



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

June 2, 2016

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Piera Siergert	Mark Hitchcox	Heather Moylett
Brian Kopper	Tyson Emery	Ruth Welliver	Dan Mackesy
Rick Zink	Julie Van Meter	Dale Anderson	Steve Bullington
Terry Bourgoin	Brad Lewis	Ian Foley	Susan Schechter
Joel Bard	Yolisa Ishibashi	Melinda Sullivan	Eileen Luke

2017 Survey Guidelines

As of yet, the NCC did not have any feedback from their constituency about the 2017 Guidelines that were published on April 22. The PDMT would like to know what everyone thinks in order to better serve the community. The CPHST CAPS Support Team put a lot of work into getting the 2017 Guidelines published on time, and also would like to hear back from constituents.

No one quite knows what ezFedGrants will look like yet, or when it actually will be implemented. The target date is October 1, but like other large encompassing systems, one can never tell. There has been some talk that other Agencies are having difficulties, and there still are questions like; will we be using the same forms, will we upload documents or complete everything online, how will reimbursements work, and when will training occur.

Since the target date for going live with ezFedGrants is after the date when work and financial plans are due, the CAPS program will keep to the processes already in place as used in previous years. States will complete the work and financial forms, submit them to their SPHD, who will enter them into the Field Operations SharePoint site as specified in the 2017 National Pest Surveillance Guidelines (do not forget to enter your survey information into the Survey Summary Form on the CAPS R&C site).

National CAPS Meeting

In preparing for a National CAPS Meeting, and what it will take to get the meeting approved, perhaps the best approach is to start over. The objectives, justification, outcomes, and agenda that were developed are solid and would result in a successful meeting, but are not going to be approved in the current climate. We need to satisfy certain perceptions, and the best way to do that is to start again fresh.

The best approach may be to identify 2, 3, or 4 really focused, important topics that need to be discussed, develop white papers for these topics, and then build the agenda around them. These topics will focus our objectives for the meeting with the result of tangible outcomes to really

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.



drive and strengthen the justification for having the meeting. With these in place we can then add those extras that we really need to do without diluting the main thrusts of the justification.

The target date for the meeting is the week of November 13, 2017. This gives us about 17 months to develop the meeting, gain approval, and prepare to deliver it. It may seem a long way off, but it is not, and a lot has to be done. We start now, all of us, together.

The NCC should talk with their constituency, brainstorm, and collect ideas on what could be main topics that need face-to-face discussion and resolution from their unique perspective. Topics may be cross-cutting and be of interest to all, be specific to a peer group, or be of regional interest. Some topics to build around may include: agreements and audits; budget realities, are our roles and responsibilities still the same, are we optimizing our resources, and what can we not afford to do anymore; data management; legal implications to survey, permits, fees, etc., support for screening, identification, and diagnostics, and do we have sufficient resources; and learning opportunities. Please have your conversations and submit your topics and feedback this summer. We would like to start putting things down on paper early this fall, and have white papers completed and vetted before the end of the year.

A question arose about funding and the need to put travel to the meeting in state FY17 budgets. FY17 budgets in PPQ currently are being developed. Whether funds need to be requested in FY17 financial plans, or supplemented later still needs to be resolved. PPQ travel will be in FY18. An update and further guidance will be communicated on the July NCC call.

As a check, and to make sure that holding the meeting is fully supported by the CAPS community, and from what the PDMT has heard it is, please ask your constituency if this is indeed true.

- Ruth asked this of the EPB SSC group, and those who previously had attended the meeting were greatly supportive. There was one SSC who felt she didn't get more out of it than what she already got out of the EPB meeting. A SPHD expressed the wish that there would be a National CAPS Meeting because the SPHDs and SPROs are always separated out from the CAPS breakout and did not have the chance to participate.
- Ian offered that the national meeting is important for the western CAPS community because the WPB meeting does not have a CAPS breakout.
- Dale said that the CPB is in the same boat as the EPB. There is strong CAPS support in the CPB. Older people that attended previous national CAPS meetings are in favor. New people don't have an opinion.

Purdue and NAPIS

Many SSCs are new in their position and do not have the required amount of familiarity with NAPIS and other services offered to the CAPS community. Susan will plan to hold a series of webinars later this summer to help get the new people up to speed. In the meantime, if anyone



has questions, please contact Susan or one of your more experienced colleagues. No question is too trivial, and everyone is more than happy to help.

From last month's call: Trap and Lure fields are now required for NAPIS data entry for insect trapping surveys. Most of the information from the Approved Methods and your Survey Summary Form should appear in your My Surveys in NAPIS. This is for the Priority Pests where this information is available in the Approved Methods.

For a non-Priority Pest, this information may not yet be available in the Trap and Lure Dictionaries. Lisa has spent much time to review the Survey Summary Form information and reach out to many of you to get this information in the system to facilitate data entry. However, not all the traps and lures used by the CAPS community have been added yet. If the user has entered an invalid combination of Trap and Lure, or specifies "Other" in the Trap or Lure fields (not yet known by the system), a message with a link appears to request a new trap & lure. That message goes to Lisa. As an example, the following is from the interactive Add Record interface when a user specifies "Other."

