**Purpose:**

The purpose of this 3-day meeting was to bring together National CAPS Committee (NCC) members to share key pieces of information and make program decisions, including revisiting what makes a priority pest and strategies to maintain the priority pest list.

**Desired Outcomes:**

Share Relevant Information:

* NCC Member Rotations
* Updates on CAPS Program
* Review FY21 Mission Updates
* CAPSIS Update
* PPA CFWG Updates
* Preliminary ID & FY22 CFWG Plans
* 2021 NCC Personal Goals
* CAPS Mission Statement Update
* Distribution Maps
* 60% Priority Pests
* Science and Technology (S&T) Updates
* SAFARIS Updates

Program Decisions:

* How can we better manage the National Priority Pest List?
	+ Discussion of historical information on the issue
	+ Review how pests go on and off the National Priority Pest List
* Online Work Plan Interface

**Participants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attendee** | **Organization**  |
| John Crowe | PPQ National Policy Manager – Pest Detection |
| Darrell Bays | PPQ National Operations Manager – Pest Detection |
| Lisa Jackson | PPQ National Operations Manager – Pest Detection |
| Michelle (Shelley) Gray | PPQ S&T CAPS Science Support |
| Feridoon Mehdizadegan (Day 2) | PPQ PPA 7721 Representative |
| Eric Ewing | PPQ SPHD Representative – WV |
| Alana Wild | PPQ SPHD Representative – NV&UT |
| Kimberly Rice | Eastern Plant Board SPRO Representative - MD |
| Tina Peltier | Southern Plant Board SPRO Representative - LA |
| Megan Abraham | Central Plant Board SPRO Representative - IN |
| Helmuth Rogg | Western Plant Board SPRO Representative - OR |
| Avi Eitam | PPQ PSS Representative – OH |
| Greg Aydelotte | PPQ PSS Representative - TN |
| Cindy Kwolek | Eastern Plant Board SSC Representative - RI |
| Brad Danner | Southern Plant Board SSC Representative - FL |
| Sarah Phipps | Central Plant Board SSC Representative - MO |
| Darcy Oishi | Western Plant Board SSC Representative - HI |
| Dan Mackesy | PPQ S&T – CAPS Science Support Co-Lead |
| Amber Tripodi | PPQ S&T – Risk Analyst |
| James Kruse | CAPSIS Team - Interim Project Coordinator  |
| Michael Hill | CAPSIS Team - CERIS Director |
| Van Pichler (Day 2) | PPQ – National Policy Advisor |
| Yu Takeuchi (Day 3) | PPQ S&T –Risk Analyst |
| Colin Funaro (Day 3) | PPQ S&T – CAPS Science Support Co-Lead |
| Ernie Hain (Day 3) | PPQ S&T – Quantitative Risk Analyst |
| Steve Shearer  | Facilitator, PPQ PDC |
| Adrienne Reaves | Facilitator, PPQ PDC |

**January 25, 2022**

**Day 1**

**Desired Outcomes:**

* Share Updates on New NCC Member Rotations
* Share Updates on CAPS Program
* Review FY21 CAPS Mission Updates
* Share CAPSIS Update
* Begin Group Discussion on National Priority Pest List
* Share Updates on FY21 Personal Goals

**Topic: New NCC Member Rotations**

John Crowe reviewed document regarding National CAPS Committee rotations. Detailed list is available at: <https://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/ncc>. Abbreviated list as of January 2022:

