



Annual National CAPS Committee Meeting
January 29-30, 2020
Office of the Illinois State Plant Health Director
Des Plaines, Illinois
Meeting Minutes



Table of Contents

Participants.....	1
Welcome and Introductions	1
Host Welcome and State Overview	1
Meeting Overview	1
NCC Bylaws Review	2
2019 NCC Meeting Action Items Review	2
Pest Surveillance Guidelines.....	3
Pollinator Bycatch / FWS Consultation.....	6
Survey Supply Procurement Program.....	7
PPA 7721	7
2020 PPA Goal 1 Survey – Expectations	8
Non-Traditional Cooperators	8
Data Entry Expectations	9
Facilitation and Meeting Design Training	10
Cooperative Agreements.....	10
Identification / Diagnostic Issues.....	10
National Identification Services (NIS).....	11
National Mycology Specialists - Limited Pathogen Screening	11
S&T Beltsville Lab	12
PPQ Domestic Identifier – Plant Pathogens	12
S&T CAPS Support	13
Pest Summary Reports.....	13
Priority Pest List	13
New Pest Submissions	14
Other Pest Concerns.....	14

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.



Survey and Pest Information..... 14

Commodity Manuals..... 14

Pest Information..... 15

Survey Builder 15

Focus Group..... 16

Approved Methods for Pest Surveillance 16

Research and Method Development..... 17

Purdue Update..... 17

ISPM 8: Determination of Pest Status in an Area..... 17

CAPS Webinar Series..... 18

CAPS Recognition 18

Facilitation Training..... 18

Tour of Terminal 5, the international terminal, at O’Hare International Airport 18



Annual National CAPS Committee Meeting
January 29-30, 2020
Office of the Illinois State Plant Health Director
Des Plaines, Illinois
Meeting Minutes



Participants

John Bowers	Megan Abraham	Darcy Oishi	Feridoon Mehdizadegan
Lisa Jackson	Helmuth Rogg	Heather Moylett	Jesse Hardin
Shelley Gray	Chris Pierce	Cynthia Landry	Greg Rentschler
Eric Ewing	Erin Caruso*	Cindy Music	Scott Schirmer
Alana Wild	Emilie Inoue	David McClure	Alison Neeley
Kim Rice	Brad Danner	Mike Hill	Jo-Ann Bentz-Blanco
Joy Goforth	Dale Anderson	Martin Deubler	Jacob Cerminar

*for Tiffany Mauro

Welcome and Introductions [↑](#)

Introductions were made and those new to the NCC were recognized; Darcy Oishi (SSC HI), Alana Wild (SPHD NV/UT), and Erin Caruso (PSS NY) participating for Tiffany Mauro (PSS NJ) who was on detail to the Spotted lanternfly program. Additionally, Cynthia Landry (PPQ S&T), Jesse Hardin (PPQ NIS), Alison Neeley (PPQ S&T) and Jo-Ann Bentz-Blanco (PPQ PSEM) also were introduced. Also, Mike Hill and Martin Deubler (Director and Asst. Director, respectively, CERIS, Purdue) participated on the second day. And certainly not least, Jacob Cerminar (PPQ IL SPHD office) assisted in taking notes for these Minutes.

Host Welcome and State Overview [↑](#)

Greg Rentschler (SPHD IL) and Scott Schirmer (SPRO IL) welcomed the group to Chicago and presented the work that PPQ and the State do individually and cooperatively in Illinois. Greg and Scott presented staffing across the state, Illinois agriculture (a leading producer of soybeans, corn, and swine, as well as ethanol production), and the importance and magnitude of exports. Scott also covered the surveys the state conducts through CAPS and PPA 7721 across the state, and their experiences with EAB and ALB. The NCC appreciates their time and energy to host the meeting. See [ppt - Illinois SPHD-SPRO](#)

Meeting Overview [↑](#)

Everyone at the meeting was there because they represent a constituency in the CAPS community. The NCC members are the voice of the larger CAPS community so that the whole community can have ownership in the Program. While the NCC needed to bring their local and regional perspective, they also needed to think nationally, and how what was discussed, and what will be discussed in the future, will affect the program as a whole.

