



Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Erin Stiers
Matt Royer	Ken Carnes
Brian Kopper	Kathy Handy
Kristian Rondeau	Susan Schechter
Dan Fieselmann	Eileen Luke
Bruce Shambaugh	Lisa Jackson
Dan Hilburn	Melinda Sullivan
Robert Dahl	Charles Pierre
Vicki Smith	Tim Bergstrom
Benny Graves	Valerie DeFeo
Adam Silagyi	Talitha Price

Farm Bill

Matt Royer provided an update as to the status of the Farm Bill, and provided the NCC information regarding the Farm Bill Stakeholders Meeting, June 8-9, 2009 in Riverdale, MD. The focus of the meeting will be to provide opportunity stakeholder input, helping stakeholders understand the process, and listen to stakeholder needs as the planning process for FY2010 moves forward. The role of the NCC in the meeting will be to listen to stakeholders needs, clarify roles that the CAPS program may play in terms of cooperative agreements, surveys, state infrastructure, and reporting of data, and to represent the needs of our various constituents. Notes from the Farm Bill meeting will be available on the APHIS web page.

PPQ Farm Bill web page:

http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/pest_detection/farm_bill.shtml

2010 Survey Guidelines

Updates have been made to Appendices D, G-1, G-2, J-3, and M in the 2010 Survey Guidelines, and are posted on the web sites below. Appendix D, the AHP Prioritized List was updated to add four pests, previously listed but not ranked, to the rankings. The AHP Prioritized list now contains 58 ranked pests. This update necessitated updating Appendices G-1 and G-2, The Priority Pest List, to include the new rankings. HTML pages with links on the CAPS web site also were updated. Appendix J-3 was updated to reflect minor editorial changes in the spreadsheet headings. The most dramatic update was to Appendix M (the recent version is dated 5-21-09). This update includes new scientific knowledge, taxonomy, and survey methodology.

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.



As noted in the minutes to last month's call, **the current version of Appendix M, published on the web sites listed below, supersedes any information contained in any other document.** These documents will be updated to reflect the information contained in Appendix M. Appendix M will officially take effect in 2010, but the guidance will be incorporated into the data entry validation for negative data in NAPIS later this year. States are encouraged to start following the guidance in the 2010 edition of Appendix M as soon as possible. If you have questions or comments regarding this issue please contact your National CAPS Committee (NCC) representative.

The Survey Guidelines and updated appendices have been posted on the CAPS web site.
<http://ceris.purdue.edu/caps/adm2010/adm2010000001.htm>.

The 2010 Guidelines also are posted on the PPQ Pest Detection site.
http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/pest_detection/index.shtml

Along these same lines, an effort is underway to develop an Appendix M-x for each of our Commodity Surveys (Citrus, Grape, Oak, Pine, Small Grains, Soybean) and Taxonomic/Habitat-based Surveys (EWB/BB [completed] and Cyst Nematodes). The remaining pests on the AHP Prioritized list also will be addressed. **These appendices will contain the PPQ-approved survey method for each pest or pathogen, which will be the only method for which negative data will be accepted.** The appropriate documents then will be updated to reflect this information. This will standardize surveys across the country and make clear the appropriate trap, lure, or diagnostic to be used. This will also help us identify holes in our trapping, identification, and diagnostic protocols, and give direction to research efforts for new survey methodology development. For the CAPS program, the current published version of these appendices will be the sole guide to survey methodology.

Commodity/Bundled Surveys

The majority of the call was spent discussing the future of producing these types of documents. Presently, Corn and Potato commodity documents are in development via cooperative agreements with the University of Nebraska and Wyoming, respectively. A draft of the Corn commodity document was delivered to CPHST, and was deemed unacceptable. Revisions are in progress. Target time lines are to have the Corn commodity survey ready for the 2011 Guidelines (to be published March 2010) and the Potato commodity survey ready for the 2012 Guidelines (to be published March 2011).

A lot of discussion was held regarding what next, if anything. A topic discussed as a possibility was instead of producing commodity or commodity-like documents, produce mini Pest Risk Assessment-like data sheets where states could pull sheets for whatever pests they needed to develop their bundled surveys. This idea has merit, but the consensus was to wait until

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.



we see what the states will actually propose in their 2010 work plans, and go from there to assess needs.

A moth survey was proposed to compliment the exotic wood boring & bark beetle survey. This also would align our survey efforts with the new direction of developing New Pest Response Guidelines (NPRG). Valerie DeFeo, PPQ, Riverdale, presented the NCC with an overview of their new process, which will rely heavily on the AHP Prioritized list and grouping pests using several criteria. A brief description follows these minutes. In the end, the result would be a matching set of documents for a pest or group of pests from survey and detection through to response. This would go a long way to connecting aspects of various programs.