**National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Committee (NCC) - Term Limits & Rotations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | **State** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** |
| John Crowe | National | x | x | x | x | X |
| Lisa Jackson | National | x | x | x | x | X |
| Darrell Bays | National | x | x | x | x | X |
| Michelle (Shelley) Gray | National | x | x | x | x | X |
| Feridoon Mehdizadegan | National | x | x | x | x | x |
| Eric Ewing (2nd Term) | West Virginia |  | x | x | x |  |
| Alana Wild (1st Term) | Nevada / Utah | x | x | x |  |  |
| Megan Abraham (1st Term) | Indiana | x | x | x |  |  |
| Kimberly Rice (2nd Term) | Maryland |  | x | x | x |  |
| Tina Peltier (1st Term) | Louisiana |  |  | x | x | x |
| Helmuth Rogg (2nd Term) | Hawaii |  | x | x | x |  |
| Greg Aydelotte (1St Term) | Tennessee | x | x | x |  |  |
| Avraham Eitam (1st Term) | Ohio |  |  | x | x | x |
| Sarah Phipps (1st Term) | Missouri | x | x | x |  |  |
| Cynthia Kwolek (1st Term) | Vermont |  |  | x | x | x |
| Brad Danner (2nd Term) | Florida |  |  | x | x | x |
| Darcy Oishi (1st Term) | Hawaii | x | x | x |  |  |

**CAPS Program and FY21 Mission Updates**

The Pest Detection Cross Functional Working Group (CFWG) is working with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on a formal consultation for Rusty Patched Bumble Bee and an informal consultation for the remaining ESA-Listed insects. A PowerPoint with updates regarding the program can be found on the web section of the meetings page (<https://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/ncc>). It reviews:

* Mission Update
* PPD Review Recommendations and Status
* Rusty Patched Bumble Bee Formal ESA Consultation. All ESA Guidance can be found at: <https://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/pest-surveillance-guidelines/esa>.
* Pest Surveillance Overview - 4 Pillars
	+ CAPS
	+ PPQ Pest Detection Surveys
	+ AQI Port Environs
	+ PPA 7721 Goal 1 Survey

**CAPS Information Services (CAPSIS) Update**

Mike Hill provided an update on CAPSIS. In July 2021, Cindy Music retired from the position of project coordinator. James Kruse has been filling the role on a temporary basis, but the permanent project coordinator position should be filled during Quarter 1. James will transition the project coordinator into their new role. The CAPSIS Team has continued to provide a high level of customer service throughout the transition.

**National Priority Pest List (Part 1)**

Initial discussion led by the CAPS CFWG. Group discussion centered on process and criteria for National Priority Pest List pest additions, removals, and implications for state constituents.

* Proposed removals – coffee leaf rust, coconut cadang cadang, boll weevil, pink bollworm
* *Tuta absoluta* has an updated scientific name (*Phthorimaea absoluta)* – Please watch for different name in literature. CAPS will continue to use *Tuta absoluta*.
* Question – coffee leaf rust – question about relation to coffee growing industries in CA and FL.
	+ Follow up from CA and FL indicate that they have no concern with coffee leaf rust in their states.
* Priority Pest support and expectations:
	+ PPQ will provide survey supplies
	+ Surveys must use Approved Methods for pest surveillance
	+ Datasheets will continue to be updated as S&T resources allow
	+ Preliminary identification will be supported as resources allow
* When Priority Pests roll off the list:
	+ PPQ will not order additional traps and lures
	+ PPQ will offer traps and lures that are in current inventory, until they run out
	+ Data entry will no longer be locked down to approved survey and identification methods
	+ Datasheets will not be updated
* Discussion over removal of the cotton pests
	+ Cotton program was consulted about these removals. It will not impact operations of cotton program surveys.
	+ Pest information generated by CAPS is not used in the Cotton Program analysis and would be difficult to include.
	+ Cotton program concurs with the removal of pink bollworm and boll weevil from the National Priority Pest List.
* Coconut cadang cadang
	+ Question about the survey methodology – datasheet is no longer accurate; molecular identification requires palm fronds that have been newly generated.
	+ Significant concerns include:
		- Safety associated with climbing palm trees to recover samples
		- Ability to effectively clean equipment between surveys
		- Ability to gather apical meristematic tissue
	+ Hawaii confirmed it’s a pest of concern and suggested the following:
		- Limits on size of palm because dwarf varieties are available
		- For taller palms, bucket trucks/lifts can be used
		- Train employees to use lifts
		- Growers in Hawaii are willing to cut down a palm for survey, if needed
* Began discussing criteria for removing pests from the National Priority Pest List. This discussion will continue on Thursday. Some possible criteria include:
	+ no surveys for the pest in the last few years or lack of interest
	+ overlap with program pests, for example Cotton Program pests
* SSC input (what other questions should we be considering for maintaining the National Priority Pest List):
	+ One state was concerned about the removal of a longhorn beetle, but it was put back on the list for one more year.
	+ We’re asking the right questions.
	+ Constituents have been OK with changes generally.
	+ Discussion on Survey Names--there is the option of using the Survey Name of “Pathway Survey” if the survey will be done in multiple crops, or Vegetable Survey, etc.
	+ Most states felt that there were enough Priority Pests to choose from for a state to reach the 60%.

