National CAPS Committee (NCC) Annual Meeting
January 26 - 27, 2011
Raleigh, NC
Minutes

Table of Contents

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.

Participants

John Bowers CAPS National Program Manager	**Vicki Smith** EPB SPRO	**Beth Long** SPB SSC
Matt Royer Director Pest Detection	**Joe Collins** SPB SPRO	**Laurinda Ramonda** CPB SSC
Brian Kopper CAPS ER Program Manager	**Julie Van Meter** CPB SPRO	**Helmuth Rogg** WPB SSC
Kristian Rondeau CAPS WR Program Manager	**Clair Allen** WPB SPRO	**Lisa Jackson** CPHST CAPS Support
Rick Zink CPHST Laboratory Director	**Avi Eitam** ER PSS	**Talitha Price** CPHST CAPS Support
Jason Watkins ER SPHD	**Chris Pierce** WR PSS	**Carl Etsitty** PPQ Tribal Liaison
Joel Bard WR SPHD	**Nancy Richwine** EPB SSC	

Tribal Liaison

Carl Etsitty is the new PPQ National Program Manager for Tribal Liaison, and helps programs interact with Tribal Nations. He specifically deals with issues that arise when interacting with Tribes and helps with awareness when talking to states and constituencies about Tribes. The NCC would like to determine how to get Tribes more involved with the CAPS Program.

There are several initiatives (example: Executive Order 13007) that groups, such as CAPS, need to be aware of when interacting with Tribal Nations. Tribes should be involved with issues that can affect them; when Tribal Nations are not involved, or are involved at too late a stage, it can lead to litigations between the two parties.

Carl suggested that CAPS should work on building awareness of the program through outreach. CAPS should consider inviting Tribal Nations out to meetings and including them in discussions within the Program. Some states may already have good relationships with their Tribal Nations and can be used as a resource when trying to bridge the gap. Tribal Nations may be more comfortable working with CAPS on the National level versus the state level due to sovereignty issues.

A problem that may arise when performing outreach is difficulty getting Tribal Nations to respond. It may be difficult to find the correct contact to send information to. Carl suggests that outreach be more personal. Sometimes there can be cultural issues, etc. Tribal Nations like to interact on a personal level. They may prefer personal interaction versus letters/phone calls. This may lead to delays, but it is better in the long run.

Joann Cruse (SPHD WI) developed a presentation through Farm Bill funding that is focused on how to make initial contact with Tribal Nations. APHIS also is developing something similar to this that is broader that deals with tribal consultation. Joann's PowerPoint currently is on Carl's SharePoint site.

- Action Item: Carl will look at what is currently on his SharePoint site dealing with outreach on Tribal Nations. He will work with Kristian to determine if some of this material can be posted to the CAPS Resource and Collaboration Site.

There are events/meetings that the CAPS Program can attend where they can work on outreach with Tribal Nations. A booth, similar to the one for stone fruit, can be developed that can be taken and used for outreach at national/local meetings, tribal colleges, professional organizations, tribal fairs, etc.

- Action Item: Carl will keep the CAPS program informed of any events/meetings that may be of interest to the Program (ATNI, ATNWI, NCAI, along with other local and regional meetings).
- Action Item: John will look into developing a national outreach message and materials (e.g., a display) that can be made available to cooperators.

Farm Bill Update

Internal deadlines for developing the FY11 Spending Plan to implement Section 10201 of the 2008 Farm Bill were met in July, 2010. The plan was approved by the Undersecretary; however, the legal parameters governing use of Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) funds prevent APHIS from using these funds for this purpose. Accordingly, approved projects cannot be released nor can financial commitments be made at this time.

If delays in Farm Bill money continue, adjustments may need to be made to the spending plan that was developed in July, 2010. The group should look at the criteria used to rate the projects (alignment with 10201, impact, and technical feasibility) and consider adding new criteria to help re-prioritize survey projects for purposes of identifying those that can reasonably begin with funding arriving much later than expected.

- Action Item: Matt will be sending an email out for projects from the previous year asking for accomplishments. It is extremely important to show what has been done with the funds. Designated Project Leaders must enter Program Accomplishments into the SharePoint site developed to track FY10 Farm Bill projects. Matt will compile a comprehensive report of progress to date.
- Action Item: Matt will keep the NCC up to date on the current Farm Bill situation.