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.



Action Item 1: The ongoing evaluation of CAPS and PPA 7721 funding needs to continue.

In our discussion about our ability to better quantify survey efforts, a question arose as to the definition of a trap, site, and location. Are these being used consistently across the board? If there was the ability to accurately count the number of traps placed vs. the number of sites and locations being surveyed, it likely would better represent the effort that is accomplished. If we can show through the data that less funding results in fewer targets, fewer traps per site, or fewer sites or locations, then that would be a strong argument. However, how do you take into account high risk pathway trapping vs. scattered trapping to cover the state? Perhaps a weighting system for high-risk sites? Along with this, can we demonstrate through our data that trapping numbers represent effective trapping for that commodity or state or does trapping in high-risk pathways represent the most effective way to trap?

Action Item 2: The NCC needs to determine a constant definition for sites and locations, and then decide if both are actually needed. The goal is to tie trapping numbers to funding.

Action Item 3: The NCC should investigate whether methodology exists or should be developed, perhaps state-by-state, to answer the question of the effectiveness of trapping strategies given commodities and funding available for survey.

Pest Surveillance Guidelines

Review of the 2020 Pest Surveillance Guidelines did not raise any questions, issues, or topics of special concern. For the most part, the 2021 Guidelines will follow the 2020 Guidelines. We do not foresee major changes at this time outside of changes to the Priority Pest List and processes that are described in more detail throughout these minutes. The PDMT stressed the importance of the [Data Entry Roles and Responsibilities](#) that were developed last year in Portland. Most of the discussion and questions were about direction going into the 2021 Guidelines, and mostly about agreements and financials, and what course to take.

A main topic of discussion was the relationship between Infrastructure and Survey. In the past we were told that Infrastructure and Survey had to be different agreements, and hence work plans, because they represented 'different' work. As time goes on, that distinction has blurred. SSC salary, the main driving force behind Infrastructure, has bled over in part to Survey for some states, and there is not the same partition as in the past. This is partly due to rising salaries, but also due to the SSC actually participating in the surveys. Partitioning their time and salary to Survey is appropriate in this instance. The question then arises as to why separate Infrastructure and Survey, and instead, combine it all into one agreement with one financial plan. Having one agreement also would introduce more flexibility. The ongoing review of the CAPS program and the message at the end may shed some light on an appropriate course of action.



Action Item 4: After the CAPS review, the PDMT will revisit whether we need to have both an Infrastructure and Survey agreement. At a minimum, we could keep Infrastructure at the same level, but allow people to just have one agreement. Due date: Q1 of FY2021.

As noted earlier, there are increased costs associated with Infrastructure. The group discussed possible impacts: less survey activities are able to be done – less sites surveyed or sites that are more expensive to survey (farther distance) may not be included in surveys. As noted earlier, the NCC should continue to explore options to fund Infrastructure in different ways. Is PPA a possibility? Can CAPS exclusively fund Infrastructure and PPA fund surveys? Or is there a way to better manage CAPS and PPA funding so that some dollar amount can be assured (as best it can be) so that states can plan better. This focuses back on Action Items 1 and 4 above, and offers another reason to look critically at this issue.

Action Item 5: The PDMT will work with the PPA Team to determine if PPA Goal 1 Survey funding for National Priority Surveys (as defined in the Implementation Plan) can be assured on an annual basis, and to investigate how to couple with Pest Detection funding for Survey agreements. (Expands on Action Item 1)

Another issue that was broached is the indirect rates charged by the states. This varies widely among the states, with some states absorbing 40% or more of their budget on indirect charges. As it stands now, we cannot place a cap on indirect rates, and likely would need congressional approval to do so. PPA 7721 can impose a cap on indirect rates because that money comes from a different source and they have the authority to do so. CAPS agreements are funded by the Pest Detection line item, which is part of the congressional appropriations bill each year.

Action Item 6: The PDMT will look into the process of developing indirect rates and share with the NCC for their knowledge.