SPRO Input:

* Some states tend to conduct the same surveys from year to year with the same target pests. States have not had issues with current Priority Pest List.
* If the survey method is potentially dangerous, and if state is willing to put in appropriate safety measures, can it be left up to the state? Can the pest stay on the list or can the state continue to bundle it?
* There is interest in bringing on new commodity surveys (e.g., hemp). In theory, these surveys can be done in “certified hemp fields.”
	+ Several states with large hemp production have made requests to survey for pests; however, no pests have been identified that are unique to hemp.
	+ If you have pests of concern on hemp, forward for OPEP consideration.
	+ If existing National Priority Pest is selected and survey will be conducted on hemp the field has to be a certified (non-THC) hemp farm to use Federal resources.
	+ Pathogen samples are the primary concern as identification requires tissue sample and hemp with increased THC would be prohibited in federal spaces. No pathogens on the 2022 priority pest list would likely include hemp as a host.
* General concern is limited funding and determining what’s most important for each state or go PPA 7721 route.

SPHD Input:

* No feedback about list specifically.
* List is OK and making changes to it is working fine.
* Some states tend to repeat surveys over and over, trying to find ways to work with that.
* The 60% has been hard to hit for some.

If a pest will be on the National Priority Pest List, should it be a host of a specific economic value?

What is our process for submitting pests?

* Add something to the guidelines about submitting pests
* Can do a better job of communicating process
* Do a formal call for pests to CAPS community twice per year

Patrick – 12-203 comments – opportunity APHIS gives to public to comment on certain pests (both plant and animal) – goal is for public to be able to comment on pests and share pests they think should be of importance to APHIS. APHIS is working on coordination of this.

CAPS CFWG is not considering an arbitrary number to hit when removing pests from the list. The group is thinking about need, capacity, importance, and resources – we also have bundling.

**January 26, 2022**

**Day 2**

**Desired Outcomes:**

* Share Updates from PPA CFWG (Van Pichler)
* Share Preliminary ID Updates
* Discuss 60% Priority Pests
* Online Work Plan Interface Updates and Discussion

**PPA 7721 Update**

Feridoon Mehdizadegan provided an update on PPA and introduced the new National Policy Manager, Van Pichler.

Updated PPA contacts:

* Van Pichler, National Policy Manager
* Brooke Divver, Management and Program Analyst
* Feridoon Mehdizadegan, National Operations Manager, Field Operations
* Ron Weeks, PPA 7721 Coordinator, Science & Technology
* Jennifer Nicholson, National Clean Plant Network Coordinator, Science & Technology
* General inquiries, PPA-Projects@usda.gov

General Evaluation Criteria for PPA Requests:

* Strategic Alignment – Does the suggestion align with the strategic objectives of PPA Section 7721?
* Impact/Outcome – Will the project make an impact and produce results as defined by the individual goal area?
* Feasibility – Can the project be accomplished based on key factors such as resources, collaborative partnerships, and a clearly defined process?
* Past Performance, Best Practices, and Innovation – Will the project be successful based on previous experience in similar endeavors or to the extent in which the project uses best practices and innovation to achieve success?

Questions from the group:

* What percentage of PPA requests are funded?

80% are funded in some capacity

* When will the 2022 spending plan be released?

Usually on or about the beginning of February, this year’s is expected in late February

* How will the release date be messaged down?

