

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

**National CAPS Conference**

**Phoenix, Arizona**

**December 2 – 4, 2008**

**EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>2008 National CAPS Evaluation Summary Report.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Topics.....	2
Panel Members.....	2
<b>Evaluation Data.....</b>	<b>5-18</b>
Data for question #1.....	5
Data for question #2.....	5
Data for question #3.....	6
Written Comment .....	8
Results & Recommendation .....	18
Additional Comment Forms .....	19

---

# **2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Conference December 3-4, 2008**

## **National CAPS Conference**

**Phoenix, Arizona**

**December 2 – 4, 2008**

### **EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT**

2008 National CAPS Conference took place in Phoenix, Arizona from Tuesday through Thursday, December 2nd through 4th, 2008. The conference was designed to be a working meeting, with the intent to obtain input from the States and field on a variety of issues. This is a major opportunity for all involved to participate in the future direction of the CAPS program, and come away with a sense of ownership in the program. We will face the future together!

Specifically, the planning team designed and developed strategies to enhance the meeting experience for participants to create an environment to facilitate networking, information exchange and discussions. As a result, this year's meeting included guest speakers, technology demonstrations, taxonomic/diagnostic demonstrations, panel discussions, best practices discussions, and break-out sessions for various groups. Also, networking events included a welcome reception, networking breakfast and a banquet.

The meeting included various guest speakers and panel discussions that included the following:

#### **State Welcome**

John Caravetta, SPRO, Arizona

#### **Remarks by PPQ Executive Team**

Phil Garcia, Western Region Director, PPQ

#### **Vision of Pest Detection and CAPS: Facing the Future Together**

Matt Royer (PPQ, MD), John Bowers (PPQ, MD)

#### **Panel Discussion: CAPS Survey Guidelines**

Panel Members

John Bowers (PPQ, MD), Kristian Rondeau (PPQ, CO), and Brian Kopper (PPQ, NC)

#### **Impact of the 2008 Farm Bill on CAPS**

Matt Royer (PPQ, MD)

## **2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Conference December 3-4, 2008**

### **Panel Discussion: Best Practices Session: Agency Cooperation**

Panel Members:

Federal: Matt Royer (PPQ, MD), and Marty Draper (CSREES, DC)

State: Mike Wallace (SSC, AZ), and John Weaver (SSC, NH)

### **Breakout Sessions: What will a Commodity-like Survey Look Like in the Future?**

Eastern States: Vicki Smith (EPB, CT); Southern States: Benny Graves (SPB, MS);

Central States: Bob Dahl (CPB, WI) and Western States: Jeff Knight (WPB, NV)

### **Breakout Sessions: What Does the Future Look Like for These CAPS Topics?**

Analytical Tools to Conduct CAPS Business: Kristian Rondeau (PPQ, CO); Survey Methodology and Guidelines - What is the Reality?: Dan Fieselmann (PPQ, NC);

Appropriate Data to Collect and Record: Brian Kopper (PPQ, NC); and

Risk-based vs. Commodity-like Surveys Adam Silagyi (PPQ, FL)

### **Vision of Data Management for Pest Detection and CAPS**

Todd Schroeder (PPQ, MD)

### **Information Technology Session (Data Management Systems):**

Demonstration #1: PHIS: Todd Schroeder (PPQ, MD)

Demonstration #2: ISIS: Brett Miller (PPQ, CO)

Demonstration #3: AQAS: Ethan Kane (PPQ, MD)

General Demonstration #4: NAPIS (Pest Tracker), GIS, NAPPFAST

Susan Schechter (Purdue, IN), Mark Crane (PPQ, NC), Dan Borchert (PPQ, NC)

### **Panel Discussion: Outreach: Sharing Our Mission with Industry and the Public**

Panel Members: John Bowers (PPQ, MD), Brian Kopper (PPQ, NC), and Kristian Rondaue (PPQ, CO)

### **Introduction to the Taxonomic / Diagnostics Session**

Joel Floyd (PPQ, MD)

### **Taxonomic and Diagnostic Demonstrations:**

Identification Aids for Screening Bark Beetles: Bobby Brown, PPQ Domestic Entomology Identifier, IN

Screening Aids for Moths and Seed Bugs: Julieta Brambila, PPQ Domestic Entomology Identifier, FL

Sample Handling and Field Screening of Plant Diseases: Grace O'Keefe, PPQ Domestic Plant Pathology Identifier, PA

PCR 101' Workshop: Craig Webb, PPQ Domestic Plant Pathology Identifier, KS

Internet-based, Media-rich, Identification Tools: Terrence Walters, PPQ, CPHST Identification Technology