This year we noticed that many states were not abiding by the deadline to submit work and financial plans. In all fairness, we did say that it was a soft deadline, but the softness was taken to be airy. In the future we need to hold to a much harder deadline for work and financial plans. This is necessary to ensure that an efficient and complete review occurs, and that we have all the information needed to develop a Pest Detection spending plan in a timely manner.

Action Item 7: The PDMT will establish a hard deadline for submission of work and financial plans for FY21, determine the cost of non-compliance, and publish the information with the 2021 Guidelines.

Action Item 8: To facilitate implementation of Action Item 7, the PDMT will work with the SPHDs to make it a policy that when the SPHD uploads the signed work plans to SharePoint, that they send an email to Lisa, and that they also carbon copy SSC, SPRO, and PSS. This way, everyone would know when the work plan was uploaded. The SSC will know that if they do not



see that email, then they need to reach out to the SPHD. Right now, the work plans often get stuck at the SPHD level and the SSC cannot tell when the plan is uploaded. This needs to happen for both CAPS and PPA work plans.

There presently is a \$3,000 cap on travel, and some questions were raised as to the proper use of this money. Priority of this funding should be the Regional Plant Board Meetings, State CAPS meetings, and possible identification training. These funds are not to be used for travel to professional meetings (nor professional dues) or other pest program meetings.

Action Item 9: As the online work plan is developed (discussed below), Lisa will send a proposed mockup for travel that will appear in the online work plan. The NCC needs to discuss the criteria for the cap on travel costs and write up clearer guidance for the 2021 Guidelines.

Due: April 1.

Equipment and data collection device purchases are limited to the needs of the SSC at this time. CAPS funding will not allow for purchasing more devices; there just is not enough money to go around. States will need to pay for anything above and beyond what is critically needed by the SSC.

The new requirement this year that 2018 data be entered into NAPIS before 2020 work plans were reviewed went surprisingly well. We saw increased activity in the Change Request process, but some states waited until the last minute to meet requirements. States would like an email in advance to include what information they need and what they need to do, as well as the opportunity to give a reason why the data is not turned in.

The Accountability Report mirrors what has been entered into the Survey Summary Form (SSF). If the survey was not able to be completed or if certain pest targets were not able to be surveyed for, then the SSF needs to be revised. This will then transfer over to the Accountability Report (removing those pests or surveys). Remember that the SSF should be revised as needed throughout the survey season to mirror the work that was actually accomplished.

Action Item 10: For the CAPS community, all 2019 data will need to be entered into NAPIS before 2021 work plans will be reviewed. 2019 Accomplishment Reports should mirror the information in the 2019 Survey Summary Form at the time the Accomplishment Report is submitted.

Action Item 11: CAPSIS will send out an automated email to the SPRO, SSC, PSS and SPHD from the Accountability Report if all the required data has not been entered into NAPIS. For CAPS work plans, the email should go out on June 1. For PPA work plans, January 15 or after spending plan is announced? Due date: Start with CAPS 2021, target date of June 1.

Proposed language: “Your data from the Year/Funding Source/Name of Survey (example: 2020 CAPS Corn Survey) is not complete. You either need to upload the missing data or revise your



Survey Summary Form (remove surveys or pests that were not surveyed for). If there is some reason that you were not able to enter the data, contact your SPHD.”

Dale proposed modifications to the Guidelines page on the CAPS R&C site. The NCC found that the Resources page did not make sense, and that no one actually went to that page for information. Everyone went straight to the Guidelines page. Dale proposed combining the Resources and Guidelines pages so that all the information will be on one page. The Resources page was originally set up with the thought that this page would contain the most up-to-date versions, and that the Guidelines pages would be specific for that year. If this is not working as intended, then some changes need to be made so that everyone can find easily what they are looking for on the site. The PDMT met after the meeting and discussed some possibilities. A proposal will be discussed on the March NCC conference call.

Action Item 12: Discuss with the NCC proposed changes in the CAPS R&C website to alleviate confusion in finding information.