Always tentative but will bring the topic of communicating the date to the CFWG

* With the system change, what happens to previous years’ data?

We have maintained custody of the data. It will transfer into the new system.

**Preliminary ID**

Darrell Bays shared updates on preliminary ID and CFWG plans for FY22. He introduced a new team member, Patrick Haslem, to the group. He also shared some reporting metrics and touched on these topics:

* OPEP Assessment – Evaluating the survey and diagnostic assessment process
* Needs – Develop a system to identify diagnostic capacity
* Is there a need for a PPQ identifier? We would probably benefit from this role, funding could be an issue
* Is there a definition of what constitutes a sample (e.g., Washington over 20,000)? – Need to clarify how institutions are defining and reporting

**60% Priority Pests**

Lisa Jackson and Darrell Bays led a conversation with the group on the transition from 50% to 60% priority pests in workplans.

Group Feedback, Issues, Concerns:

* Four states in the west want to go back to the 50%. This desire could be satisfied by allowing “freebie pests.” These would be pests that 1) do not require extra effort/expense to conduct the survey and 2) do not require extra effort/expense to identify the sample.
* Examples:
* A soil sample is taken for two Priority Pest targets. When the sample is processed, it can provide negative data for other cyst nematodes.
* A trap and lure combination is used that is effective for one Priority Pest and two non-Priority Pests. When the sample is processed, it can provide negative data for all three pests.
* Several states felt like they didn’t have many Priority Pests that were relevant for their state.
* Some states had concern about pests rolling off the list, particularly ones in pine and oak.
* Action: For FY2023, we will investigate ways to capture “freebies” without having them impact the 40% non-Priority Pest cap.

**Online Workplan Interface**

Steve Shearer facilitated constituent feedback report-outs on the Online Workplan Interface from attending SSCs, SPROs, SPHDs, and PSSs. After completing all report-outs, Lisa Jackson and Darrell Bays led a group conversation on planned next steps for the Online Workplan Interface.

Constituent FeedbackSSCs (Brad Danner,Sarah Phipps, Darcy Oishi)

* On the Word export there is too much blank space
	+ Workplan had way too much empty space – editing took it from 32 pages to 17 pages.
	+ One SSC reported that it took over 2 hours to edit.
* On the Survey Summary Form (SSF) and Financial page, there was mostly positive feedback
* The SSCs contacted various people for assistance (CAPSIS, ADODRs, PSSs, NOMs)
	+ Budget section direct & indirect cost was an issue (direct cost is not calculated properly)
* Too many internal approval layers – hinders internal review process
	+ Online submission process doesn’t relate well to our in-person approval process
* Some issues connecting to the site
* Issues related to financial plan dates, not in the abstract, requested by SPHDs office
* Some data from the SSF is lost in final workplan (e.g., number of visits)
* Good step in the right direction

Suggested Improvements:

* Want to have a submit button and confirmation that it was correctly submitted
* Ability to download current template then cut and paste into online system
	+ Allow Word document uploads (using provided templates)
* Is it possible to print all data?
* Is there a way to reduce redundancies in data entry from form to form?
* Regularly scheduled training (“how to” doc from early spring was helpful)

SPRO’s (Kimberly Rice, Tina Peltier, Megan Abraham, Helmuth Rogg)

* 1 SPRO used the system to help out; it took 4 days and data was lost
* Exporting resulted in way too much white space.
	+ Editing to proper formatting took anywhere from 10 minutes to half a day
* Saves time up front, but that time is eaten up by editing on the back end of the process
	+ Layout was different but all data was there
* Overall – no time saved. Newer system is cumbersome.

Suggested Improvements:

* Enable SPROs/SPHDs to sign electronically in online version
* Enable SPROs to download a copy
	+ Especially helpful when SSCs are in the field

SPHDS **(**Eric Ewing, Alana Wild)

* SPHDs generally like the online interface though there is room for improvement
* Received complaints on formatting
* Surprised that the work plans couldn’t be signed using the online interface
* Specificity of questions (e.g., difficult to determine the number of interviews that will be conducted – this is in the Infrastructure Workplan)
* Questions
	+ Who is responsible when changes are needed after signature?
	+ Are they reflected in the PDF? The Online Interface? Both?