CPHST-CAPS Support Discussion

Rick Zink, Director of the Ft. Collins and Phoenix labs for CPHST, will be acting in the CPHST National Science Program Leader position on the NCC. Rick wants to work within CPHST to bring together more resources for support of the CAPS program. The main goal is to bring more direct support for the states, support diagnostics, answer questions from states, and work with CAPS Program Managers to make it a more collaborative exchange. The first step is visualizing pest detection activities (these are spread out through several labs: Otis, Mission, Ft. Collins, Raleigh) and bring them all together through communication and coordination. The goal is to have CPHST personnel available to the states to help them plan surveys and determine risk, e.g., Lisa Kennaway's work with Asian gypsy moth trapping. Lisa helped make recommendations for where traps should be set by looking at different criteria for different states (pathways, risk of introduction, etc.).

- Action Item: Rick will develop a chart showing CPHST collaborators, what they do, etc. This will be under development for some time as CPHST determines what resources are available (this is still a fluid situation in CPHST as it responds to budget realities). In due time, this information will be shared with the CAPS community.
- Action Item: SSCs will discuss at the upcoming breakout sessions at the regional Plant Board meetings what support they need and how CPHST can help (this can be done regionally, so several states can request support together).

NCC Bylaws

- Decision: No change is needed in the mission statement.
- Decision: No change is needed in the Bylaws.

Terms and Rotations

The current terms and rotations were reviewed, and are posted on the CAPS R&C site along with the NCC Bylaws. Terms are for three years. Members can be re-nominated by their constituency, but should allow other individuals to serve on the NCC after two terms to ensure that the NCC is getting new and different perspectives from across the CAPS Program.

Review of CAPS Conference

The evaluations from the CAPS Conference as compiled by Troy Fine are posted on the CAPS R&C site for everyone's review. Seventy-eight evaluation forms were received out of 209 total participants registered (37.3%). The NCC discussed several item/issues presented below. Other items/issues from the CAPS Conference appear under other discussion topics.

Participants liked the facilitators. They were aware of the programs and did a good job overall. Some comments dealt with wanting to include state participants as facilitators for the next meeting.

- - **Response:** The main meeting facilitator, Troy Fine, was designated by PPQ-PDC as an individual who had the required training and experience to lead the Conference. Because of budget and travel considerations, other facilitators were drawn from the meeting attendees. Melinda Sullivan (PPQ-CPHST) agreed to assist Troy, especially in the meeting planning stage and with meeting design. Three other facilitators needed for the breakout sessions were asked to help based on their facilitation training. Dennis Barclift (AL), Gary Gibson (WV), and Shashank Nilakhe (TX) are state personnel and SPROs in their respective states. A good mix of PPQ and state cooperators was achieved. Overall the NCC believes that the states were represented well.

Many participants wanted more emphasis put on IPHIS. There is a lot of anxiety over this in states and many thought that Todd's presentation did not answer a lot of the lingering questions on IPHIS. One problem is that he could not tell participants what was successfully being used with IPHIS (tablets, PDAs, etc.) and he could not give them a success story on using it. (Brian: all of the current equipment that is web enabled should work with IPHIS).

- - **Response:** IPHIS training has been discussed in the East. If you are PPQ and taking the training, you will be expected to travel and train other people, including state personnel, and possibly in different states. In the East there will be a training session in Florida and three in Raleigh; in the West there will be one central training session TBD, one in Texas, one in California, and 1-2 in Ft. Collins. A list of participants for IPHIS training will be going out to SPHDs and SPROs soon (this week or early next week).
- - **Response:** A library of excel sheets for data entry (templates) for CAPS surveys will be made available when completed. Also, the language in the cooperative agreements will need to be changed for FY11 and FY12 agreements (all currently mention ISIS or NAPIS). Kristian is working with the PPQ Regions on appropriate language.

Most participants liked the CAPS Fair and thought it was a very positive part of the meeting, and that it should continue in future meetings. Some other comments were that a couple of booths broke down early, the fair lasted too long, and the SPHDs were not able to participate. The NCC noted that people were still talking at the booths near the end of the time frame.