Pollinator Bycatch / FWS Consultation

APHIS, on behalf of PPQ, Pest Detection and the Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey Program has entered into Section 7 Consultation with FWS regarding the bycatch of endangered species in survey traps. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) directs all Federal agencies to work to conserve endangered and threatened species and to use their authorities to further the purposes of the Act. Section 7 of the Act, called "Interagency Cooperation," is the mechanism by which Federal agencies ensure the actions they take, including those they fund or authorize, do not jeopardize the existence of any listed species. APHIS Policy and Program Development (PPD) with Pest Detection Team input, developed a Biological Assessment for FWS consultation. The Assessment details where traps placed in certain areas, counties, and states may affect a listed species. The Biological Assessment will be posted on the CAPS R&C after it has gone through a final review process.

Until scientific evidence is available that supports using a different trap, the tricolored bucket trap is the only color combination approved for use in CAPS surveys using plastic bucket traps. Previous guidance stated that green traps (green lid, funnel, and bucket) would be available on a case-by-case basis. At this time, green traps are no longer offered as an alternative due to lack of efficacy. Research is ongoing to develop an alternative trap. This guidance can be found in more detail in the [Supplemental Info Booklet](#).

The CAPS program has developed guidance specifically around the listed bumblebees *Bombus affinis* and *B. franklini*. Formal guidance for 2020 surveys will be coming out soon.

Traps should not be placed in areas where *B. affinis* has been observed. This means that no traps should be placed in the red, yellow, or blue areas in the map at the FWS link <https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/insects/rpbb/rpbbmap.html>.



For *B. franklini*, traps should not be placed in specific counties in California and Oregon. For more information see <https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp0/profile/speciesProfile?sId=7022>.

Action Item 13: The PDMT will distribute guidance for surveys in areas where *Bombus affinis*, Rusty patch bumblebee, and *B. franklini*, Franklin's bumblebee, are known to occur. Guidance also will be prepared that addresses other listed endangered species as per the Biological Assessment.

Survey Supply Procurement Program



The Survey Supplies Ordering Module exists in the Integrated Plant Health Information System, IPHIS. There are off the shelf inventory products/systems that will likely work better for our needs. Paul Ijams is looking into several alternatives to meet our specific needs (inventory control, tracking expiration dates, etc.). This may take some time to implement, but we are actively working on it.

The question of lure contamination has come up in the past as a concern when storing lures in close proximity to different lures. Storing lures in the freezer in heat-sealed Mylar bags may reduce cross-contamination during long-term storage. Heather and Lisa will work with the Survey Supply Procurement Program to add Mylar bags to the Survey Supply Ordering System.

Action Item 14: Heather and Lisa will work with Paul to add Mylar bags to the SSPP inventory. The request was for bags that can be heat-sealed and then stored in the freezer between uses.

An issue arose regarding the screens in bucket traps. Chris stated that they do not properly fit the trap, but has figured out a way to modify the screen so that it is useable. He is willing to share how this is done. Lisa requested that Chris let us know the dimensions/changes to the screen. The screens are made specifically for our use by the machinist staff at Moore Air Base. They can alter the way that they make them if they know what to do.

Action Item 15: Chris will let Lisa and Paul know how to modify the screens and the resulting dimensions so that changes in the production of the screens can be made.

PPA 7721



Feridoon presented an update of the [FY20 PPA program](#). The presentation is posted on the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site. The funding breakdown was as follows.

PPA Section 7721	
Appropriated	\$ 75,000,000
Sequester %	5.9%
Sequester Amount	\$ 4,425,000
Net to APHIS	\$ 70,575,000



NCPN	\$ 7,500,000
PPDMDPP	\$ 63,075,000

The open period for the receipt of suggestions has been a 7-week period from early July to mid-August. Based on the time a spending plan takes in review, the PPA Team is considering moving back the open period for suggestions to mid-May to the end of June with the hope that a spending plan would be released by the end of December. The NCC expressed pros and cons to this proposal. After the meeting, the PPA team reached out to the PDMT and NCC to gather comments from their constituency. Many comments were submitted and forwarded to the PPA Team for consideration. Comments ranged from positive to neutral to negative in about equal amounts.

