

2016

National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey Program



Minutes of the National CAPS Committee (NCC) Annual Meeting

PPQ AZ SPHD Office & PPQ CPHST Phoenix Lab

Phoenix, Arizona

February 2 - 3, 2016



Annual National CAPS Committee Meeting
February 2 – 3, 2016
PPQ CPHST Phoenix Lab & PPQ AZ SPHD Office
Phoenix, Arizona
Meeting Minutes



Participants

John Bowers	Tyson Emery	Sherry Aultman	Alison Neeley
Brian Kopper	Carrie Larson*	Dale Anderson	Susan Schechter
Kristian Rondeau	Brad Lewis	Ian Foley	
Terry Bourgoin	Yolisa Ishibashi	Lisa Jackson	
Joel Bard	Mark Hitchcox	Melinda Sullivan	
Piera Siegert	Ruth Welliver	Dan Mackesy	

* For Julie Van Meter

Welcome, NCC Introductions

John Bowers welcomed the National CAPS Committee to the meeting. All members and guests present introduced themselves and explained their role on the committee.

State and PPQ Welcome and Overview

Jerry Levitt – Arizona SPHD and John Caravetta – Arizona SPRO

Jerry and John gave an overview of PPQ and state operations in Arizona and New Mexico. Agriculture is a \$17 billion industry in Arizona with exports worth over \$4 billion. The number one export in Arizona is vegetable seeds. Arizona can grow a variety of crop seeds and ships to 70 countries. The arid/desert environment lessens bacterial and fungal disease concerns. Any seed disease, however, is a concern for the state. The number two export from Arizona is lumber, primarily pine. The Forest Service is thinning forests after decades of unmanaged growth due to some major forest fires in recent years. Most lumber exports (~57%) go to Mexico. Other valuable crops grown in Arizona are pecans, pistachios, dates, alfalfa, onions, seed potatoes, and winter vegetables. Arizona can provide isolation but has created artificial areas where pests can become established via irrigation.

Arizona currently has 71 PPQ employees; New Mexico has 7. There are issues in Arizona with span of control. Three or four supervisors are managing 71 employees. The AQI programs in Arizona and New Mexico are similar to California and Florida but on a smaller scale. Arizona also has many domestic programs (Imported Fire Ant (IFA) exclusion, Fruit Fly, Asian Citrus Psyllid (ACP), Gypsy Moth (GM), etc.) and many tribal programs. There are between 21 and 22 tribes in each state. Arizona currently has no CAPS program but does participate in Farm Bill. New Mexico does participate in CAPS. The biggest programs in the state are ACP and GM. The biggest concern for Arizona is Huanglongbing (HLB). The state is surrounded on three sides by HLB. Other concerns are nut pests and date palm pests (i.e., South American palm weevil). The nut industry and date industry are growing rapidly, and the navel orangeworm is a

pest of concern. Pink bollworm will hopefully be considered eradicated in the Southwest in the next year.

Arizona has a successful water management program, so water and drought currently are not a major concern. The state has been banking groundwater for years. Water availability and quality are both good. Melon growers in California have taken note and are increasingly interested in moving to Arizona. Melon water in California is becoming more brackish, affecting melon quality. The regulatory environment is more favorable to industry. In addition, Arizona offers a unique phytosanitary status (free from a number of pests), which in the long-term will help other industries establish in Arizona. Also, Arizona is outside the HPAI (Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza) migratory flight paths, so there is increasing interest from the poultry industry in relocating to Arizona. There already is a large egg producing facility near Phoenix.

Why We Are Here and What We Need To Talk About

John discussed why we are here and some items that we need to talk about. Everyone is equal here and should speak up and be heard. We need consensus about where we are as a program and where we are going. The [Agenda](#) is posted on the CAPS site.

Field Ops Realignment

Brian gave an update on the Field Operations (FO) realignment. Nothing is official yet, but FO is proposing to transition to six districts. The driving force behind the change is span of control (supervisory ratios are too large). By modifying span of control, the Agency wants to limit the number of people below each supervisor. The proposal is to add more Associate Executive Directors (AEDs) to address the span of control. There is concern about how the Programs will be managed nationwide. How will there be consistency if one program covers six different districts? Would there be six different National Operations Managers (NOMs) covering CAPS and other programs or will the NOMs maintain the nationwide role for programs that are national like CAPS and Farm Bill? The Field Operation Realignment Transition Team (FORTT) is creating a plan for implementing this new structure.

NCC Bylaws review

[NCC Bylaws](#) were reviewed, and the consensus was they are good the way they are. NCC structure may be impacted by PPQ Field Operations realignment, but that remains to be seen. There was one minor change suggested:

Action item: Change the use of NAPIS to CAPSIS (CAPS Information Services) in the bylaws. There are more services offered through the Purdue Cooperative Agreement than just the NAPIS database.