Some participants thought that the PSS peer-group breakout session should have been longer. For most this is the only opportunity they have to meet on a national level. The suggestion for future meetings is to have longer sessions that would allow the peer groups to develop an agenda with their own topics in addition to the national topics for discussion.

Many comments dealt with items that were beyond the group's control. Examples: only having a two day meeting, combining SPHD and CAPS meeting, not having all of Friday for travel. A reoccurring theme was that the CAPS Conference needs to be three full days. A benefit of having the SPHD meeting at the same time was that PPQ Management was there to observe the

professional attitude of CAPS Conference and the passion our cooperators have for the CAPS program. They generally liked what they saw regarding the CAPS Program, and saw its relevance as a professional organization for both PSSs and SCCs.

The NCC previously discussed having agreements training at the CAPS Conference. However, this requires a full day and the agreements staff generally prefers smaller groups in the states. This training could possibly be done a day earlier or a day later during the National CAPS Conference. The group should confer with the agreements staff and look into different options.

Some participants thought subject matter breakout groups were too large, while others wanted to go to more than one breakout group. Unfortunately, these were held at the same time.

- Decision: The NCC recognizes this problem. For the next National CAPS Conference individuals in charge of the breakout groups will outline the action items/strategies/time tables, etc. decided during the breakout session, and present a 5-10 minute review with time for discussion on either the last day or the afternoon following the session to allow those not present to weigh in on the subject. Other options will be investigated as well.

There were a few comments on why those who received recognition at the banquet were recognized. The attendees would have like a little more information on why the recipients were recognized. This was due, in part, because in some cases little information was given on the recipients when they were nominated. In order to say more about all the recipients, more information should be included on nomination forms to allow the presenters to say more of why the individual received the recognition.

- Action Item: The NCC needs to decide if the awards recognition should be done every year or only years with CAPS Conferences. Whenever this is next organized, the NCC needs to give more clear direction on what is expected on the nomination form.
- Action Item: During the Plant Board meeting, SPROs on the NCC should request 10-15 minutes to give a summary of the CAPS Conference.
- Action Item: Nancy and Beth will complete a first draft on an executive summary (two page max, preferably one) of the summary report on the CAPS Conference before the end of February. A draft was submitted to the NCC for review.
- Action Item: Any comments or changes to the National CAPS Conference documents should be sent to John who will compile corrections and finalize the documents. The final document will be sent out and should be used when presenting at the National Plant Boards.
- Action Item: John will determine how many people responded to the feedback questionnaire. Seventy-eight evaluation forms were received out of 209 total participants registered (37.3%).

- **Decision:** The NCC should push for a three day meeting. If this has to be combined with another SPHD meeting, the NCC should considering having the PSSs and SCCs meet on the same day as the SPHD meeting. The timing of the meeting is fine. The NCC would rather have a shorter, combined meeting than none at all. Meeting every other year is preferred and desired. It would be nice to have the National Plant Board weigh in that they approve of holding the CAPS Conference every other year.

The CAPS 101 session was well attended, but could have been developed and presented better. There is a very strong interest from the SSCs for information on CAPS in order to help them better understand their job and be able to interact with the CAPS Program. There is no user's manual for new SCCs, and a lot have requested something like this be developed. The NCC needs to get this going (maybe do something similar to NPDN modules, job aids, and/or FAQs). The NCC also should be informed when a new SCC has been hired. It would be nice to set them up with an experienced mentor.

- **Action Item:** The SCCs and PSSs (and Kristian) on the NCC should outline what is needed for "CAPS 101." They will come up with a list of topics that are needed, and recommend content, presentation, delivery and other issues associated with informing new and not so new members of the CAPS community about the CAPS Program.

- **Decision:** NCC members should let John know when new people come into the program. John will include this information on the CAPS listserv and can include it in the News and Announcements portion of the CAPS R&C site.

State CAPS Committees also were discussed. There is little or no real guidance on what constitutes a State CAPS Committee, how one should be formed, who should be a part of it, who leads it, when and how many times it should meet, and generally what is its function and how it operates and should be run. There is a lot of variability among the states, but the NCC felt that some overarching guidance could be developed for those state that feel they could use it.

