

NCC Conference Call

September 4, 2009

## Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Kathy Handy
Kristian Rondeau	Susan Schechter
Jason Watkins	Eileen Luke
Bruce Shambaugh	Lisa Jackson
Robert Dahl	Melinda Sullivan
Vicki Smith	Joel Floyd
Dan Hilburn	Christina Jewett
Adam Silagyi	Tim Bergstrom
Erin Stiers	Charles Pierre
Ken Carnes	Melissa Thornton
Mike Wallace	Rob Alleman

# Work Plan Submission Update

Work plans are being reviewed in the Regions. Kristian Rondeau summarized a new detailed work plan submission process in the Western Region that improves on the process instituted previously in the Eastern Region. The process uses a common mailbox for submitting proposals and streamlines work flow using a process diagram and a SharePoint site. The CAPS Program has talked about standardizing work plan submission utilizing a future module in the Plant Health Information System (PHIS). The detailed process developed by the Western Region will help us decide whether to pursue this effort, and if so, how to integrate and, at the same time, keep separate those processes that happen in and are the purview of the Regions. Your thoughts on the matter are appreciated, especially from the perspective of our cooperators in the states. Is there functionality as a 'submittor' or 'submittee' that you would like to see? Please forward any comments, suggestions, and/or recommendations through your NCC representative.

## **Survey Supply Database**

The Survey Supply Database will have closed by the time you read this (COB September 4). If you have any further items to add or delete because of changes to the survey work plan, please contact Brian Kopper in the ER or Roeland Elliston in the WR. They will forward your request to the procurement office.

Survey Supplies for Farm Bill survey suggestions should not be ordered at this time. Guidance will be given on how and when to order these supplies.



NCC Conference Call

**Survey Guidelines** - Visual Surveys

Adam Silagyi and Lisa Jackson continue to work on guidelines for those pests for which we only have visual methods for survey (see the minutes to the NCC call for July 30). They reported that the project would like to shift focus slightly and concentrate on developing protocols or pilot projects for the number 1 and 2 ranked pests on the AHP Prioritized list, *Agrilus biguttatus*, oak splendor beetle, and *Platypus quercivorus*, oak ambrosia beetle, respectively. These top-ranked pests do not yet have specific trap and lures identified, yet are a serious threat. The goal is to develop species-specific visual protocols that can be used nation-wide and will be valid for entering negative data. Several states may be asked to pilot these visual surveys. If this effort is a success, then visual survey protocols will be developed for other pests for which there is only a visual survey. Comments, suggestions, and/or recommendations should be directed to Adam or Lisa.

### - Appendices M

Lisa Jackson and Melinda Sullivan have completed tables for pests and pathogens on the Priority Pest List detailing survey protocols and diagnostic methods. These tables have been sent out for expert review. These tables will form the basis for the PPQ-approved survey methods that will be detailed in future Appendices M of the CAPS survey Guidelines. See the minutes to the NCC call for July 2 for further explanation.

#### - Data Entry Guidelines

Kristian Rondeau and his group continue to work on data entry guidelines (see the minutes to the NCC call for July 30). The group presented three options to consider. As of the date of this call, very little response was received from the states and those in the field that actually enter data. The time for comment has been extended. **Please take the time to read the proposal, and send any comments, suggestions and/or recommendations to Kristian.** The NCC will discuss the proposal on October 1, and based on consensus, will begin to develop and implement data entry policies and guidelines.

#### **Pest Tracker Maps**

An effort is underway to make the maps on the public web site Pest Tracker more user friendly and usable. Recently the color scheme has been changed for clarity, including the outlines of the counties, and the maps can now be printed in pdf format. A suggestion was received to display regional maps where smaller states and counties can be distinguished easily, and this is being investigated by the folks at Purdue. While these cosmetic changes add value, the real question





for users of the maps is, "What do you want the maps to display to aid you in your position or project?" Presently, a 3-year survey map is displayed for each pest. Would you like to be able to see yearly maps (for the last 10 years)? How about an all-time map for each pest? Basically, what survey maps should be displayed on the public site? Send your comments, suggestions and/or recommendations to John Bowers and Susan Schechter, or your NCC representative.

A related issue concerns consensus data. Presently, any consensus record entered is only valid for the year in which the record was entered. A consensus record has to be added for each pest each year. At one point in time, this was done by folks at Purdue, but as the result of personnel changes and work load, this has not been routinely done. If yearly survey maps are to be presented, consensus data entered in one year would not show on the maps the following year unless the state once again entered the consensus record.

The proposal put on the table was to program the database so that once a consensus record was added (following the protocol, of course), then that record would automatically carry over from year to year until another consensus record was entered indicating that the pest, for whatever reason, was no longer established in that state. This way, consensus data would be displayed on the Pest Tracker maps each year on a yearly basis starting at the time the record was entered without the need for the state to enter consensus records each year. The folks at Purdue are researching the possibility of this proposal. A concern was raised that, with the present mapping logic, a survey record for a particular pest seems to override a consensus record. This also is being looked into. If you have any comments, suggestions and/or recommendations regarding these issues, please send them to Kathy Handy and Susan Schechter or your NCC representative.

## ISIS 4

ISIS 4 will be transferred to servers at the National Information Technology Center (NITC) before the end of the calendar year. NITC is part of the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) for the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The mission of NITC is to provide reliable and cost-effective Information Technology Solutions to achieve effective mission performance delivery for the USDA, its agencies, and others (<u>http://www.ocio.usda.gov/nitc/index.html</u>). With the transfer of ISIS 4 to NITC, access problems for the states should be resolved with the implementation of eAuthentication (<u>http://www.eauth.egov.usda.gov/index.html</u>).

## **CAPS Conference - December 2010**

Previously, the CAPS Program was told that holding the next CAPS Conference in December 2010 (as recommended by attendees at the last Conference in Phoenix) would not be possible due to budget issues and the state of the economy. That situation has now changed, and **we have a** 



NCC Conference Call

verbal agreement that we can go ahead and start planning our next CAPS Conference for December 2010 (in FY11). The expectation is that 'things' will loosen up by then. In your long-range planning, please pencil in attending a CAPS Conference next December. The last CAPS meetings were held in Nashville, and then Phoenix. We will look at locations in the southeast this time around, and will need a cost analysis based on 4-5 locations. Suggestions can be sent to John Bowers or forwarded up through your NCC representative.

# **NCC Meeting**

The National CAPS Committee will hold its yearly meeting in the later part of January 2010. If there is a PPQ office or state department of agriculture who would like to host this 2-day meeting at their facility, please contact John Bowers. All offers will be considered, and as always, selection of a site will be based on the results of a cost analysis. Think of the prestige and obvious networking opportunities presented by hosting the NCC at your facility! :) One offer is on the table, are there others?