### **Concurrent Breakout Session – SPHDs and SPROs: Managing Cooperative Agreements at the State Level**

Bruce Shambaugh (PPQ, WY)

## 2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Conference December 3-4, 2008

### Breakout Sessions – Peer Group Discussions: Discussion of Topics of Interest Relevant to the Perspective of the Various Roles in the CAPS Program

SPHD: Steve Knight (PPQ, IL)

SPRO: Bob Dahl (CPB, WI)

PSS: Erin Stiers (PPQ, KS)

SSC: Ken Carnes (SSC, NY)

### Meeting Summary and Closing, Q&A, and Discussion

John Bowers (PPQ, MD)

### CAPS Banquet

John Bowers (PPQ, MD)

### Evaluation

At the end of conference, participants were provided an opportunity to evaluate and provide comments related conference. The below chart reflects the average ratings participants assessed each area. Additionally, they were provided an opportunity to submit written comments. The evaluation form queried participants on conference facilities, logistics, objectives, content and materials, pacing and length of session, overall quality of speakers, panels, presentations and presenters. The table below details the individual evaluation scores and the overall meeting score.

*Scale used:*

	Excellent				Poor	Not
	5	4	3	2	1	Answered
	5	4	3	2	1	0

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

**The 2008 CAPS Conference provided the following opportunities:**

The 2008 CAPS Conference provided the following opportunities:	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	Not Answered
	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
1. Addressing Latest CAPS Issues.	<b>16%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>2%</b>		<b>4%</b>
2. Networking Opportunities.	<b>53%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>		<b>2%</b>
3. Opportunity to Find New Collaborators.	<b>10%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>5%</b>
4. Sharing Ideas.	<b>40%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>15%</b>			
5. Opportunity to Interact with PPQ and other Stakeholders Representatives.	<b>42%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2%</b>		<b>3%</b>

**The 2008 CAPS Conference Planning and Logistics Support:**

The 2008 CAPS Conference Planning and Logistics Support:	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	Not Answered
	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
1. Annual Meeting Support Staff.	<b>53%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>5%</b>			<b>5%</b>
2. Meeting Facilities (conference Rooms –Sheraton Crescent Hotel).	<b>39%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	
3. Quality of Refreshments Process.	<b>32%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

4. Meeting Registration Process.	<b>37%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>
5. Meeting Location (Phoenix, Arizona).	<b>47%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>6%</b>		<b>2%</b>
6. Individual Accommodations (Guest Rooms – Sheraton Crescent Hotel)	<b>45%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>

**Perception of the following Events:**

Perception of the following Events:	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	Not Answered
	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
1. Welcome Reception.	<b>26%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>10%</b>			<b>20%</b>
2. Networking Events.	<b>24%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>		<b>2%</b>
3. Keynote Speakers.	<b>15%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>8%</b>
4. Best Practices Session.	<b>7%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>6%</b>		<b>3%</b>
5. Panel Discussions.	<b>10%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>6%</b>		<b>1%</b>
6. CAPS Banquet	<b>14%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>8%</b>			<b>51%</b>
Information Technology Sessions.	<b>11%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>13%</b>

## 2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Conference December 3-4, 2008

### Written Comments

In addition to the numerical ratings, participants were asked to assess other aspects of the meeting they felt strongly about based on their experiences and observations. Below is the question statement followed by the participants' response(s):