- **Action Item:** CAPS 101 should include information on how to form and operate a State CAPS Committee.

The NCC should consider a TDY or a developmental assignment for an interested individual that would develop a packet for "CAPS 101" based on input from the SSCs and PSSs. The NCC should consider talking to Amanda Hodges about the NPDN training modules that have been developed.

- Action Item: John, Brian, and Kristian will look into the possibility of a TDY or developmental assignment for the purposes of beginning the development of a CAPS 101 document/website/ training module.

ISPM Standards and Language

The NCC should be aware of the International Standards, and the CAPS Program should move to align itself with ISPMs. When CAPS uses terms, the NCC should make sure that the right terms with the right meanings are being used (ISPM 5, Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms). ISPM 6, Guidelines for Surveillance, "describes the components of survey and monitoring systems for the purpose of pest detection and the supply of information for use in pest risk analyses, the establishment of pest free areas and, where appropriate, the preparation of pest lists." CAPS surveys fall into both "general" and "specific" surveys. In general, CAPS is very in line with the International Standards and is doing much of what is required in the standard already. But, is this advertised enough? Should it be pointed out in the Guidelines?

- Decision: The general consensus was that alignment with the International Standards should be communicated through another source, e.g., a white paper, but not the Guidelines. An alternative is that it can be put generally in the mission statement ("terminology is based on ISPM…" or "the CAPS Program strives to conform to these documents…"). The group can look at how NAPPO documents relay this. By aligning with ISPMs, CAPS will be adding validity to what the program is doing and why it is being done that way. This message of alignment should be conveyed to PPQ Management and the Plant Board.

- Action Item: Create an outreach document that states what the CAPS mission is and how it relates to the International Standards.
- Action Item: When Brian, Kristian, and John go through and edit the Survey Guidelines, they will need to make sure the correct terms are being used (alignment with ISPMs).

ISPM 8, Determination of Pest Status in an Area, "describes the content of a pest record, and the use of pest records and other information in the determination of pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided as well as recommendations for good reporting practices." This ISPM is mainly about terminology and how to report what a country's pest population is (presence, absence, transience) and what information should be reported in a pest record.

- Decision: To an extent, CAPS does some of this with NAPIS data, but it does not accurately cover all situations. The NCC needs to look at this and how the CAPS Program reports data using these terms. CAPS need not adopt all terms, but should strive to be a close as possible. This is an opportune time as the program transitions into IPHIS.

When developing templates for IPHIS, the CAPS Program should align input with ISPM terms. IPHIS data will still go into Pest Tracker, which is used by trading partners and trade staff when working with other countries. Alignment with ISPM terms should facilitate discussions.

- **Action Item:** NCC needs to determine what pest status terms will be adopted by CAPS. If anyone has any thoughts on this matter, they should be passed on to John.

2012 Survey Guidelines
Format and Presentation
Right now the Guidelines are in a PDF format that can be downloaded and printed. Does this format work for those in the states? Are there other, more efficient ways to present the Guidelines? What is the best way to update the CAPS Guidelines? The NCC agrees that the current method works well. It also forces constituents to use the CAPS R&C site. There may be ways to format, e.g., put all of the documents in one file and index it differently, or present, e.g., Lucid-like website, the Guidelines in a better way.

- **Decision:** Updating the PDF files once a year is acceptable. It can be confusing to states when new versions are continually posted.

- **Action Item:** NCC members should go through the CAPS documents (especially the Guidelines and appendices) and send all comments and suggestions, even small editorial changes, to John for consideration in the 2012 Guidelines.
- **Action Item:** Although the PDF format works well, the NCC should look into other formats and delivery options for consideration, especially as technology changes.
- **Action Item:** John will talk to Susan to see if she can provide hit statistics on the CAPS R&C site to determine who is going on the site and what they are looking at, with specific interest in the Guidelines pages.

Commodity Documents versus Individual Pest Data Sheets
The CAPS Program has covered most of the major commodities. Now the Program is looking at moving towards datasheets that are pest specific and touch on minor crops not covered with major commodities. The proposal is to develop individual pest data sheets, and then group them by commodity, taxon, or environmental niche as the need arises instead of going through the process of developing the large commodity documents. The datasheets would be grouped by a commonality in line with our bundled survey concept. The best example would be palm. There are three or four palm pest on our Priority and Additional Pest of Concern lists. This would cut back on much of the extra information that is included in the large commodity documents. It would save time and energy in the long run.