Representation and Terms (Graphic of terms in meeting packet)

[NCC Term Limits and Rotations](#) were reviewed. Several representatives (Joel, Julie, Yolisa, Ian) are in their final year of a 3-year term in 2016. State representatives were happy with the current level of Plant Board representation but had concerns if six operations managers for CAPS and Farm Bill were added due to the Field Ops realignment. The level of state and federal representation should be balanced as much as possible. If the six operations manager concept is chosen, there may have to be a representative chosen to represent the whole group (similar to the Plant Board representation). Keeping the Annual NCC Meeting to 20 or fewer people is optimal.

2015 NCC Meeting review

After review of the [2015 NCC Meeting Minutes](#), is there anything we need to address from 2015?

How can states estimate how much funding they will get from Farm Bill? What happens when states put in a suggestion for CAPS while awaiting approval for a survey for Farm Bill? This issue will be discussed later in the agenda.

Joel asked for an update on the GAP analysis project, which was presented by the CPHST team in 2015. For this project, CPHST completed gap analyses on six example pests to examine which states have been looking for each pest versus who should be looking for each pest based on risk (host presence, climate conditions, and/or pathway). The CPHST team is still reviewing the GAP analysis project, and recommendations are still pending. Some patterns were identified as to how CPHST and states can both improve their operations. The overall consensus, however, was that the states were doing a pretty good job aligning risk with what surveys were being conducted. This project has fallen to the backburner for the time being but is still on the CAPS program's radar. The CPHST CAPS Support Team had staffing issues in the last year and their resources are limited. Due to changes in the pest lists and additional surveys that have occurred over the past year, these analyses would need to be updated if they were to be used for programmatic decisions versus information gathering.

CAPS Processes

John reviewed the flowchart of [CAPS Processes](#) (from pest lists to approved methods to survey summary form to survey to accomplishment reports, etc.). Everything in the flowchart revolves around the Survey Summary Form. John also has started creating a Prezi presentation of the CAPS process. Prezi is an online presentation program, but is not yet supported by the Department.

Action item: The CAPS program is in need of a dynamic presentation to help educate the CAPS community (new and experienced) on CAPS processes and how our information systems tie

everything together. We are looking for volunteers to help create this dynamic presentation in any medium. Carrie and Susan offered some names. A good graphic designer would be great. NCC members should ask their constituencies for volunteers to work with John.

CAPS Performance

John reviewed the performance measures for Pest Detection (CAPS and PPQ) and Farm Bill (National Priority) surveys. The [NCC Measures](#) presentation can be found on the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site under the Phoenix meeting heading. [Supplemental material](#) also is available. The NCC should encourage their constituency to review the presentation and supplemental materials, and forward any topics for discussion and/or clarification.

Action Item: NCC should ask their constituency: What information would the CAPS community want to see; how best to present this information in the future; and how would they like to review it.

CAPS and Farm Bill surveys were discussed. The overlap between the two has been problematic. A long term goal would be to continue to work to find the best solution to maximize program efficiency and funding. The NCC discussed the issues from the PPQ and state perspective of managing surveys from both CAPS and FB.

- A problem with Farm Bill funding of surveys in the Northeastern states is that specialty crops are not covered in CAPS, and adequate funding is not assured for Farm Bill surveys. This puts these states in a bind in terms of planning and maintaining resources. There is a real perception in the states that Farm Bill funding is a competition and getting adequate funding is uncertain at best.
- The topic of Farm Bill suggestions also came up. Ruth noted that there is little incentive for states to get creative with new Goal 1 Survey suggestions. The states want certainty, and the typical suggestions (featuring priority pests/surveys) are the ones that are most likely to get funded. On that note, why would states put more effort into the typical suggestion other than cutting and pasting if it is almost guaranteed to get funded?
- There will be a Farm Bill Accountability Report in the future to mirror the CAPS Accountability Report to check for appropriate data entry.

Funding Measures

Funding for FY14 and FY15 CAPS and Farm Bill surveys was discussed. For FY15, CAPS recorded 122 surveys for a total of \$2.6 million, while Farm Bill National Priority (not all of

Goal 1 Survey) recorded 80 surveys for a total of \$5.3 million (less surveys, more funding). Also from FY14 to FY15, Farm Bill National Priority surveys had an increase in total funding, but the number of surveys did not increase. For example, the stone fruit survey budget went from \$300,000 to \$1.0 million, but decreased from 12 to 9 states. Are Farm Bill surveys increasing the scope of individual surveys over what is possible with CAPS funding??

- Piera noticed when comparing the funding levels for EWB/BB surveys that Farm Bill was funding those surveys about three times the amount as CAPS. However, we do not have a thorough understanding of the scope of these surveys.
- Questions to be asked include: Are Farm Bill surveys actually enhancing CAPS surveys; What are the differences between CAPS and Farm Bill surveys; Do Farm Bill surveys cover more ground (trap sites) than CAPS surveys; Are more pests being targeted; Is more survey being conducted than that possible through CAPS surveys? There may be other surveys that cross over CAPS and Farm Bill that might be good to examine as well.
- Farm Bill funding timing is problematic for hiring staff; CAPS is problematic due to limited resources. Are the surveys different based on funding source?