Some points that were made during the discussion;

- Some would like a timetable of the PPA process available to all with deadlines. A calendar was available internally, but making it widely available would be appreciated. States need to know where the hold ups occur.
- Most appreciated the feedback as to why or why not they were funded for a certain amount or were not funded.
- For Goal 1 Survey
 - SPRO's and SSCs need to rank the surveys they are proposing in order of importance. This is important for managing the budget with State priorities.
 - Single pest surveys do not meet requirements for Goal 1 funding.
 - Do not submit PPQ emergency pest program suggestions to Goal 1. These single-pest surveys should be submitted to Goal 6, however, they can be bundled in a Goal 1 Survey suggestion if appropriate.
 - Hemp is becoming an important commodity, but there are no Priority Pests for hemp. States should confer with their industry for pests of concern that can be analyzed via the OPEP model. Thought also should be given to guidance for hemp surveys. These fall into the category of Cooperator Surveys, so a well-planned multiple pest survey should meet the funding requirement.

2020 PPA Goal 1 Survey – Expectations (from the [January 9, 2020](#) NCC call) [↑](#)

Non-Traditional Cooperators

For PPA Goal 1 surveys conducted by non-traditional cooperators (surveys that are conducted by other institutions than the typical State/SSC), the ADODR should work with the cooperator and the SSC to have the Survey Summary Form and data entered.

Process for Non-Traditional Cooperators conducting PPA Goal 1 Surveys to fill out the Survey Summary Form and have data entered [Data Entry Roles and Responsibilities](#) :



- When the PPA Spending Plan is announced, the ADODR will need to email the non-traditional cooperator and the SSC, effectively matching them up to work together and identifying their responsibilities.
- The SSC will send the cooperator an Excel version of the Survey Summary Form (SSF) for them to complete.
- The SSC will enter this information into the PPA SSF.
- The cooperator will need to prepare their data for the SSC.
- The SSC will enter the prepared data into NAPIS.

Data Entry Expectations

Similar to what was expected during the 2020 CAPS work plan process, during the 2020 PPA Goal 1 Survey work plan submission process, the SSC and ADODR should ensure data from previous year's surveys has been entered into NAPIS. For 2020, Lisa and fellow NOMs will not approve work plans until data has been entered for similar 2018 surveys (surveys from the same cooperator). *Note, a traditional cooperator (State/SSC) will not have work plans held up if data from a non-traditional cooperator has not been entered and vice versa.

Each year, John creates an Excel file that has guidance for each funded survey and whether NAPIS data is required. Here is the file for 2019: [Survey Summary Form and Data Requirements for Funded Surveys](#). Only surveys that require NAPIS as the official database for survey data will appear in the PPA Accountability Report. The 2020 file will be posted once the Spending Plan is announced. *Note:* The PPA 7721 Spending Plan was announced on March 2, 2020. The 2020 [Survey Summary Form and Data Requirements for Funded Surveys](#) file is now posted on the 2020 PPA page of the CAPS R&C.

1) SSCs – before submitting a new work and financial plan to the ADODR, check the Accountability Report on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website to ensure data from previous years surveys have been entered into the appropriate database (NAPIS). ***SSCs may wish to do this now before the spending plan is announced.***

2) ADODRs – before uploading a new work and financial plan to the Field Operations Cooperative Agreements Work Plan Management Site, check the Accountability Report on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website to ensure data from previous years surveys have been entered into the appropriate database (NAPIS). If the data has not been entered, the ADODR should communicate this deficiency to the cooperator. Once the missing data is entered, or an acceptable justification is provided, submission of new work and financial plans may proceed. New work plans will not be processed until data entry requirements are met.

For example: For review of a 2020 work plan (PD and PPA 7721), the ADODR should check and determine that all 2018 and earlier data from the cooperator has been entered into NAPIS. Surveys for 2019 are in progress, and all the 2019 data is not expected to be available when 2020



- WSDA
- Xanthe Shirley
- Craig Webb
- Bobby Brown
- Julieta Brambila

You can find contact information for PPQ Domestic Identifiers here: [Domestic Identifiers](#).

If you need assistance in finding an identifier or institution for a target (Priority Pests only) you may reach out to Lisa Jackson (lisa.d.jackson@usda.gov) for arthropods or mollusks and Heather (heather.moylett@usda.gov) for pathogens and nematodes.