PSS **(**Greg Aydelotte)

* No real complaints received. Folks needed help initially, but they were able to do it independently afterward.

Group Conversation (Lisa and Darrell)

* Online interface didn’t really decrease Darrell and Lisa’s workload.

Benefits:

Biggest benefit was the financial page. We are now able to run reports across all states and years. This is helpful for the NOMs and the Pest Detection CFWG to manage the program and to respond to inquiries.

The pest list is the same in the SSF as in the work plan, since they are linked.

If we move away from the online interface, we will need to determine what needs to be collected electronically and what is ok being collected in static pdf documents.

Disadvantage if we go back to the Word template, we need to maintain Word templates.

Will have to enforce that the cooperators use the correct template.

This was an issue in the past.

* The group talked about how they share and edit work plans before the work plan is final (referencing one state’s 5-layer review process).

How do they share and get draft work plan approved?

Usually through email, sharing the Word export (or in the past, the Word template).

Edits are added to Word document.

* We can make changes to the process but want financial information to remain the same
* Want financial plan development piece to work well and be user friendly (e.g., rounding issue, always over by $1)
* There are steps in the process that are outside of our control, as they are used across PPQ/APHIS: ezFedGrants, PPQ Agreements SharePoint.

Feedback on some issues raised

* Internal approval process at cooperator level

States will have different approval processes, we cannot manage state level approval processes

* We will have to use the online interface as-is for FY2022 PPA; perhaps we can make changes for CAPS FY2023.

**January 27, 2022**

**Day 3 MS Teams Meeting:** [Click here to join the meeting](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/t-59584e83/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fteams.microsoft.com%2Fl%2Fmeetup-join%2F19%253ameeting_YTg5OWU2ZmUtZGY4OC00YTIzLTg3YjgtOTdkNjY5NjBiMWNl%2540thread.v2%2F0%3Fcontext%3D%257b%2522Tid%2522%253a%2522ed5b36e7-01ee-4ebc-867e-e03cfa0d4697%2522%252c%2522Oid%2522%253a%25221d1ccc97-5807-42e2-8a63-8cec491e0b56%2522%257d&data=04%7C01%7C%7C1f4c5175835e4d6ba71308d9bb4d32ef%7Ced5b36e701ee4ebc867ee03cfa0d4697%7C0%7C0%7C637746762498159089%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=lSJWOconeRXdKV2kiPHAVcAA3VOpJlHSlhNj0g%2B0Qrs%3D&reserved=0" \t "_blank)

Option to attend via conference line (audio only) 1 (202) 650-0123; ID: 936 194 419#

**Desired Outcomes:**

* Share PPQ S&T Updates
* Demonstration of Interactive Distribution Maps
* Share SAFARIS Updates
* 60% Priority Pests
* Continue Group Discussion on National Priority Pest List

**S&T Updates**

Shelley Gray and Dan Mackesy provided updates from Science & Technology. They also introduced a new employee, Colin Funaro, to the group. Dan and Colin have stepped into the role vacated by Heather Moylett. Dan will continue to cover the overarching S&T CAPS science support topics, in addition to providing science support for the pathogens on the National Priority Pest List. Colin will provide science support for the arthropods on the National Priority Pest List. Shelley also provided an updated list of [PPQ S&T Laboratories](https://usdagcc.sharepoint.com/sites/aphis-ppq-policy/php/PD/CAPS/G4%20Drafts/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2Faphis%2Dppq%2Dpolicy%2Fphp%2FPD%2FCAPS%2FG4%20Drafts%2FNational%20CAPS%20Committee%20Meetings%2FNCC%20Mtg%202022%20Virtual%2FHandouts%2FPPQ%20S%26T%20Lab%20Names%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2Faphis%2Dppq%2Dpolicy%2Fphp%2FPD%2FCAPS%2FG4%20Drafts%2FNational%20CAPS%20Committee%20Meetings%2FNCC%20Mtg%202022%20Virtual%2FHandouts) to the group.

