



## National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

March 5, 2015

### Minutes

---

#### Participants

John Bowers	Piera Siegert	Dale Anderson	Dan Mackesy
Brian Kopper	Julie Van Meter	Ian Foley	Susan Schechter
Rick Zink	Brad Lewis	Lisa Jackson	Eileen Luke
Terry Bourgoin	Yolisa Ishibashi	Melinda Sullivan	Valerie DeFeo
Joel Bard	Carol Motloch	John Crowe	Joe Deugwillo
Kristian Rondeau	Saul Vaiciunas	Talitha Molet	

---

#### 2015 CAPS Recognition !!!

The 2015 version of CAPS Recognition is in progress. The call for nominations went out on January 15, and **nominations are due by COB March 16**. Nominations should include a narrative on the specific activity conducted or achievement of the person or group being nominated. This will include a description of the activity/achievement, its significance to Pest Detection activities, and the impact of the effort. Narratives should be no more than two pages in length, and shall be submitted along with the nomination form to the National CAPS Program Managers. As last year, awardee will be recognized publically at the 2015 National Plant Board Meeting. See [Appendix Q of the 2015 National Survey Guidelines](#) for more detailed information. Please consider nominating a worthwhile individual or group. The deadline is fast approaching!

#### Work Plan Update

One of the topics discussed at last month's Annual NCC Meeting in Sacramento was revising the guidance on work plans. A subcommittee has been, and is continuing to review the work plan template, and is working on options for a revised template. One option under consideration is to develop a work plan template where states could bundle their all of their surveys for one line item funding source under one work plan. Any revised work plan will have to meet the requirements of the Agreements Services Center and their regulations and policies before being implemented. A revised template and guidance is tentatively expected to be available by the time the 2016 Guidelines are published in April. Any new option may or may not be available for 2015 Farm Bill surveys, and will depend on timing.

#### Budget – Pest Detection

There should be no further changes to the FY15 budget for Pest Detection. Field Operations has the green light to proceed, and agreement paperwork will be sent soon. The President's FY16 budget for Pest Detection contains the same amount as for FY15. The Senate or House appropriation committees can propose changes, and budget hearings are underway. We will just

---

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.



have to see how the process plays out. The FY17 budget process will begin soon, and once again, Pest Detection will submit an increase request similar to last year.

### **Budget – Farm Bill**

The final approval for 2015 Farm Bill spending plan is imminent, and should be announced in mid-March. As in previous years, there will be an official press release from the Secretary's office, and it will be communicated through the Stakeholder Registry.

### **Survey Summary Form**

There will be an addition to the Survey Summary Form for 2016 CAPS/Pest Detection and thereafter. States will be asked to indicate the specific hosts, commodities, environments, or habitats in which they plan to conduct surveys. This information is not always apparent from the survey name. For example, for a Stone Fruit survey, will the survey be conducted in peach or cherries or in both? Likewise for an Orchard survey; will it be conducted in apples, pears, peaches, or all of the above? Will the Exotic Woodboring & Bark Beetle survey be conducted in a forest/wood environment or among warehouses? APHIS and PPQ are conducting industry sector meetings to hear the topics, issues, and concerns that are important to the various commodity industries. In preparation for these meetings, we are often asked to provide background information. For our part, that would be what states are conducting what surveys in the various commodities. Being able to provide this information on a commodity basis would be extremely helpful. Please keep this in mind when preparing 2016 work plans. This request is specific to the Survey Summary Form only, but should be included in the work plan as well. This is not a new data entry requirement. The new information request in the Survey Summary Form likely will not be ready for 2015 Farm Bill surveys.

### **2016 Guidelines**

The current process for updating the annual Survey Guidelines can be labor intensive, especially with the number of appendices attached to the Guidelines. Often these just need a date change, or do not change at all, but have to be treated as a new document if the current presentation of the Guidelines continues. The appendices have become part of the CAPS Program, some for many years. They have been incorporated into the Program, and are now simply the way we do business. Is it necessary to keep highlighting them as appendices in the Guidelines?

We propose to take the appendices out of the annual Guidelines, and instead post these documents in their proper place on the CAPS R&C website. Links in the Guidelines will point to these documents, which can be updated as needed. Future upgrades to the CAPS site will allow users to see when the document was last updated and determine that the present document contains the current guidance, regardless of when it was last updated. This process will maintain a review of the links and the documents to determine if any changes are needed, increase the role and ease of the NCC in reviewing these documents, and remove the process of handling each file multiple times to update the Guidelines on a yearly basis.



While the idea was acceptable to those on the call, the main concern expressed was the ability to easily find the information and be able to direct others to the information on the site. After the call, John sent to the NCC an outline of the proposed changes, including developing new pages to hold the information and links to the information. The former appendices should be accessible from links on the Guidelines page of the CAPS R&C site, as well as from inside the Guidelines document. The NCC was asked to review the proposed changes and discuss the change with their constituency.

### **Out-of-State Travel Limits**

Also discussed at the NCC meeting in Sacramento was possibly changing the out-of-state travel limits for SSCs from \$3,000 to \$5,000 to allow more travel to possible training or workshops. The Pest Detection Management Team considered this request, and decided that the limit will remain at \$3,000. This is the equitable amount for out-of-state travel for both PPQ and state cooperators. Potential travelers will need to set priorities to decide what is most important to their performance. The PDMT also recognizes the need for training and the benefits to the Program. Going forward, the Program will need to address training and planning for training, including setting aside money for training in the budget. A CAPS Training Coordinator was a topic at one point in time; perhaps it is time to renew that discussion.