This also will need to be done for 2020 PPA Goal 1 Surveys as well. Once the PPA spending plan has been announced, please confirm taxonomic support for these surveys as well.

National Identification Services (NIS)



NIS does not do preliminary identification, but rather concerns itself with confirmatory identification, except with the specific pathogens below. NIS confirms suspect samples that have a preliminary identification. Jesse Hardin presented an overview of the work NIS conducts in [NIS Confirmatory ID](#).

The process to request confirmatory identification has been posted on the APHIS website at: <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-disease-programs/request-official-confirmation-preliminary-pest-id>

Action Item 17: The link above regarding the process for confirmatory identification will be posted on the appropriate page of the CAPS R&C website.

National Mycology Specialists - Limited Pathogen Screening



PPQ has limited capacity to screen select pathogen samples. Do not send unprocessed or bulk samples to PPQ for pathogen screening. Only send samples for screening to PPQ under the following circumstances (slides 38-42 in [CAPS Science Support](#)):

The PPQ National Mycology Specialists can screen samples for these targets:

- *Cronartium flaccidum*, Scots pine blister rust
- *Hemileia vastatrix*, coffee leaf rust
- *Pseudopezicula tracheiphila*, rotbrenner
- *Synchytrium endobioticum*, potato wart*
- *Ceratocystis manginecans*, mango sudden decline**
- *Raffaelea quercivora*, Japanese oak wilt**

To request support, contact PPQ National Mycology Specialists (PPQNISNTMycology@usda.gov) by email and copy Steve Bullington, PPQ Domestic



Diagnostics Coordinator (PPQ.Domestic.Diagnostic.Coordinator@aphis.usda.gov). Include this information from your Survey Summary Form:

- Target(s)
- Type of samples: raw or screened samples
- Expected number of samples
- Point of contact name and email of who will be submitting samples

Prior to sending samples, notify the PPQ National Mycology Specialists (PPQNISNTMycology@usda.gov) by email and copy Steve Bullington, PPQ Domestic Diagnostics Coordinator (PPQ.Domestic.Diagnostic.Coordinator@aphis.usda.gov). In the email, include an explanation of what you are sending, a PDF file of your completed PPQ Form 391, and the tracking number.

* *Synchytrium endobioticum* is a select agent. See the S&T Beltsville section for select agent guidance. Include the PPQ National Mycology Specialists (PPQNISNTMycology@usda.gov) in your email.

** If you have non-PPQ taxonomic assistance in place for *Ceratocystis manginecans* and *Raffaelea quercivora* surveys, it is still important to contact the PPQ National Mycology Specialists prior to the start of the survey season. Both require isolation prior to screening, and NIS can provide guidance on how to sample and isolate these fungi in addition to discussing the laboratory requirements for successful isolation.

S&T Beltsville Lab ↑

Only send samples for confirmatory diagnostics. Do not send samples for screening. Select agents are the only exception. Prior to sending samples, contact Phillip Lake (phillip.c.lake@usda.gov) and Kurt Zeller (kurt.a.zeller@usda.gov), and copy the S&T Beltsville lab (PPQ_CPHST_Beltsville_Sample_Diagnostics@aphis.usda.gov) and Steve Bullington, PPQ Domestic Diagnostics Coordinator (PPQ.Domestic.Diagnostic.Coordinator@aphis.usda.gov). They will provide you with the necessary forms and sample submission instructions.

Select agents on the CAPS Priority Pest List:

- *Peronosclerospora philippinensis*, Philippine downy mildew
- *Ralstonia solanacearum*, bacterial wilt
- *Synchytrium endobioticum*, potato wart
- *Xanthomonas oryzae* (includes pvs. *oryzae* and *oryzicola*), bacterial blight and bacterial leaf streak

PPQ Domestic Identifier – Plant Pathogens ↑

The PPQ Domestic Identifier for plant pathogens can screen samples for these targets:

- *Globodera pallida*, Pale cyst nematode
- *Globodera rostochiensis*, Golden nematode
- *Potyvirus Plum Pox Virus*, Plum pox virus (PPV)



To request support, contact Craig Webb, PPQ Domestic Identifier for plant pathogens (craig.a.webb@usda.gov) by email and copy Steve Bullington, PPQ Domestic Diagnostics Coordinator (PPQ.Domestic.Diagnostic.Coordinator@aphis.usda.gov). Include this information from your Survey Summary Form:

- Target(s)
- Type of samples: raw or screened samples
- Expected number of samples
- Point of contact name and email of who will be submitting samples

Prior to sending samples, notify Craig Webb by email and copy Steve Bullington. In the email, include an explanation of what you are sending, a PDF file of your completed PPQ Form 391, and the tracking number.