- **Decision:** All pests on the AHP list that are not in a commodity or taxon document will have an individual pest data sheet completed. Nothing else will be added or updated in the commodity documents for the time being until the NCC has a more firm grasp of where to go with this issue. CPHST will stick to detailed datasheets that the field can then use as they wish.

- **Action Item:** Rick and team will develop an example of the individual grouped datasheets and a separate intro document for the Asian Defoliator Survey. The Intro document will describe how to survey for Asian defoliators, a description of the pathway, reason as to why this survey is important, etc. The NCC can review this document and provide feedback for future "intro documents." The NCC needs a name to refer to these new documents.
- **Action Item:** Rick and team will develop the Intro document and grouped datasheets for palm pests. It will have a short introduction on how to survey in palms as well as individual pest sheets on pests of palm. Datasheets can be pulled from Terrence's Lucid key and revised for our needs.
- **Action Item:** Rick, Terrence, and John will discuss the best way to proceed over the next year for the datasheets and determine the best way to deliver the product.
- **Action Item:** When updating commodity documents, Lisa will break bigger documents up into smaller parts (by chapter, intro, pest datasheets, references, etc.).

Commodity/Taxon Documents
Potato, Cotton, and Stone fruit
Cotton Commodity Survey will have a draft version by mid-July; Stone Fruit will have a draft by mid-March. Both will be available for the 2012 Guidelines. A cooperative agreement for Potato documents was in place, but it was terminated because the work was not being completed. CPHST will restart this in house.

- **Action Item:** Lisa and Melinda will prepare the Cotton and Stone Fruit Commodity Pest Lists for inclusion in the 2012 Survey Guidelines. The approved survey methodology also will be added to the CAPS-Approved Methods website for these pests.

Asian Defoliators
There has been a lot of interest in this. Traditionally these surveys were done with AQI user fees through PPQ. When user fees slowed, these types of surveys were hit hard; they still need to be done. It makes sense to do these surveys, there is a lot of interest in these pests, and these pests have a high impact. Presently, these surveys have been funded via the Farm Bill. Does CAPS want to proceed with Asian defoliators as a CAPS survey that would be funded as part of our Priority Surveys?

- **Decision:** Asian defoliators will be offered as a taxon survey for 2012 and include five moths; Asian gypsy moth, Nun moth, Siberian silk moth, Pink (rosy) gypsy moth, and Apple ermine moth. For 2013, the NCC will consider adding four additional species that the CPHST Otis lab has suggested.

- **Action Item:** Lisa and Talitha will prepare the Asian Defoliator data sheets, the Intro document, and pest list for inclusion in the 2012 Survey Guidelines. The approved survey methodology also will be added to the CAPS-Approved Methods website for these pests.

Weeds

There has been some interest in covering weeds through CAPS, including aquatic weeds. There is currently 1-2 on the AHP list. The NCC has not really addressed this issue. There is a federal noxious weed program, but they do not have a lot of money for surveying. A lot of states have their own weed risk management programs, so is it necessary for us to address weeds in the CAPS Program? The Pest List Working Group (PLWG) recommended not including additional plants at this time.

- **Decision:** States should realize that if a State CAPS Committee decides to survey for weeds, the funding will have to be at the expense of other surveys. Also, the weeds never ranked well on the AHP list (partly because the criteria do not fit plants as well as insects). In this time of flat budgets, adding this option at the expense of other national priority pests is not a good option. States should remember that they cannot use CAPS funds for delimitation or management surveys.
- **Decision:** Aquatic plants will not be supported in 2012, but the group will work on this for 2013 for incorporation into guidelines if a favorable response from the states is received. This topic will be discussed at this time next year.

- **Action Item:** SPROs and SSCs to ask if weeds are important to states at the regional Plant Board meetings. Would states survey for weeds over other things (at the expense of something else)? Results will be reported back on one of the NCC conference calls.