*What went well for you during the 2008 CAPS conference?*

- Exposure to the National CAPS Program and understanding the direction that the CAPS program is moving. Networking with APHIS and State peers. The location (hotel), the planning at the event.
- The meeting as a whole ran very smoothly and was most likely due to the facilitators aiding in this process. Managing several hundred people with opinions could be very challenging. It was a great opportunity to meet new people and to speak with them face-to-face.
- Networking and introduction of new IT. The facility was better than expected. Format was good but could have been expanded. Hotel was also good.
- The Thursday 3:30-4:30 breakout session for SSCs was the best part of the whole meeting.
- Smooth operation! We covered all issues on agenda well – good Q&A.
- Opportunity to meet new people involved with CAPS. Opportunity to provide input on CAPS issues. Opportunity to learn ideas from other states. Good facilitation!
- Networking opportunities were abundant.
- Great to meet new people.
- Face to face with peers.
- Opportunity to meet and share information with peers and colleagues. There seems to be a lot of new people to meet.
- I liked the two-day format (and the opportunity to participate). Discussions seemed to have been more concise.
- New format was good.
- 100% lecture format has gotten stale this “new” way was a nice change.
- Good information and sharing of ideas, practices that have worked in other States.
- Sessions were kept on schedule. Opportunities to network were good.
- In general, everything went well.
- Information and networking panel discussions.
- New ideas and directions were welcomed for CAPS program. Good facilitation of all sessions.
- Much more State input and more focus on solving real issues and challenges within CAPS. HOOORAAAYYY!! Big improvement from previous years meeting.
- Facility-good; facilitators-ok
- Opportunity to interact/network with staff, State, federal colleagues.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- Break-out sessions were good.
- Open discussion format was good.
- Discussions with other States.
- No power points the first day-what a nice change! Drink coupons were good to get people to participate. Club rooms and hospitality suites were put to good usage. Poster sessions were a nice professional addition.
- The networking opportunities were very good. Break out sessions were pretty good and had good discussions.
- Great opportunity to visit with counterparts from other States.
- Meeting people in my region.
- Networking. Breakout sessions according to position/program.
- Breakout sessions allowed for open discussion.
- The networking with others.
- Good networking. Learned more about resources available. Use of door prizes to get people back on time seemed effective.
- I met many people and I was able to discuss with them CAPS issues, survey protocols, etc. The networking time built in to the meeting was valuable.
- Various breakout sessions and panel discussions. I really liked the “what does the future look like.... Session. The facilitators were a good improvement.
- Talking to other cooperators and finding out what they are doing in their State in the CAPS program.
- The networking was great.
- Meeting people/networking.
- The discussion sessions were the best. Also the sessions on PHIS, ISIS and AQAS.
- Panels and breakout sessions.
- It was great being able to meet my counterparts from all over the USA.
- Location, location, location! The fact that we had a meeting!!! NEED to make sure that we continue all the discussions after the meeting.
- Good effort to identify and receive input on issues of concern.
- Separate breakouts for various positions afforded good discussion and input of ideas. Nice concept to gather info.
- I like the breakout sessions. The discussions were productive.
- The sessions with open discussion were great, giving everyone the opportunity to express their opinion.
- Networking opportunities with old and many new CAPS colleague panels were a good idea for direct questions that could be addressed.
- Well organized. Good pace on most sessions. Things started and ended on time. The facilitators from PDC were very helpful. I like the Q&A and panel sessions-the give and take – not just having to sit through lectures.
- Networking, regional meeting, meeting with peers. Facilitators were very helpful.
- Meeting facility and facilitation excellent. Preparation for the meeting well done as expected.



**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

*What could have been done more, better, or differently to improve the 2008 CAPS Conference?*