S&T CAPS Support



Objective Prioritization of Exotic Pest (OPEP)

Cynthia Landry presented an update on the OPEP model for prioritizing Priority Pests. See slides 2-12 in [CAPS Science Support](#). Impact assessments for all Priority Pests are almost complete. Within OPEP, the Likelihood of Introduction model is almost complete and will further refine the Impact model. Also, a Mollusk model with Impact and Likelihood of Introduction assessment models is nearly complete.

Action Item 18: Cynthia Landry will organize and present a webinar on the OPEP model in the spring of 2020.

Pest Summary Reports

Impact Assessment Summaries for pests run through the OPEP model can be found on [PestLens](#) (slides 13-14 in [CAPS Science Support](#)). After logging in to PestLens, select the dropdown heading Reports, and then select Analytical Reports by Group. Select Objective Prioritization of Exotic Pests Group, and set the Dates for assessment summaries completed during that timeframe.

Action Item 19: Place a link to the Impact Assessment Summary reports of the CAPS R&C website.

Priority Pest List

Heather presented the current status of the Priority Pest List, and the proposed changes for 2021 (slides 15-22 in [CAPS Science Support](#)). Twenty-five pests on the 2020 Priority Pest List are proposed to be dropped for the 2021 Priority Pest List based on predicted Impact from the OPEP model, U. S. distribution, or other concerns. One pathogen, *Magnaporthe oryzae* Triticum pathotype (MoT) (causal agent of Wheat blast) will be added to the Priority Pest List for 2021.



New Pest Submissions

Submission of new pests for consideration and assessment can be done at any time. A quarterly call for new pest submissions may be the best avenue to keep it in the forefront of everyone's mind. Typically, it takes about a month to assess a new pest. To submit a new pest for assessment, email the particulars or any information that you think may help the assessment to stcaps@usda.gov.

Action Item 20: In an effort to increase pest submissions from the field, S&T will send out quarterly calls for pest submissions. The first call for new pest submissions will go out March 30, 2020.

Other Pest Concerns

The Tropical Pest List generated some discussion. The Tropical Commodity Survey was put together with assistance by Yolisa Ishibashi (retired, PSS HI) to facilitate the needs of tropical and sub-tropical states and territories. These localities often do not have the agriculture and environment of the rest of the U.S., and were finding it hard to fit into the CAPS program. It is now time to re-assess the Tropical Pest List, and S&T is interested in improving the representation of tropical pests on the Priority Pest List.

Action Item 21: Heather will organize a conference call with representatives from tropical states to discuss their pest concerns and prioritization processes. Pests identified in these discussions may be considered for the Priority Pest List, and will undergo the pest assessment and prioritization process.

Industrial hemp also generated some discussion. The NCC was interested if a hemp commodity survey could be developed. Many states have or are beginning to have industrial hemp grown as regulations and legislation take effect across the U. S. To develop the commodity survey, a pest list will need to be developed first.

Action Item 22: The NCC members are to ask States that have hemp industry to please ask people in the industry what hemp pest are of concern, and relay that information to S&T CAPS Support.

Survey and Pest Information

CAPS Science Support is developing a new survey support tool, the Survey Builder, and improving the presentation and delivery of pest information (i.e., datasheets, approved methods for pest surveillance) to customers.

Commodity Manuals

Heather presented the current status and a proposed new structure for the commodity manuals (slides 24-28 in [CAPS Science Support](#)).



For an Apple/Pear commodity survey, S&T reviewed 22 pest candidates for assessment by the OPEP model. Three of these were identified as Category 1 and have a high probability of causing significant impacts should they become established in the U. S. A survey and identification feasibility assessment is in progress.