Action item: Piera will review information for CAPS and Farm Bill EWB/BB surveys with regard to targets, sites, and funding. What increased benefits are being returned for the appearance of increased funding through Farm Bill?

Funding for CAPS survey and infrastructure has remained relatively constant over the last several years due to the fact that the Pest Detection line item has not had an increase in several years. The question about infrastructure vs. survey funding came up again. Is Pest Detection footing the bill for other activities? Yes, Infrastructure funding supports work for other PPQ programs. An inquiry by Dan confirmed this. PPQ Management appears to support the status quo as long as programs are running smoothly. This work for other programs creates a drain on Pest Detection funding, but supports the critical SSC position and all of PPQ programs with work in the states. The question is; how does CAPS support PPQ work while remaining fiscally accountable to Pest Detection funding from Congress. Here lies the conundrum.

Some states have an SSC on state funds, but still take Infrastructure money to supplement their programs. It was suggested that states be canvassed to find out who has their SSC on permanent state monies. Maybe this can lower the overall infrastructure cost in those states and provide some relief to a strained Pest Detection budget. Some states (e.g., PA and WA) already ask for

little or no Infrastructure because the SSC position is state-supported. Most, if not all, of their CAPS funding is put into Survey.

States are at their survey capacity, and survey performance measures should not be expected to increase. The number of pests on the Priority Pest List has increased to around 154 for 2016, which causes the percentage of Priority Pests targeted for survey to go down because states are at their capacity. CPHST CAPS Support is at their capacity as well. They cannot support any further increase in the Priority Pest List (Datasheets, Approved Methods, etc.) and still do other work in support of CAPS. There will be an effort to reduce the number of Priority Pests and pests in commodity/taxon surveys for 2017.

Purdue Update

Susan provided a [CAPS Services Update](#), and reviewed the Survey Summaries process. For 2016, Trap & Lure is now a required field for the Survey Summary Form. Use code 3001 for all trap surveys. Lisa Jackson is working to get all traps and lures in the database even for state pests that do not have Approved Methods since these fields are now required. She is not approving the trap or lure, but working on a standard naming convention and making sure everything is available to the users. This effort has already taken ~120 hours of her time. The hope is that each year the time required decreases as more pests are surveyed for and more trap and lure names are entered. This will also help on the data entry side for pests that do not have an Approved Method since the My Surveys template is derived from the Survey Summary Form information.

Beginning in 2016 there will be a single user interface for the Survey Summary Forms. It will be flexible and able to handle changes in plans. In the past, there has been up to three different forms (one each for CAPS, FB, and PPQ surveys). A Survey Summary Change Request Form will become available with the change to a single user interface. This will allow survey data to be modified as surveys change. This then will ensure that the Accountability Reports match intended surveys with data entry. Accountability Reports will be extended to leverage funding source fields.

Survey Method Reconciliation is still in progress. This project will reduce the number and variety of Survey Methods in NAPIS in favor of referring to the Approved Methods for Pest Surveillance (AMPS). Under the new system, there will be three procedures: Trap & Lure, Visual, or Sample. For Trap & Lures, the NAPIS Survey Method has been distilled down to a single code, 3001, for all trapping surveys.

For Visual and Sample methods, the number of codes has increased substantially over time. States have requested new codes to match up with their survey work. We are working to

minimize and simplify the number of codes, but also strike a balance with what is needed and informative.

Action item: What information for sample collection and visual surveys do we need in order to capture what we are doing? Can we request certain information common to a sample collection or visual survey so that the number of existing Survey Methods in NAPIS can be eliminated, blended, melded, or otherwise reduced? The NCC should request volunteers in their constituency to help (2-3 hours of time is all that will be required). Ruth volunteered, but other volunteers are needed. Pass along the names of volunteers to Susan so she can set up times to work on this as a group.

The Host Code is required for validation of pathogen data. Can negative data be recorded with family level hosts? The final thought was that negative data should be entered at the genus or species level if at all possible, but may be entered at the family level if necessary. The best informative information available is always a good guide. Positive data needs to be at the species level.

One state would like to report trap services in addition to traps. We do not think this is necessary. Summary data for a trap is as granular as needed. The state should keep trap service information locally for survey management purposes.

Should Observation Year and Funding Year match up for data validation purposes? Consensus is no. Some surveys cross years, e.g., Farm Bill surveys when the funding comes too late to carry out the survey in the same calendar year. No validation will be implemented.