- Nothing, specifically, for ‘new’ CAPS personnel – welcoming us. On background for infrastructure; would have been helpful. Learning about more emerging pest issues, pathways, etc. Where can I get more information on PPQ/CAPS website needs to be cleaned up –easier to navigate and search.
- More space and emphasis on posters and displays.
- My main concern for this meeting was that the facilitators could have engaged the Chairpersons of the breakout sessions in the questions they wanted to have answered. This was very poor planning. My breakout session was the Risk-based vs. Commodity-based surveys and the whitepaper for this session had clearly defined questions to be answered along with clearly defined goals to be met. When I was about to start the session, the facilitator opened his paper with three entirely different questions he wanted to have answered. Afterwards it was explained to me that this was done in the name of time management. I completely understand time management with a group this size. However, with that said, as the Chair of this very important topic I could have been included in this decision-making process as I do understand the goals to be achieved, including something about time management. Second, the three questions presented to this group covered NOTHING about the goals and questions on the white paper. All of the breakout sessions were very important and we all could have answered or at least brought up ideas for the main questions in the time allotted. Thirdly, the facilitators should NOT have been the ones to present the final comments to the entire group. Another very poor decision! You could tell during the breakout sessions, as well as during the reporting, that they ALL struggled with getting the details in the messages out to the entire group. If time management was an issue, the Chairs could have more effectively reported out with the understanding that no questions would follow. I was so upset at how mine went I almost stood up in front of the whole group to complain. I knew this was not the venue for that, so I refrained from doing so. This breakout session was very important and I personally feel that we missed this very important opportunity at this national meeting.
- Because of the special circumstances this year, the conference was shortened a day. Very unfortunate. Some people traveled very far and had no time to enjoy the place they came to. Also, the location of the conference didn’t make it conducive to enjoy outside activities. Also, more lively presentations.
- More microphones.
- Fully satisfied with agenda.
- More time needed to dialogue IT direction and programs. Discussion back/ forth is needed. Also, if you want us to read something for discussion then send it ahead of time. Todd’s presentation on Thursday was very poorly presented. The font/background washed out. Busy slides of unclear talk goals suggested he did not know his audience or proactive his message. Todd is an extremely good and helpful IT person but his presentation was important but wasted.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- There was not enough organized discussion among State Cooperators. The session above could have easily lasted a half a day. I got the feeling that APHIS is providing the money, they are responsible for the outcome, they are going to call all the shots. Why have a meeting of 150 people, ask their opinions about best types of surveys, etc. then provide a list of the pests that must be surveyed, how to conduct the surveys, etc.
- More on handling/managing cooperative agreements at State level – good job Mr. Shambaugh!
- Better meeting rooms (Crestview was noisy, temperature off).
- All responses suggested we needed more time – with two more days the participants would not be satisfied. The results will be in the NCC's follow up actions to the notes and "how to improve" actions identified.
- Did not have enough time to complain about ISIS.
- It's been too long since the last CAPS. Hold at least every other year.
- More time spent on interaction between PSSs, SSCs and SPHDs.
- Breakout sessions did not provide enough time to address issues.
- More time allotted, especially for breakout sessions. Facilitators need a better background of the issues facing the meeting.
- Provide summary of SUDA Forest Service events (EAB & ALB) that overlap with CAPS/APHIS interests. Log summary of recent emergency (eradication) action plan.
- Wednesday breakout session – I would have liked it to have been to more than me, so 2 ½ or 3 day meeting might have been better. I would like to have seen the taxonomic stuff too.
- There was no need to make everyone bounce room to room on Thursday morning – not enough seats and too noisy! Speakers stood at the side of the room rather than at the front so we had to crane our necks for 40 minutes. When audience was given microphones for questions/comments on Wednesday, they should be asked to stand up and identify themselves. Temperature of room was too cold!
- More registration stations on the first morning. Lines were long and wait was frustrating.
- If a session is pertinent to PPQ personnel (States not allowed access to databases) that information should be made know to potential participants.
- More SSC involvement seemed geared to PSSs. Longer peer sessions instead of IT morning sessions.
- Not enough time, too general, most of it was PPQ talking to each other.
- More time in sessions.
- Cash registration procedure was ambiguous. Too short- we could have really used another day.
- Better planning and organization – meeting information must be out at least three months ahead of time.
- Discussion on specific pest issues – updates on PCN, EAB, ALB, etc.
- If discussion centers on a document or report (i.e. CAPS guidelines) these documents must be presented at the meeting.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- Extend by a day to allow SPHDs time to get together to discuss issues within their region outside of CAPS)! Meet objectives by combining meetings.
- I wish it were 3 days long, instead of 2 days. It felt pretty rushed. Also the location didn't provide for many nice places to walk to, eat, or shop.
- The first IT session this morning was pretty impenetrable. Also the federal-oriented IT sessions (e.g. AQAS) were of limited utility for SSCs.
- I realize situations created a short meeting and the agenda may not have allowed this suggestion and it may have been done in prior years. There is no report on the status of CAPS - what has been done in the current year, what was detected, what worked, what did not work, what the specific is-ex. cost/budget, what is the direction for next year. This may help to give a perspective of what CAPS has accomplished.
- The meeting was a bit heavy on the Q&A and breakout sessions. I understand the need for feedback but a few lecture-style talks would also be useful.
- Many of the breakout sessions needed more time. I also would have liked to go to more than one of the Wednesday afternoon (Future of CAPS) sessions.
- More ISIS! It seems that everyone's problem involves ISIS. We need more training.
- Most of the breakouts on Thursday morning did not pertain to States.
- Not a great location.
- Too short-2 days not long enough to cover all topics.
- Keep discussions in future meetings, meetings together and separately (SPHD/SPROs) no good.
- Meeting started out too slowly on first AM and then we were rushed in the PM.
- The eastern region breakout was too much like the risk vs. commodity like breakout.
- Make sure there were questions allowed during the ISIS presentation. More discussion on data collection methods including the use of ISIS and the constant daily changes in templates without notice to field.
- It went well; a bit intense at times.
- During the breakout discussions that were time limited it would have been beneficial to allow the conversations to continue on course instead of trying to touch on all 3 questions.
- A little more basic structure of CAPS (i.e. who fits where/how) should've been briefly shown list thing. IT discussions were very abstract. Need to be more too-the-point or less talk-around and slides were hard to read.
- The information tech sessions did not provide much useful information.
- To have had a third day of meeting and more time to meet with peers and to meet in region to work on actual regional plans or multi-state plan development for 2010.
- Speakers on Thursday associated with PHIS, ISIS (not too much) and AQAS (particularly) seemed to be ignoring the State cooperators. They demonstrated tools inaccessible by State cooperators. The State cooperators need these tools and they have been developed for and are being demonstrated for the Federal component.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- Time for short sessions.