AMPS Page, CAPS Webpage, and AMPS Change Request

* The group is seeking feedback on AMPS page layout and content
* Discussed changes already implemented and future plans for the page
* Meeting attendees were happy with recommendations from the focus group

**SAFARIS Distribution Maps**

Amber Tripodi demonstrated interactive maps, which are primarily based on climate data and NOT host presence. She also highly recommended that users become familiar with the methodology document. We don’t want users to unintentionally misuse the maps. Users should read the methodology document for each pest map.

Group Questions

Who is the point of contact for questions?

* Permanent POC has not been identified yet, for now it’s John Crowe and Amber Tripodi

Historically host information was included. Can we add a disclaimer that clearly says maps DO NOT indicate where hosts are present?

* Yes, this information can be added.

Has the model been validated?

* Models are heavily reviewed. Difficult to validate for pests who are not present.

How should we be using the maps?

* Currently the maps are just a tool to assist in decision making, and are not intended to inform where to place traps

**National Priority Pest List (Part 2)**

John Crowe continued the discussion from Day 1 of the virtual meeting focused on the National Priority Pest List. His conversation began with a discussion of the desired number of pests we want to keep on the list, and he collected input on when and how to remove a pest from the list.

Should we consider the number of surveys being done (e.g, is only one state doing one set of surveys on it)?

* States near a major port could be surveying for something that the rest of the country doesn’t want to show up. This is more important for states with a port.
* There are certain states “on the frontline” for pests, but we don’t want 1-2 states to determine what’s on or not on the list.
* Should we consider a pest’s impact on exports?
* Are there Program Pests with funding already associated with them?
	+ Determination: this is one of several factors that should be used when considering what should remain on the list
	+ Want to support states trying to bundle pests any way we can
	+ Some states may receive funding for a Program Pest, while states that do not yet have the pest would be reliant on CAPS or PPA funding.

Are there unknown pests that we need to consider?

* This is an ongoing question; please continue to submit your pests to be considered for the National Priority Pest List.

List size

* In the past, approximately 6-7 years ago, the list ballooned. In response to that, rules became more stringent to add pests.
* In addition, once the OPEP model was finalized, all pests previously listed on the National Priority Pest List were evaluated using OPEP. This caused some pests to roll off.
* In addition, the Survey and Diagnostic Assessment was applied to all National Priority Pests as well. Some rolled off because of lack of effective survey or diagnostic methods.

Pest presence

* A previous, unofficial standard, was a pest established in 3 or more states
* When a pest is deregulated, you still have the option to bundle

Program pest

* Are they appropriate to keep on the National Priority Pest List if they’re in at least 6 or 7 states?

Are there other factors that should be considered?

* Have there been any recent removals of pests that have caused problems for states?
* Most concerns that states had were alleviated by being able to bundle the pests.
* The disadvantage is that these pests will no longer count towards the 60% Priority Pest requirement.

Is deregulation of pests a factor?

* State Interdiction Stations can provide an advantage to states seeking to have a Federally Recognized State Managed Program.
* CA – cottonseed bug – considered the Federally Recognized State Managed Phytosanitary Program (FRSMP).
* Referenced the FL state regs on cotton from CA
* Does FRSMP fall into the category of deregulated?
	+ FRSMP is not taken into consideration for National Priority Pest List
	+ This may be of use during OPEP.

**Additional Discussion (Day 3)**

The group discussed if folks slated to roll off the committee could remain until the next CAPS meeting.

* Suggested that we consider travel costs and consider having folks attend virtually
* Considered having members that are ending their term attend as opposed to new members
* Agreed to have a conversation with individuals on a case-by-case basis
* Discussion shifted to updating changing transition plans
* Current structure for rolling off and rolling on is somewhat rigid. Maybe we need to start consider this more of a fluid group as opposed to a “voting” group
* Maybe start having folks “listen in” to meetings a couple months ahead of their group departure
* ACTION – John Crowe committed to revisiting the bylaws about the committee and meetings