Action item: What does the CAPS community want to see on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration site in terms of the program's performance, metrics, and accomplishments? What narrative, text, tables, graphs, and/or photos will help explain the CAPS program? The NCC should discuss reporting needs with their constituency.

Action item: The NCC needs to provide biographies and photo to Susan. The CAPS community should know the NCC better.

Farm Bill Update

The spending plan has been prepared but held up for a month. It should be submitted next week, and the official press release should come soon. Note: The FY16 Farm Bill Spending Plan was released on February 11, 2016. It can be found on the [Farm Bill page](#) on the APHIS website.

After the spending plan is released, states will be contacted to confirm their participation with the funding amount being offered, and work plans will be requested. Last year, the target date for implementing cooperative agreements was July 1. Expect a similar situation this year. Work plans will need to be submitted as soon as possible.

Next week, there is a meeting in Riverdale with FBMF and Farm Bill Team Leads and Co-leads. The goal is to review the program, what is working and not working.

CAPS Program Discussion

Currently, the early pest detection mission is fragmented across programs, with different protocols, processes, timelines, and funding sources. It is inefficient and ineffective to manage each process separately to arrive at the same goal. Changes are proposed to provide efficient and effective oversight and coordination of the early detection mission based on national priorities and risk, as well as fiscal responsibility and accountability. Ideally, CAPS, PPQ, and Farm Bill Goal 1 surveys would be managed as one Pest Surveillance system with a focus on National Priority Surveys. The overall ideas are to be able to look at all surveys at the same time, better match survey to funding source, and identify gaps in our pest surveillance system. If we were to go this route, and take the perceived competition for Farm Bill funds out of the process and assure each state a minimum amount of funding (e.g., no less than what a state is receiving now through CAPS), what would this look like?

There was a lot of discussion around this, and some of the comments are highlighted below.

- If we know we are going to fund something year after year, why go through the process over and over again? We want to identify surveys which we are committed to and a projected level of support. We could take these surveys out of the traditional Farm Bill suggestion process. This could streamline the Goal 1 Survey review process.
- How do we ensure equitable funding from state to state? We could end up with one suggestion to review instead of 40. Could be prescribed or not (i.e., honeybee).
- Farm Bill funding really is uncertain, and it is hard to keep resources in place with that uncertainty.
- Do states strategically apply for funding through CAPS and Farm Bill? Some states submitted identical proposals to both. Current process makes this hard to keep track of with limited time and staff.
- Sherri would like for someone to give the money, say what to do, and say how to do it. She is supportive of this process as long as states are treated fairly (not all funds going to one or a few favored states). She trusts that Farm Bill process will be fair to her state and plans ahead.

- States would need to know what to expect regardless of the source of the funds.
- For G1S, this could mimic what is happening with emergency response. A chunk of funds is held back for survey. States or the Program would submit one overall suggestion for funding, and the funds are tracked separately.
- A state may, for example, have Infrastructure funded by Pest Detection and three Farm Bill surveys. States may do better with only one combined pot of money to worry about, and may prevent fishing for surveys, i.e., a state deciding to do a lesser priority survey for their state just to get a certain amount of funding through the current dichotomy.
- As an example, John proposed a hybrid process with some sort of simple suggestion process where states list/submit their surveys in priority order with target pests and basic cost estimate. The NCC could then meet as a group and develop a Pest Detection and Farm Bill National Priority spending plans based on the state's priorities. Surveys proposed by PPQ offices would be considered along with everything else. States could be assured that they will get a minimum amount of funding to meet salary, etc. needs but that doesn't guarantee funding higher than their CAPS totals, but could be an increase.
- Even if this new approach is adopted, the process of funding states does not change. Pest Detection funds are subject to Congressional appropriations and Continuing Resolutions. The release of Farm Bill funds is dependent more on the political process. For the past couple of years, however, a fiscal year allocation and the release of the Farm Bill spending plan have occurred somewhat close to each other in the early part of the calendar year.
- Ian had some concern about national program managers making decisions for his state. The industry in his state is involved in selecting CAPS target pests and prioritizing surveys. Industry knows the priorities for their state vs. someone at a national level.
- Would states still have discretion as to what they survey for? What if states are told what to survey for? Would that work out for everyone?
- If states knew what to expect, wouldn't that help?
- Each state gets about the same Farm Bill funding over all the goals, year after year. How much is each state getting from Goal 1 Survey?
- CAPS funding is flat for the foreseeable future while Farm Bill funding has increased. What it boils down to is how do we leverage the different funding sources to achieve the early detection mission?

Action item: Can we get a more singular funding/survey process regarding CAPS and Farm Bill Goal 1 Survey? How do we do this? How do we make it happen? Where does the message come from? Who and when? The NCC should talk with their constituency. What's their opinion? How would we get on the same page? What are issues with the current status quo?

Action item: John will prepare a message that the NCC can use to poll their constituencies and initiate conversations. Would they be supportive of pursuing an alternative funding strategy?