*Other Comments:*

- Two days is long enough for a meeting.
- Location with closer access to food, shopping would be ideal.
- Giving away reference collection or materials for keying out specimens or take-away materials for diagnostics.
- Use white copies = and double sided printing to reduce paper and meeting costs.
- Really hope these (not just me but the CAPS Committee) comments are addressed at upcoming NCC meeting.
- Thursday afternoon, SSC session, 3<sup>rd</sup> point presented was not regarding PSS – they need training regarding how to better help the SSC – creating State surveys, developing pest lists and pathways, GIS help and support, work plan development assistance, etc. The PSS have access to a lot of tools and PPQ data that the States don't realize they have. The PSS need to better communicate and teach us what they know and have access to. We need then and want to have their help to participate in the CAPS team!
- I found that I had great side conversations with people about what they've been doing; what is working well, etc. So, bottom line is that the networking aspects of the conference are the most valuable.
- Facilitation team was very helpful keeping people on task and keeping meeting flowing. Nice job!
- Best CAPS meeting yet.
- Although difficult in this shortened meeting, I recommend we have 30 minute breaks, to allow for in-depth discussions in the halls.
- The meeting was very necessary and the new anti power point format was very good. However, with PPQ's mission, Farm Bill and our direction as an agency poor upper management recognition of our true mission by failing to support a full week dedicated to this meeting shows extremely poor management. They are not practicing what they preach on leadership.
- The breaks out sessions were good – but the overall structured format prevented needed back and forth dialogue. Topics should/could have been debated. Can't just have one person's thoughts assumes that there are not counter opinions.
- The PDC staff did a good job but see the above for further consideration. I am a believer in forward thinking but debate and dialogue have to be a part at a break out session.
- If you're going to ignore the input it's just window dressing. Do the job duties of the PSS include coordination and dissemination of information to State CAPS cooperators? Are they training in how they can assist State cooperators? Those PSS who moved up from SSC positions are excellent. Others are off conducting surveys of their own interests and don't have any idea or inclination to learn how they can assist State CAPS Cooperators.  
Why do you allocate 25% of Pest Survey funds to pests of State concern then ignore (actually deleted) the list of pests of State Concern? The 2010 guidelines

## 2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Conference December 3-4, 2008

should require that each State prepare a list of the top 20 pests of State concern. Those pests should become an appendix with pests listed in decreasing order of (number if states listing) and each pest followed by the States that include it in their list. Each year, our State CAPS committee could then see what neighboring States are concerned about and may even choose to amend our list or perhaps even open a discussion with other States about regional surveys. APHIS might even “possibly” allow those pests to be surveyed with the 25% funding.