### **NAPIS Data Entry – Funding Fields and Observation Number**

A Survey Update email was sent out last week clarifying guidance on 1) the new funding fields and 2) observation numbers in NAPIS. The email appears below as reference. Please contact Kathy if you have any questions.

1) Since the implementation of the new data entry fields in NAPIS, several issues arose that required some minor corrections and clarification. The new fields, Funding Year, Funding Source, and Survey Name, are intended to support the Accountability Report that will accurately match information from the Survey Summary Forms for CAPS and Farm Bill surveys with data entry in NAPIS.

To resolve these issues, we have limited the Funding Source choices to 1) CAPS, 2) Farm Bill, 3) State, and 4) Other. This means that cooperative agreements with cooperators funded either through CAPS/Pest Detection or Farm Bill would indicate this in the Funding Source field. Surveys funded with state money would be indicated as such. All other survey data funded from any other source, e.g., Forest Service, would simply be indicated as Other. In turn, we have expanded the Survey Name field when Funding Source of 'State' or 'Other' are chosen to include all possible survey names, as surveys with these funding sources will not be reflected in the CAPS or Farm Bill Accountability Report.

2) Another issue regarding Observation Numbers also has come to our attention when attempting to assist in data entry problems. Observation numbers in NAPIS are required to be alphanumeric (A-Z, 0-9) and must be unique in combination with User ID, Observation Year and Pest Code. These requirements have been in place as far back as 1996 and possibly earlier. However, some cooperators have been able to use hyphens and other non-



alphanumeric values when creating observation numbers. This has caused a problem for reporting outputs, especially when asking for a range of observation numbers. This query requires the range to be separated by a hyphen. We're not quite sure when, but during one of the system data entry updates the coding for the Observation Number to allow only alphanumerical values was lost. We're not changing any data already in NAPIS, but from this point forward any attempts to enter special characters such as hyphens, underscores, hash tags, plus signs, spaces etc., will be rejected. Reports requesting a range of observation numbers will be changed to require "thru" in the logic to alleviate problems for those existing records containing non-alphanumeric characters. As an example the request for a range of observation numbers would be "14BB001 thru 14BB050". The bottom line, only use alphanumeric (A-Z, 0-9) characters in the Observation Number field. Remember, that the Observation Number must be unique in combination with User ID, Observation Year and Pest Code.

### ***Striga* spp. (Witchweed)**

An issue came up a couple of weeks ago regarding *Striga* and corn seed exports. Argentina was challenging our freedom from this parasitic weed, and was requiring survey on the phytosanitary certificate. John Crowe received questions from India and Pakistan about *Striga* as well, so the issue may be larger. Brian asked those conducting a corn commodity survey to add this weed to their survey this year. Most will do so, but the main concern was identification help.

We removed Witchweed from the corn survey a few years ago. Should we add it back? There are pros and cons to this issue.

#### **PRO:**

1. Closely associated with the host (can focus on agricultural fields)
2. Most likely will generate negative data that will assist trade/export

#### **CON:**

1. Visual survey (most obvious when flowering), produces tons of tiny, tiny seeds, and a morphological ID is best when you have flowers present. Who would do the ID? Can states (other than NC or SC) do their own ID or will they require APHIS assistance?
2. Most of the APHIS staff that had Witchweed experience are long gone.
3. There are multiple (25-40 depending upon the source) *Striga* spp. There are differences between species but finding any could be problematic for trade/export. Who will decide what species to target?
4. Witchweeds are very difficult to manage. Florida has one *Striga* spp. present, but it may be more of a legume and tobacco parasite. However, it can affect corn. Will this further hinder trade?
5. Will there be an increased cost associated with adding this as a target (especially if only hanging traps initially) to surveys? Are we giving up surveys for valuable targets by adding these pests?



6. Federal noxious weeds: We get into the whole discussion of whether we should be doing weeds/parasitic plants because of Congressional funding direction.
7. *Striga* spp. can complete lifecycle in host stubble after harvest. So, in some cases it might not be visible during the regular growing or survey season.
8. If added as an official target, CPHST would need to develop information, guidance, datasheets, and approved methods. This would take away from other efforts.

The consensus is that we should investigate adding *Striga* back to the Corn Manual and Priority Pest List if a good survey method can be found. The ability to generate negative data for trade purposes overrode some of the cons.

### **Requests for survey outside of the main CAPS community**

Another topic for discussion came up the other day regarding providing traps for the Sentinel Plant Network. The Network is funded through Farm Bill for mostly information and outreach activities, both within the arboretums and gardens and with the public. The topic goes beyond this one network, and may apply to all public gardens and arboretums that may wish to survey their properties. What should our response be?

Several issues were brought up. First, APHIS cannot recommend any vendor over another. APHIS can provide Statements of Work (descriptions of the traps and lures) as these are public documents and provide the details for our current vendors and likely other providers. Also, there is a general policy that survey supply needs for Farm Bill-supported survey are provided through the Survey Supply Procurement Program (SSPP). Survey supplies for Farm Bill surveys are funded through the Farm Bill.

Other issues were raised with regard to training, specific targets, identification assistance, and the CAPS Approved Methods. For instance, ALB has no approved trap and/or lure. We would not support trapping for this pest. Other line items, e.g., EAB, also have limited funds and cannot support extras outside the program.

It was agreed that unless there was a national agreement for survey with PPQ and the Pest Detection program, the best advice would be for each participating garden or arboretum to connect with the state CAPS committee in their home state, and begin the conversation at the local level.

**The next NCC call will be held on Thursday, April 2, 2015, at 1:00 pm eastern time.**

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