The group discussed whether we can bring this up at the regional plant board meetings. John and Brian think it is premature to discuss at a plant board meeting. John has not fully discussed this concept with his management. The PDMT and The FBMT are meeting in early March to discuss this issue further. The path forward and messaging the results of the discussion will be decided then. In the meantime, the thoughts of the constituency groups are needed to help inform the discussions.

Funding Update

The FY16 Pest Detection appropriation from Congress is the same as FY15. The President's proposed appropriation language for FY17 does not specifically mention Pest Detection, so it likely will be the same as FY16 unless Congress changes it. The FY18 budget process starts in a couple of weeks, and we are limited internally in our ability to request budget increases.

The FY16 Pest Detection line item will have an approximately \$1.7 million deficit when the allocation tables for PPQ are released. It is very highly unlikely that cooperative agreements will be touched. Regardless, the ability to increase the amount of Pest Detection funding for cooperative agreements and other initiatives is severely limited now and into the future. The issue is to figure a way out of this funding rut and/or obtain an increase.

- Mark offered that there could be some better storytelling from the field level. The budget process starts in the field. What is the true need, as opposed to wants, for people at the state level?
- Who else is noticing that we start every year in the hole? How real of a problem is this if every year it is absorbed somewhere.
- The Program put in for an increase of \$8.0 million as part of an effort to support exports, but that did not pan out.

Action item: John and Brian to continue to bring this issue up with PPQ management. How do we ask for more funding in the best possible way?

Pest Prioritization Model Revision Project Update

Alison reviewed the pest prioritization models that were presented to the NCC previously, and shared with the NCC the draft list of pests. The [Pest Prioritization](#) presentation is on the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site. Currently an arthropod and pathogen model is complete, and a mollusk one is in the works. Under the new models, pests are categorized into risk groups (high, moderate, and low impact) and not ranked in numerical order. As such, the addition or

subtraction of a pest will not change or impact other pests in the model (unlike the Analytical Hierarchy Process, AHP). The new prioritized pest list will be termed the Objective Prioritization of Exotic Pests (OPEP).

The models were developed by statistically validating the importance that specific questions have regarding a pest's impact. In this manner, many questions about the biology and perceived risk of a pest were reduced to those that will have impact. The output is in terms of the probability of having an impact. As a result, uncertainty can be determined. This should aid in decisions about survey and prioritization about needed method development. Economic inputs and outputs of the model will be available in a couple of years. CPHST CAPS Support and CPHST PERAL are working to get everything in order to roll out the new prioritized list with supplemental documentation in April, with the 2017 Survey Guidelines.

There will be some changes in the status of a few pests with the new model. Some highly ranked pests will not be so highly ranked in the new model, but are ranked more in line with observed impact rather than perception. See comments below under Pest Lists. Documentation explaining the impacts will be available.

There was a lot of interest and discussion around the question in the model dealing with control practices. Several NCC members brought up organic production and that some cropping systems may be changing (use of cover crops becoming more popular). There was concern that the PERAL analysts may not understand all of the nuances of each cropping system. Lisa observed this when reviewing the arthropod assessments. Could the NCC provide guidance on this? Could it be addressed during a review process?

Action item: Alison is to reach out to the NCC to determine the best way to ensure that the analysts are using the most current information regarding control practices in different cropping systems. Can this be achieved through a review process of the assessments or some type of guidelines?

Along these lines, there was interest in how the brown marmorated stink bug would have ranked using this model. This is a pest that has caused impacts to organic production and also has had worse impacts than expected because of changes to control regimens. Several of the members of the NCC expressed interest in seeing this pest being run through the model.

Action item: Alison will provide results of brown marmorated stink bug to the NCC once it has been run through the OPEP model as an exercise to determine the effects of control practices in different agricultural environments.

The NCC wanted to know what the archiving process would be for assessments and how frequently the assessments would be updated. Like NPAG, the plan is to archive the assessments and references and only revisit them if we are prompted to do so. Anyone could reach out to Alison if new information on the pest is available and the assessment should be re-opened.

The NCC asked if S&T planned on providing training to state cooperators on how to use the model to perform assessments for pests of interest to the state (similar to the weed model)? That is possible, but that would be in the future. A substantial training would definitely be required to conduct the assessments properly.

A summary document is being prepared for every pest in the OPEP list. State cooperators would like access to them. Should we institute a review process? There also was interest in being able to see the full Excel file, including questions, evidence, and references. The CAPS community should be able to review the assessments and provide additional information.

This is a touchy subject given that the manner in which a pest was assessed and the probability of risk given to a pest may have trade implications. If we are not in agreement with a trade issue, then everyone has a problem. The OPEP models and list have yet to be shared with the trade folks, so we should be cautious until then. One suggestion would be to house the documents on the CAPS R&C behind the login. Some NCC members thought the summaries should be completely public. What are potential pitfalls for making this all public? Are there any trade concerns?