- These meetings are great! There should be a national meeting on even years and a regional meeting on odd years.
- Do States have input on their regional representative on the National CAPS Committee?
- The staff that got hotel, rooms to meet, food, snacks, and registrations did an outstanding job; they deserve a big thanks you and a cash award.
- The Crest View room was horrible for hearing. A microphone would have been good.
- Somewhere closer to the airport and closer to more restaurants would have been nice. But good nonetheless.
- Overall, CAPS needs a significant change...something already identified (day 1). Sadly, the meetings dialogue gravitated to re-working the current “old” CAPS model.
- Recognize small states have crossover duties between SPHD, DPC, and PSS. In small States we are not so strictly defined by job description we are defined by accomplishing the job. Training should include the feds in a holistic manner.
- This meeting far exceeded Nashville.
- While I appreciate all the effort and resources spent on improving CAPS, we are still debating issues we discussed 5, 6, and 10 years ago.
  - Data collection, ISIS, while improved it still doesn't work.
  - Work plan submission still is not standardized.
  - We need to recognize that what a PSS or DPC does in one State isn't going to always be the same and that's not bad. We don't have to be cookie cutters.
  - Provide acronym dictionary with meeting packet.
- Provide contact list of those that attend.
- Too many open question sessions and not enough structure and organization – the speakers should use power point for visual aids rather than talk for an hour without any visual aid to keep audience on the topics.
- Using masking tape to hang posters is not visually appealing.
- With Farm Bill funding need to have yearly national meetings to better plan for surveys and other activities.
- Analytical tools to conduct CAPS business – conference call.
- IT sessions – geared to PPQ – showed what was available but showed that States can't access. Accessibility is big issue. We need this to plan and conduct surveys.
- To do the best job of surveying we need all the tools possible at the states immediate disposal.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- When I arrived from flying all day from the east coast the hotel told me that there were no rooms left. I had made a reservation 6 weeks prior and they had me on file but they gave away my room and sent me to a different hotel. I was not happy. Two other people were sent away with me also. They were not happy either.
- It was good to learn about the databases about pests but discouraging that the information can not be shared with the States who need it the most.
- This meeting helped me put the CAPS program on perspective for my State. It is important but is not our only pest detection effort.
- Communication between SPHD, SDPRO, PSC and SSC could provide more structured and representative input that could have been presented in summary form at the meeting.
- A summary of conference expenses should be provided to each SPRO. Income vs. expense.
- SSC's should have been on the managing co-operative agreement section.
- Use of facilitators was very helpful.
- If information is not available to States I don't need to know about it.
- Too rushed. I liked the discussion format, but we need more time to talk.
- There is an assumption by many speakers that all in attendance are very knowledgeable on each topic, but many in the audience especially SSC's, are very new to the process. What happened to the introduction to CAPS session that was originally scheduled for Tuesday night?
- The AQAS info breakout session was worthless to State people.
- Todd Schroeder gave a fair presentation on PHIS, but still did not explain why this is a real benefit to the State. Many of the features he showed are not available to States. But Todd gave his presentation as though we were all PPQ employees. Speakers need to know and be able to speak to a very diverse audience.
- Dave Kowazski gave a good presentation and seems like a real asset to State cooperators attending to us ISIS.
- Positive meeting – presentations-time for Q&A session, use of facilitators throughout meeting. Good job!
- I wish to thank everyone involved with planning their meeting. I know it's a lot of hard work and it's very much appreciated.
- Using the three bullet point summaries to "capture" the breakout sessions didn't really represent the spirit of the discussion – ex. I thought the coordinator for the SSC breakout did a good job as a facilitator but then when the report was only the 3 recommendations, it sounded like the SSC group was just whining. Overall, I thought the SSC breakout was very positive.
- I hope you learned what you wanted to learn!
- The moderators in the breakout session who wrote comments on the paper did a great job keeping people on track and on topic. Many times, though, it seemed that those people didn't know much about the CAPS program so it was difficult for them to understand the comments that people were making. In the future those moderators should perhaps be CAPS people.
- Time frames were just about right. The use of the facilitators was excellent.



**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- I liked the increased opportunity to supply opinions on the direction and future of CAPS. But if these opinions are not integrated into CAPS policy then the meeting will have been no more useful than previous ones.
- Every State needs to be on the same page. Standard designs should be created by PPQ and sent to cooperators – then cooperator can add data entries if they desire but the basics should come from PPQ. Some States the SSC enters into ISIS- others the PSS enter data – some States use PDA's and some don't. Survey guidelines are great and should be created for every survey. It is important that all agencies work together. Bundled surveys would be great if feasible. More regions need to be formed – not just east and west. I am on a southern State and networking with other States with the same type pest problems that my State has would be very beneficial.
- I appreciate your efforts in taking comment and suggestions for the direction of CAPS program but “bottom line” decisions need to be made and standards set so this wonderful effort to protect American Agriculture can move forward.
- We need a little something during breaks to keep us going. Snacks would be great.
- Western Region needs an SSC representative. We need to be able to choose this person to accurately represent us.
- Use PowerPoint – it keeps us engaged and it's easy to use.
- Plan the next meeting with some local attractions available.
- The \$150 cash registration was a challenge. As an SSC that has been traveling for the last 10 weeks it is extremely difficult to come up with the cash. This left very little in my bank account for my family to buy groceries. It must be nice to have federal credit cards and higher salaries. Don't forget the ones who actually survey aren't paid so well.
- Still unclear about ISIS and NAPIS –there really aren't any answers or clear directions that are provided. Need much more clarity on this issue. More involvement from States would be helpful. What the heck is going on??
- The NCC did a great job for this year's meeting. Truly appreciate that there weren't very many PowerPoints and very few talking heads. Some of the speakers could have been more animated. The facilitators did a good job of keeping the sessions on track.
- Would have liked to have discussion sessions with SPHDs/SPROs/PSSs/SSCs in smaller groups or regions. For instance along Plant Board areas or even smaller areas.
- Ice cream social a nice and different break.
- 2 days were just right.
- I really hated having to bring \$150 in cash to register.
- Appropriate date to collect and record.
- Need to make sure the agreement section personnel are included on the agenda to give a presentation on the latest updates in this area.
- Facilitation team was very helpful keeping people on task and keeping meeting flowing. Nice job!

