important due to the pathogen that they vector. You can't have disease development, however, without the vector. Do we ignore the vectors, run them through the analysis on their own (though they will likely fail), or do some sort of combination analysis where the vector and the pathogen get the same ranking? Complicating the issue is that some pathogens can be vectored by multiple vectors or some vectors can transmit multiple pathogens. Another issue was discussed relating to vectors that are known to occur in the United States and thus are non-reportable at the port of entry. Though survey would not necessarily be supported



for the vector, they could harbor exotic pathogens or new strains or more virulent strains of an existing pathogen.

No consensus was made on this topic, but the NCC will consider issue and follow up at a later date. Decisions may have to be made on a pest by pest basis, but CPHST would like some guidance on what the CAPS community would like them to do with the vectors.

CAPS Volunteer Survey Group

The purpose of the CAPS Volunteer Survey Group was to put guidelines together so states would be able to train volunteers and ensure they were proficient in surveying for pests, i.e., states would be able to enter valid negative data. There is a one page document on the CAPS R&C site explaining the findings of the group (<https://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/dmm/2606>).

The group found that there were liability and confidentiality issues with using volunteers for CAPS work. The states would basically have to treat the volunteers like employees in some ways in order to receive guidance at the federal level. Because of this, states will have to come up with their own guidance if they want to use volunteers.

The working group will be closed down; however, John would like to note the good work that the working group accomplished. They put together a great training program that could be used to certify volunteers for ALB surveys.

CAPS Recognition

The nomination period for the CAPS Recognition Award is open. The deadline for nominations is March 16, 2015. The Awards will be presented at the National Plant Board. There have been no nominations received to date. (Note: two nominations have been received since the end of this meeting).