Action item: The NCC is to discuss how to make available the OPEP summaries. Do they need to be behind a login? Is there any information in the summaries that should not be public?

Due: April 1.

Action item: What would be the best way to present the OPEP results and information to the CAPS community? We need feedback by the March NCC call. The NCC is to discuss the matter with their constituencies.

Due: March 3 (next NCC call).

CPHST CAPS Support

Pest Lists

Lisa Jackson discussed observations on the new pest model from the arthropod perspective. Main observations include:

- If the pest consistently damages the host, it receives a higher score.
- Moths (the larval stage) consistently damage the marketable portion of many crops and usually receive a high score.

- In the past, it was thought that if a pest was polyphagous (having many hosts), that this characteristic would make the pest a high impact pest. This was disproved in the new model. Pests may have a limited host range but may still cause devastating losses to those hosts. Polyphagous pests ranked higher in last model.
- The model does not include the economic value of the hosts. In the previous model, if the pest had a high value host crop (citrus, pine, wheat, etc.), its score would be inflated. In this model, only the impacts of the pest (damage) are being assessed.
- Some forest pests moved down in rank drastically for several reasons:
 - Pests that only cause problems in one portion of their established range do not score as high. Wood-boring beetles and bark beetles often have inconsistent damage throughout their range.
 - Outbreak pests do not score as high (do not consistently cause damage at all times).
 - It is hard to predict how wood-boring beetles and bark beetles will behave in a new environment. Moths usually act consistently.
 - Due to the large amount of acreage of pine, some pine pests in the previous model were ranked higher based on host acreage.
- If the pest could likely be controlled in the majority of its cropping systems by control regimens already in place, the score was lowered. These pests were ranked higher previously, but would be expected to be controlled in most of their host cropping systems:
 - *Helicoverpa armigera* (Old World bollworm) (Score: high or moderate)
 - *Nysius huttoni* (Wheat bug) (Score: low)

Melinda discussed observations on the new pest model from the pathogen perspective.

- Many were ranked higher with the new model. Instead of 19 in the top 58, there are now 20 in the top 45.
- Plant death and control measures were significant criteria. Only three existing CAPS pathogens ranked as low in the new model. However, pathogens are more likely to fall off the list after post-assessments are analyzed.

There are still 10 pathogens pending the outcome of the post-assessment. If they pass the post-assessment, they would be added to priority pest listing.

- *Magnaporthe oryzae* triticum strain (wheat blast) ranked high but failed post-assessment based on lack of diagnostic methods. Fort Detrick and Kansas State University have been working on this pathogen for several years and have a new PCR available for diagnostics. After further validation, this pathogen will likely be available for survey in 2018.
- Although *Rathayibacter toxicus* ranked low in the new model based on its plant impacts, CPHST is further evaluating this pest. The damage is really to animals (death) but PPQ is the only one doing surveys for this organism.

Pre-assessment and Post-assessment

A new question was added to the Pre-assessment, “Is citrus the only important host for this pest?” If the pest is primarily a citrus pest, the pest will be referred to the CPHST citrus team for further analysis.

We discussed the post-assessment process. How specific do the traps need to be? Pheromone traps are best. Generic traps are not as good since they attract many non-targets. There are genus-level pheromone traps for long-horned beetles that will be available soon that are very effective for beetles in that genus.

Outcome for Pests in the New Model

Pests fall into three categories:

Category 1 (High and some Moderate pests)

- Pests have a greater than 20% probability of being a high impact pest.
- If the pest passes the Post-assessment, it will be included on the Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance List.
- Pests will also be added to relevant commodity manuals.
- If pests fail the Post-assessment, they will be placed on a priority list for research.

Category 2 (Moderate pests)

- Pests are most likely to have a moderate impact.
- These pests will not be part of the Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance List.
- Pests that are recommended for survey and pass the Post-assessment will be added to a commodity manual or posted as free-standing datasheets.
- If pests fail the Post-assessment, they may or may not be listed as priorities for research.

Category 3 (Low impact pests)

- Pests are most likely to have a low impact.
- These pests will not be included on the Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance List.
- New pests assessed will not be included in a commodity manual or posted as free-standing datasheets.
- Existing pests present in a commodity-manual will likely be removed from manuals over time.

Pests Analyzed in New Model

CPHST analyzed 53 of the pests from the current Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance List. In addition, 38 new pests were analyzed. These pests came from sources such

as PestLens, the 2012 OPIS A List, the CAPS Community, the New Pest Advisory Group (NPAG), CPHST, and other sources.

Of the new pests analyzed, 7 arthropods and 10 plant pathogens ranked high enough to be considered for addition to the 2017 Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance List or commodity manuals. These pests are currently being analyzed in the Post-assessment process for survey and diagnostic/identification method availability.