Please use this [form](#) to request an additional Trap or Lure.

This message can also appear in an email, if an Excel file is uploaded. The rationale for doing this is to capture data in a standardized way for all pests.

That was Then, and this is Now: This project continues to take up a lot of time and resources, and has become more involved than expected. We do not have the time and resources to continue to do this work, and we need a new way of gathering this information. The NCC discussed options, such as should the fields be mandatory or optional for 2016, should we do the work or drop the project as too burdensome, and, if we continue on, who does the work.

The PDMT proposed and the NCC agreed that the Trap and Lure fields would continue to be required for all trapping surveys, and that the option of no entry or free-form fields would not be in the best interest of the integrity of the data. Given that the project is to continue, that CPHST CAPS Support does not have the time or resources to devote to this project, and the PDMT does not want to delay or inhibit data entry, the decision was made to shift the burden for supplying the information back to the states who enter the data. The reason for this is that the traps and/or lures in question are not for Priority Pests, but instead for non-AMPS pests or pests of state concern that the states are bundling in their surveys. The states, who are presumably obtaining the traps and lures through their own processes, would have the information on hand, and would eliminate the need for Lisa to contact the states and then compile the information. Lisa would still review the submitted information for consistency (but will no longer seek out the information herself) before passing it along to Purdue to incorporate into the appropriate



dictionary. As more information is stored in the dictionaries, there will be less burden on all parties to supply the information in the future.

For 2016 CAPS and other state surveys for which the states wish to enter data, the above process will be incorporated into NAPIS for data entry. For 2016 Farm Bill surveys, Susan has combed through the 2016 Farm Bill Survey Summary Form and has identified states with traps and lures not yet in the dictionaries, or without a trap and lure selected. Susan will contact these states (along with those for CAPS that Lisa was not able to complete) and request the needed information. This will clear the way for uninterrupted data entry. In the future starting with 2017 CAPS and PPQ surveys, the process for collecting the information will be primarily through the Survey Summary Form so that there is time to obtain the information before surveys even start, resulting in uninterrupted data entry.

For reference, the following information will be needed to complete the tables: name of trap and/or lure, definition of new trap and/or lure, manufacturer, and for lures, the compounds, type of dispenser, and the length of its effectiveness. If you have any questions, please contact Lisa or Susan.

General Lures

There has been some interest in incorporating general lures into our survey program. General lures, such as ethanol alone and other lures focused on the genus and family levels, do not have specific target pests and not approved for negative data entry. If negative data entry is not an option, then how do we report on this extra effort, and how does one receive credit for this?

The use of a general lure can have a very sound effect on our survey program. They can be extremely valuable along pathways and around warehouses and port environs where you are just trying to find pests that should not be there and not targeting any specific pests. They would increase the chance of finding something you were not looking for. General lures also could be used as second tier when surveying for target pests. Placing a general lure among your regular survey traps may facilitate capturing anything you may miss with a specific lure.

So how do we report on the use of a general lure, especially since it would not show up in the Accountability report? Besides in an Accomplishment Report, the best option would be to enter the information in the Survey Summary Form. We use the information in the Survey Summary Form for many different reports, and the inclusion of the general lures would further document the well-rounded effort. This also would help with lure procurement and planning for survey supplies.

What we do not want to do is to place too much emphasis on using general lures at the expense of our regular survey targets. We should provide some guidance for their use so that everyone is on the same page and has an understanding of where and when general lures can best be deployed. Talk with your constituency to help us develop this guidance. It would be good to



have this before work plans are due in August and the 2017 Survey Summary Forms are available.

Farm Bill Update

The FY16 program is well under way. A reminder to SPHDs and cooperators of the work plan submission deadline of July 1. The deadline to have all Farm Bill agreements obligated is August 1. States (SPHDs) should set internal deadlines to meet these requirements. Please let Kristian know ASAP if project funds cannot be used in order to redirect those to other program needs in time. Do not forget to complete the Survey Summary Form process soon.

Pathogen Diagnostics

A question arose regarding the availability of diagnostic services for plant pathogens. States need to know who is available to do what, and if a lab charges for samples so that it can be placed in the budget. In one instance, a lab recently started charging per sample where they did not charge before, and the cost was not included in the financial plan. The fear is that these surveys may not be done due to the lack or cost of diagnostics, and the new OPEP list is heavy on plant pathogens. Several identifiers for insect samples are funded through the Farm Bill, but none for plant pathogens. Is the need being captured on the Survey Summary Form? The PDMT will look into this situation and report back to the NCC.

Personnel Announcements

The SSC position in Arkansas is vacant as the former occupant took a position with PPQ. The state received permission to fill the position. Stay tuned.

Kate Kneeland, the SSC in Nebraska, lost her battle with cancer and passed away recently. Please remember her and her family in your thoughts.

The next NCC call will be held on Thursday, July, 7, 2016, at 1:00 pm eastern time.

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