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

- Need to have registration go later than 5 pm for those of us with later flights into Phoenix. Many of us couldn't register Tuesday therefore didn't get tickets for reception, didn't have agenda, etc. everyone on earlier Wednesday am registration congested lobby area.
- May CAPS participants really need a few years of consistency. When consistency can't be provided, more guidance is important.
- Workshops should include "successful" States with vigorous CAPS programs to let them tell their stories, their approaches, their retrospective, etc.
- The beginning message indicated that everything was subject to change without grounding anything associated with CAPS. Are there no components that have weathered the test of time and do work that can be counted on as part of the foundation? We all know there are but it wasn't emphasized-almost the opposite.
- The same questions are being asked at this meeting as did the last one. We seem to be rolling along without addressing the questions. Another stupid analogy - this bus looked at the map produced by the safeguarding report and didn't like the direction and throw it out the window and have are trying to remake the map again.
- We are making progress but still have a long way to go. Of note as progress are the management team and the NCC. Sorry to see regional committees be discontinued but has resulted in a couple of good outcomes (dictionary between east and west eliminated).
- Continue to pursue CAPS/Pest Detection funding – don't rely on Farm Bill.
- We are not starting from scratch! Indicating that demeans are the hard work that was expected in the past thanks for acknowledging that! When did CAPS burn to the ground? Whippersnappers!
- Overall the meeting was very good and I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to meet new individuals as well as to discuss CAPS issues in person with many others I rarely see. This past year many ideas and issues have arose during conference calls, e-mails, the Plant Board regional meetings, and now at the national CAPS meeting; many reoccurring themes and issues from all of them. The question on many peoples mind, both Federal and State, is what will come from all of this? It will be necessary/vital for the continued success of the CAPS program, working with so many stakeholders, to organize the outcomes of this meeting and then to create a time-line with action items to be achieved. If we continually talk about the same ideas and issues over and over without any change all of the talk will become rhetoric and many stakeholders will begin to loose faith with whom they so closely work in PPQ. Since our mission is to protect U.S. agriculture and natural resources, we would be jeopardizing this if our State cooperators slowly began to pull away from us due to lack of involvement and trust.
- I look forward to a very productive NCC meeting in early 2009!



**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

**Results and Recommendations**

*Results*

The plan for the meeting unfolded as expected and on time.

Participants would have preferred more time for discussing the various agenda items

Based on the results of the evaluations received, comments and observations the goals and objective of the 2008 National CAPS Conference were accomplished and were well received.

Participants felt the meeting provided an excellent opportunity to network and create an environment of inclusion.

Comprehensive and collaborative planning played a key role in the overall success of the meeting.

*Recommendations:*

Continue the practice of planning for future *National CAPS Conference* meetings.

Continue the practice of guest speakers, panels, breakout sessions and networking events.

Develop strategies to create more discussion between panel member/speakers and participants.

Continue the idea of offering smaller concurrent sessions to create more discussion.

Allocate more time for discussion.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

**Additional Comment Forms**

Due to the limited time allocated for the various topics, the meeting planners provided participants the opportunity to provide specific comments related to the various agenda items during the throughout meeting. Below are the comment forms received:

**Feedback**

**Name:** Patricia M. Denke

**Organization:** MT Department of Agriculture

**Email Address:** pdenke@mt.gov

**Questions:** What is a “high priority” pest? Why is it high priority?

**Comments:** 1. I think MT really likes the “commodity like” survey; however, we need some sort of better input from states like MT on the national pest list.

2. The J-3 form may be a very strong tool. However, it needs to be joined to changes in the workplan- the J-3 can be integrated in such a way that it acts as a summary sheet – and substitutes for portions of the workplan. The workplans are currently becoming more redundant every time I see it – repeated info throughout the form.

3. When we do “generalist” survey we get natives – we should, if we have the ability or network, try to get these items of “non-interest” to people who are interested. I think that if the State can list place residual samples will go for additional work on biodiversity; this should be a positive aspect for examining the workplan.

4. Which system of trap/lure may differ by State.

5. In the end, standardization across ecosystems may not be possible.

6. Through the time I have been the SSC, CPHIST has impressed me as being sort of heavily handed-more ability for feedback and careful wording-recommended vs. standardization of.

**Name:** Lisa Peraino

**Organization:** USDA-APHIS-PPQ

**Email Address:** lisa.j.peraino@aphis.usda.gov

**Questions:** none

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

**Comments:** Traps and lures should be recommended but not required of the science does not support a specific trap. We must keep in mind the cost restrictions facing all the states. Many of them have durable reusable traps in their inventories. A set of recommendations would provide options but still follow a set of guidelines.