We discussed weeds briefly; the weeds are in limbo. Perhaps we can look at them separately. They don't do well with our current process.

Low-ranking pests

Can we remove the low pests from commodity manuals? Consensus is to leave them in the commodity manuals through 2017. Once the model has been validated, low-ranking pests may be removed from commodity manuals. This will be done in the 2018 guidelines.

Action Item: Lisa will add a note to the 2017 guidelines: "After the model has been validated, low-ranking pests may be removed from commodity manuals. This process will begin in the 2018 Guidelines."

Due: April 2016.

Action Item: Lisa will remove the low-ranking pests from commodity manuals for the 2018 guidelines.

Due: April 2017.

Survey Manuals Update

Melinda went over the manual updates and changes for 2017. The [Tropical Hosts](#) manual is complete and available now on the CAPS R&C site. An Apple/Pear commodity manual is a new manual scheduled for delivery for the 2018 survey year.

Melinda also went over the manual and datasheet update process. Some changes are made yearly to datasheets and manual. Ideally, we completely revise datasheets every 3-4 years. Pine manual and datasheets will be revised by August, 2016. Oak manual and datasheets will be revised by August, 2017.

Mixed Forest Surveys

Do people do surveys just for oak? Can we add oak pests to a forest pest survey? The group decided to table this idea for now and revisit it in the future. As we update the manuals to free-standing form, it will be easier to mix and match them.

The ‘expanded’ commodity matrix will be a helpful resource for identifying pests and their hosts. Additional columns have been added for common shrubs and woody plants. In addition, more tree species are listed out specifically. When people create a forest pest survey, they can pick out appropriate pests using the matrix. The hosts will be added to the Survey Summary Form (e.g. cherry in a stone fruit survey).

Action item: Lisa will make sure all relevant EWB/BB targets are listed in the Oak and Pine manuals so surveyors don’t miss them. Also, add any oak or pine targets to the EWB/BB manual that are missing.

Surveys in nurseries

What pests are likely to found in which nurseries? Some nurseries are mixed. Would there be signs or symptoms present in a nursery? How can we be sure the pests are covered in the best way possible?

Action item: The CPHST core team will include nursery-specific information for pests when available.

Other suggested manuals

- 1) Small Fruit/Berry
- 2) Dry Bean/Pea/Pulse

Ian agreed to be a champion when CPHST revises the Soybean manual. It could be renamed “Soybean and Pulse Crops” and could include additional hosts and pests.

Pest Risk Mapping Catalogue

New Mapping Strategy

A year ago, CPHST decided not to support NAPPFAST. Therefore, we are developing new risk maps and a process by which they are made. Two main tools are being used currently: Host distribution and predictive weather forecasting (e.g. pest events, climate suitability).

The project lead is Lisa Kennaway. CPHST scientist Gericke Cook is working on weather forecasting and mapping products with Dr. Len Coop at Oregon State University.

This project is still in its infancy, but has a PPQ-State support group to help guide it through the early stages. Processes are still being worked out. Maps will be available in the future, but we are still working out what will be available and how the CAPS community will access the output. Host maps are being worked on now and may be available in the near future. There are six pests of variable biology that are on the year 1 pest list for the weather forecasting. These will help

resolve many of the questions the team has. All maps and the data used to create the mapping products may be available via SAFARIS housed at North Carolina State University.

CAPS 2017 Survey Guidelines

The NCC was asked to review the 2016 National Survey Guidelines before the meeting. For calendar year 2016, the timeline will remain the same. The 2017 Guidelines are due to be published on the CAPS R&C site on April 22 (Earth Day). Work plans will be due to Field Operations in mid-August. The change in format from appendices to the Resources page on the CAPS site worked well and will continue for 2017.

Cooperative agreement change

Kristian explained that changes are coming for submitting work plans and the whole cooperative agreement process, not likely this year, but definitely for next year (FY18). A new USDA system called Grantor (ezFedGrants) will be used. Grantor is, “A comprehensive, cradle-to-grave, grants and agreements management solution in the Federal sector that increases operational effectiveness and improves program results.” The system will be piloted in 2016, and go operational in 2017. Grantor will require Level 2 eAuthorization for access. For now, the guidelines will remain the same with work plan submitted through the SPHD to the FO SharePoint site. Grantor will start being explained at the Regional Plant Board Meetings.

See <https://www.pegasys.com/system/files/docs/2015/Jun/USDA-Digital-Government-Evolution-Case-Study-The-Need-for-Reuse.pdf> for a general overview.

Action item: The NCC needs to prepare the CAPS community for the change. Training will be needed by all, including state fiscal personnel and anyone who participates in the cooperative agreement process. Be prepared. Inform your constituencies. Who will need training? Get everyone trained.

CAPS Recognition

CAPS recognition submissions are due soon. Continue to encourage nominations for worthy individuals and groups.