Currently, there are 15 commodity and taxon survey manuals that include an Introduction with protocols and information to guide surveys, and with a pest list with individual datasheets. We discussed last year a plan to break down the Introductions into stand-alone components, but still retain the Manual per se. At the NCC meeting, a new structure was proposed.

The plan is to have general protocols/guides, e.g., soil sampling, sweep netting, visual survey, and then complement those with specific guidance for each pest. For example, if the approved method for a pest is visual survey, there would be a link to the visual survey guide for the best practices, and then provide additional guidance for completing a visual survey for that pest. This would be accomplished by restructuring and improving the Approved Methods for Pest Surveillance (AMPS) pages by expanding the pest page to include specific guidance and link to other stand-alone documents (a template is proposed in the presentation on slide 27).

Pest Information

Currently, pest and survey information are delivered in CAPS survey manuals, pest datasheets, and online AMPS pest pages. The datasheets and manual introductions are challenging to maintain and the AMPS pages provide a limited amount of information. Information is duplicated across all products, resulting in conflicting information. In order to improve quality and consistency, S&T proposes to:

1. Clarify the purpose of each support product. For example:
 - a. The pest datasheet will provide an overview of the pest biology, pathway, and importance. It will no longer include survey guidance and the approved methods for pest surveillance.
 - b. The AMPS pest page will provide survey guidance and approved methods for pest surveillance. Links to appropriate general guidance documents (e.g., survey and sampling protocols, data entry, etc.) will be added so all information is readily accessible.
2. Discontinue and remove manual introductions from the CAPS website (effective 2022). We will update the important and useful components (e.g. visual survey or soil sampling protocols) and post them on the CAPS Resource and Collaboration website.

Survey Builder

The development of a tool called Survey Builder is proposed to help users select appropriate survey targets for their State from the Priority Pest List (slides 28-33 in [CAPS Science Support](#)). The output of this tool would be a customized pest list for a survey that is directly transferrable to the Survey Summary Form (and online work plan). See the slides in the presentation for examples.



data in terms of the updated ISPM? Do we need to add more detail or data fields to capture what is suggested in the ISPM? Our negative data can be used to support exports. Do we qualify our negative data sufficiently so that other countries accept our determination of a pest-free area?

Action Item 25: The PDMT, NCC, and CERIS should review the data entry fields in NAPIS and compare with those presented in the updated ISPM 8, and determine if changes are necessary, or if the current data fields are sufficient. If no new fields are needed, do current fields need to be redefined or repurposed?

CAPS Webinar Series



There are planned webinars in 2020 with tentative dates.

- Spring: Objective Prioritization of Exotic Pests (OPEP) / PestLens
 - Impact Assessments
 - Likelihood of Introduction
 - Impact Assessment Summaries
 - Etc.
- May: 2021 National Pest Surveillance Guidelines
 - Priority Pest List Changes
 - Approved Methods for Pest Surveillance
 - Work Plan Expectations
 - Online Work Plans
 - Etc.

The CAPS community is encouraged to suggest additional topics for webinars and discussion.

CAPS Recognition



The deadline for the submissions of nominations for CAPS Recognition is Friday, March 6. Please discuss with your constituency and nominate a deserving individual and/or group.

Facilitation Training



The PDC has been given the “green light” to start pursuing contractors/vendors that can provide facilitation training for PPQ. We plan to create a blanket purchase agreement (BPA) for establishing a vendor agreement in FY20 that can offer training to various groups and employees across PPQ based on the need. We envision offerings to be available in FY21.

Tour of Terminal 5, the international terminal, at O’Hare International Airport



The group visited O’Hare Airport and received presentations from Customs & Border Protection officers on their roles and responsibilities at the airport. The group observed detector dogs working the baggage claim carousals. One dog hit on a bag, the bag was pulled off the carousel, opened, and three apples were confiscated and ultimately destroyed. A group picture was taken in the grinder room where ‘contraband’ is ground up in the machine in the center of the picture. The display is from items confiscated within the previous week.