Discussion then ranged from what type of moth survey (forest moths, orchard moths) to a wide range of topics and considerations. Discussion kept coming back to an orchard or tree fruit survey. In the end, the NCC concluded that a stone fruit survey should be proposed to CPHST for development. This would include not only moths, but other pests and pathogens similar to the other commodity surveys. The acceptance of this survey by the industry was discussed, and all thought that the stone fruit industry would be receptive and supportive, mainly due to several trade issues that have come about recently. It was decided to approach the industry first and ask for their involvement and input on developing the survey, especially the pests to be included in the documents. If this approach works well, then a similar approach will be used with the apple and pear industry to develop a similar survey. This will be an important new step for the CAPS program to actively engaged the various industries in early pest detection efforts.

CAPS Accountability Report

As noted in the minutes to last month's NCC conference call, the NCC has been reviewing the CAPS Accountability Report. This tool matches pests targeted in each state's survey work plans and Pest Detection agreement with data entry in NAPIS. The intent of this tool is to track the requirement of the cooperative agreement to enter the data in NAPIS, and to be guide for the SPHD, SPRO, and APHIS survey coordinators to determine if this requirement is being met. Several format changes have been incorporated and target pests for 2009 survey have been updated to reflect the targets in each state's work plan. Each state can still review the list of target pests by visiting their state page on the Pest Tracker web site. The Report will be made available to all in the very near future.

CAPS Conference

A recurring comment to come out of the 2008 CAPS Conference in Phoenix this past December was to have this type of meeting every two years (instead of the three years since the meeting in Nashville in 2005). APHIS-PPQ sponsors this meeting, and is a major expense. Preliminary inquiries were made as to the possibility of sponsoring another meeting in December 2010 (FY2011). Based on past budgets, forecasts for future budgets, and travel availability

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.



and/or restrictions, the prognosis does not look good at this time. The NCC was encouraged to “think out-of-the-box” on possibilities of holding future meetings.

The next NCC call will be on Thursday, July 2, at 11:00 am eastern time.

New Pest Response Guidelines

PPQ has historically developed New Pest Response Guidelines (NPRG) as a framework for providing methods and tools used for containment, control or eradication for a pest. NPRGs are either developed in response to a pest detection in the U.S. or proactively prior to the arrival of a pest.

PPQ has adopted criteria set forth by the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and weights associated for pest prioritization for the development of NPRGs. The AHP list is also used to coordinate a harmonized pest prioritization methodology with the Cooperative Agreements Pest Survey (CAPS) program for early pest detection.

Pests from the AHP list are grouped for use in a general guideline or isolated for use in a pest specific guideline. The general NPRGs are organized by grouping the same taxa with known detection and control methods. Simultaneously, pest specific NPRGs are developed when the pest does not fit the general guidelines criteria based on its unique characteristics. These unique pests are prioritized based on the pest’s AHP ranking. It should be noted that a pest has overarching priority over the AHP ranking list if it is deemed an immediate threat to the U.S.

The criteria for preparing NPRGs prior to the arrival of a pest provides a more rapid turn around time for product development by focusing on both general and pest specific guidelines. The process also enables coordination between EDP, CAPS and CPHST on identifying gaps on research and development of pest detection methodology, consistency on system used to rank pests, and risk analysis development.

–Valerie DeFeo, NPRG Coordinator

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.



Some supplemental information for consideration and discussion related to the above.

An email to the NCC 06/03/2009

The team that develops the New Pest Response Guidelines currently are evaluating the program and setting priorities on how they will develop these guidelines and what pests to focus on. In setting priorities, the team will use the 2010 AHP Prioritized lists as a guide. Their focus will be similar to our bundled surveys for pests (e.g., EWB/BB) in a two-tier-type system. The first, higher-level tier will be to group a collection of pests from the AHP lists with a higher level common taxonomy, such as nematodes, scale insects, moths, bark beetles, etc. The second-tier group of pests (sub-sets of the larger tier one group) will be based on common detection and response strategies. The NPRG will be developed for the second-tier groups, with one to many NPRGs as a set encompassing the first-tier group. The end product will be a set of NPRGs for Lepidoptera, as an example, with each one encompassing one to several pests. The Emergency Management staff will use the appropriate NPRG to develop pest-specific guidelines when the need arises.

This is the perfect compliment to our bundled surveys. There is the potential to have matched sets of documents for high priority pests that encompasses early detection through response. Our survey guidelines contain broad lists of exotic pests with various survey methodologies. The NPRG narrow the focus based on detection and response strategies. When a pest response program is initiated, the program develops pest-specific guidelines. Thus we have a continuum across programs in PPQ.

On our end we currently are updating the Exotic Woodboring and Bark Beetle Survey Guide. As I understand, this group will be one of the first considered for NPRGs under the new priority system. To further the linkages among programs, I would like to suggest that we take the next step and develop a companion survey guideline to the EWB/BB guideline. There are several taxonomic groups to choose from, but I think a "Moth Survey Guideline" may be the most appropriate. There are at least 10 species listed on the AHP list, and I am sure there are more to be considered. This will strengthen our taxonomy-based surveys and address the pathway approach we are promoting.

This will be an agenda item for our NCC conference call on June 4. We also should talk about where we want to go with the commodity or other bundled survey documents.

– John Bowers, National Survey Coordinator

The NCC should communicate and discuss this line of thinking with their constituency.

What are our criteria for developing commodity or other bundled survey documents?

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.