Combining work plans into an agreement - Options

A discussion was held on the benefits of combining work plans into a single cooperative agreement. Presently, individual Survey work and financial plans can be combined into a single submission with an overall financial plan. Several states have taken advantage of this to ease the paper work necessary for a single agreement as opposed to several. Infrastructure is still a separate work plan and agreement.

The question was then raised as to taking the next step and combining all survey into one work and financial plan. Can all the information be placed in one work plan? Can Infrastructure be included to create just one overarching plan? Would that work? How would the budget be presented?

Why did we keep infrastructure separate from survey? It's a matter of debate. In theory, the work is different.

Problem: Combining several work plans into one would make the cost per survey unclear if there is only one financial plan for everything. It may be arbitrary already, however. Some states divide their survey costs evenly (such as Tennessee).

Possible solution: List out the cost of each survey on the Survey Summary Form individually as done presently to show how the final figure is determined.

The consensus appears that we can leave things the way they are and encourage people to do a single work plan. The financial system, rules, regulations, etc. in some state preclude doing this, so we cannot make it mandatory.

Action item: Brian, Sherri, Ian, and Joel will write up an example of a survey work and financial plan that includes the bundled surveys in one work plan. This will serve as an example of the format and be a starting point for further discussion.

Action item: The NCC will ask its constituencies about mandatory vs. optional combining of survey work plans into a single agreement. How would that affect them?

An alternate approach is to keep infrastructure separate and offer the combining of surveys.

Data Management

IPHis is on life support only. A new PPQ Domestic Data Systems Task Force is beginning anew to look into data systems needed by domestic programs. It is unknown what this means for IPHis at this time, but it does not involve the CAPS program. We will continue to use NAPIS as our repository of all survey data and results for the foreseeable future.

Action item: Strike IPHis from all CAPS documents. Cooperative agreements should specify NAPIS as the repository for data. Provide guidance on where to input data from PPQ surveys (EWB/BB often gets neglected since there is no designated NOM/PM). Since this is a popular survey from multiple funding sources, need to ensure the dataset is complete.

National CAPS Meeting Update & Planning

We are hopeful for a national meeting in Albuquerque in November, 2016. John reviewed the status of obtaining meeting approval.

What happened in 2015? We proposed a version of the meeting that appeared to be not in line with the philosophy of what a PPQ meeting should be. This made no sense to us and was not in line with the needs of the program or the success of past meetings. The focus was narrow where it should have been broad, and not helping to achieve needed goals and networking as identified by the program. The time required to go back and forth with management took too long. Based on the time left before the meeting, we decided that it would be best to postpone the CAPS Meeting. There were multiple factors that went into this decision. Chief among these is the need to address several challenges in the Pest Detection Program with PPQ management, including the FY16 budget, and gain a consensus internally about moving forward.

To get approval: We need a package of information, including a decision memo that goes to the PPQ Deputy Administrator, Osama El-Lissy, and ultimately to the APHIS Administrator, Kevin Shea, for approval. The memo got hung up at John's management level. They thought Osama would not approve our version of the meeting based on what he has been approving and denying recently.

Problems: Most of our leadership has never been to a CAPS meeting. They may not understand the importance of it and the importance of getting people together. The term, "networking" apparently is not a good reason to have the meeting and should not be used in the decision memo, although one of the greatest benefits to the CAPS program is having people talking to each other who ordinarily would not get the chance.

The NCC discussed some solutions.

- Talk about the new people who have come into the program, e.g., new SPHDs and SSCs.
- Possibly include some ADODR training, and Grantor training.
- How has the CAPS program benefitted from prior national meetings? Advocate for policy management, advocate for export.
- Is CAPS a victim of its own success? Are we working so well that we are being ignored? Perhaps we need to promote CAPS better. Promote our successes.
- We need to handle it both internally and externally.
- Schedule a special topic with the PPQ management team after each member of the Pest Detection Management Team gets by-in from their respective Management Team representative.



- Is this a CAPS meeting or a Pest Surveillance meeting? Include Farm Bill. Maybe we can get Farm Bill funds rolled into this if we change the name.
- Our main objective is to promote the meeting and convince management that it is needed. Pest Surveillance, Grantor, are good angles.

Big challenge: For the meeting to occur in November, 2016 in Albuquerque, we need to carve out funding for PPQ with FY17 money. However, states will have to travel on FY16 agreement money. John does not have extra money to provide for state travel. When the meeting was delayed from FY15, John lost the extra money he had on hand to support state travel.

Deadline for approval is around April 22, 2016, if we want to have it this year.

Action item: 1) **PDMT, NCC:** Develop proposal for value of holding the national meeting. Include real numbers (employees, cost-savings, etc.) of benefits of holding previous meeting and benefits of holding this meeting. 2) **PDMT:** Gain approval/buy in within each CFA. 2) **PDMT:** Schedule a special topic with the PPQ management team.