Regarding cost benefit analysis of surveys, please keep in mind the impact small surveys can have, especially on program designed to promote early detection. Iowa can have a tremendous cost/benefit for a core survey when they have > 12 million acres but the urban forest pest survey which may have a very high cost ratio may be priceless when it finds a pest early enough in the sea of corn. Finding that urban forest pest surrounded by the sea of corn may provide the protection we need to actually be successful in eradication. Those small high cost ratio surveys are going to be important and cannot be discounted.

**Name:** Robin Pruisrur

**Organization:** Iowa

**Email Address:** robin.pruisrur@iowaagriculture.gov

**Questions:** There is a “vary varied” audience her of old hands, newbie’s and everything in between. I think a “CAPS 101” session to lay groundwork would be very useful. Similar to the “NPB 101” - National Plant Board training Tom helped arrange for the MD NPB meeting in August.

The first panel was a waste – they lectured and did not answer questions.

**Comments:** Provide a mechanism for states to request additional resources. Give us a form/justification format to using making a request. Don’t just lecture us about how there’s no money. Let states plead their case.

If you make states sign more cooperative agreements you’re generating more ridiculous paperwork, which costs more of staff time. My department does not want nor need more superfluous paperwork. We will stop collaborating because it costs more than its worth.

**Name:** Laurinda Ramonda

**Organization:** KS Department of Agriculture

**Email Address:** laurinda.ramonda@kda.ks.gov

**Questions:** none

**Comments: 1.** I think that instead of just an eastern and western region there should be three regions. Eastern, Central, Western.

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

2. Thursday morning breakout. Frustration. We were shown all these great things that SSC's don't have access to. I like NAPIS because of the alerts we are sent and the accessibility to data from my own state and others.

3. Longer session for peer group, SSC's.

4. Knowledge of how rep's (NCC) have decided.

**Name:** Bill Kauffman

**Organization:** PPQ-SPHD, Georgia

**Email Address:** William.c.kauffman@aphis.usda.gov

**Questions:** Can a nursery "commodity" survey be supported in states where a crops commodity survey is less useful? See below.

**Comments:** Recommend that CAPS Farm Bill funds be directed towards "Nursery Commodity" surveys. These will be for surveys of early pest detection at nurseries which are at early part of pest introduction pathways. Composed of in-nursery inspection for exotic species, as well as trapping in nursery environs. This nursery commodity survey addresses well the focus of Farm Bill for early detection and pest risk pathways. Will allow states to customize a survey, with some guidance and a minimum framework with flexibility standards, but flexible for each states needs, risk and priorities. Each state should look at their main commodities then pick key exotic pest targets off the National Pest list and Commodity Pest lists to apply Nursery Survey. This will allow us to find exotic pests early in the pathway, rather than late in the pathway in the commodity (when too late!!).

**Describe your efforts in your own State over the past three years and your views on why those efforts were particularly effective or ineffective.**

**Name:** Yvonne DeMarino

**Organization:** NY

**Email Address:** Yvonne.demarino@aphis.usda.gov

EAS survey in NE NY traps were hung using volunteers (master gardeners). Efforts were coordinated by NYS DEC with our supplies and coordination.

Also utilized NYS Department of Parks to hang EAB traps without a cooperative agreement.

**Name:** M. Nelson

**Organization:** OR

**2008 National Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)  
Conference  
December 3-4, 2008**

We developed an exotic weed guide – BioControl Rapid Response – that is specifically designed for DOTs, hikers, NGOs, Boy scouts, etc. to be used in their activities. It is pocket size, water pout has an ID page and an interactive website connection that users can/have provided input. We know we are getting coverage along all state/federal roads maintained by ODOT because there people have used this tool.

Be careful about the concept of volunteerism; while, it sounds good and we encourage it a lot – volunteerism – even in the FS, has a major resource component which PPQ field does not have at this present level. The FS program is sued a lot to describe how beneficial PPQ can do – yet the FS has established specific resources to manage the volunteers. Talking to local SUFS people the volunteers take lots of training and most don't stay around. While PSS have a component for outreach – they are already stretched thin. PPQ would need to form a foundational structure before we implement a national volunteer program. Extra eyes helping us look for pests is a good long held concept in the pest survey community. It still is –what we don't need is another un-foundational – non-funded mandate from HQ to implement a sexy volunteerism program that takes time and resources away from what the field already has mandated for.

We have tried organizing volunteer groups and the problem is the results did not fit a cost benefit scenario.