New Pests

How should CAPS respond as a program to new detections? An example is red palm weevil. Should we allow delimiting versus early detection? Is it CAPS' responsibility to respond to this? Does CAPS want to offer a palm survey with specific pests as part of the priority pest list for 2012?
- **Decision:** This would be applicable to Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which do not fit into the typical CAPS model very well. The Program wants to be flexible. It may make sense to send out a "FYI, look out for this if applicable". Red palm weevil will be on 2012

Additional Pests of Concern list (low AHP rank). For 2012, palm pests can be surveyed as discretionary surveys (a palm pest data sheet concept document will be prepared as mentioned above).

- Action Item: When releasing the 2012 Guidelines, John will include a letter relating notable pest finds over the year that may be important to bring to the states' attention.

Snails
Should CAPS offer a taxon based survey for snails? A limiting factor is diagnostics. There are snails on AHP list and they are constantly being intercepted at ports. Since there are limited identifiers (molecular work is being done within CPHST), CAPS should not push a taxon survey for snails at the national level.

- Decision: CAPS will continue to handle snails as they have been in the past. If they are on the AHP list, they will have a datasheet for states to use if they want to survey.

Pest Lists
Pest List Working Group (PLWG) Recommendations
The purpose of the PLWG is to determine what changes should be made to the existing commodity and taxon pest lists, help answer questions that have come up during the year regarding those pests, and recommend to the NCC the disposition of pests on the lists. The PLWG generally does not involve itself with the AHP Prioritized List. Discussions on the following issues occurred before the NCC meeting, thus only the resulting recommendations are presented here. Minutes to the PLWG calls are found elsewhere.

Three Bark Beetles with Limited Distribution
Recommendation: Because the distributions for all three (*Hylastes palliatus*, *Hylurgops ligniperda*, and *Orthotomicus erosus*) are still limited and the insects are attracted to lure combinations that are used for other EWB/BB targets, they will continue to be included in the EWB/BB manual for 2012.

- Decision: Agree with recommendation; keep the three species.

***Xyleborus* and *Xylotrechus* genera**
Recommendations:
1. *Xylotrechus* will be broken down to species level for 2012. Several species will be identified as survey targets for which negative data can be entered.
2. *Xyleborus* will continue at genus level until it can be broken down to species level (may not happen in time for 2012 Guidelines).
3. *Xyleborus* will continue on list to keep it on the radar to encourage the reporting of positive data. Currently, we allow negative data to be reported at the genus level based on visual surveys

because there is no trap/lure that works for the entire genus. However, since these are tiny insects that occur on different hosts, we decided that <u>negative data will not be accepted at the genus level</u>. Positive data should be reported at the species level for any specimens that are caught in traps. This will need to be changed in the 2012 Guidelines.

- <u>Decision:</u> Agree with recommendations.

- <u>Action item:</u> Lisa will identify several target species of *Xylotrechus* with specific survey methodology, and report back to the NCC on progress to determine if this is possible for inclusion in the 2012 Guidelines.
- <u>Action Item:</u> John will edit Appendix N-1 to indicate that negative data will not be accepted for *Xyleborus* at the genus or species level. As always, positive data must be at the species level.
- Lisa will work with Kathy and John to look at data that has already been entered for *Xyleborus* and recommend changes, if any.

Citrus Pests   <u>Return to Contents</u>
Recommendation: Refer issue to NCC.

- Decision: The Citrus Commodity Survey will no longer be supported through CAPS; however, states may still survey for citrus pests that are on the AHP list. Most citrus pests on the AHP list have other important hosts. Citrus can be revisited if there is an upcoming citrus pest that should be considered. Puerto Rico, US Virgin Islands, and St. Croix will be given more latitude in this area.

- <u>Action Item:</u> John will contact the Citrus Health Response Program (CHRP) to ask them to take over ownership and responsibility for updating the Citrus Commodity Survey documents.

Duponchelia fovealis   <u>Return to Contents</u>
<u>Recommendations:</u>
1. This pest is widespread. Pest will be dropped for 2012.
2. If states want to survey for in 2011, that's fine as it was still on the list at that time.

- <u>Decision:</u> Agree with recommendations; this pest will not be supported for surveys in 2012 and will be dropped from all lists.

Eudocima fullonia   <u>Return to Contents</u>
<u>Recommendations:</u>
1. We will keep the moth on the CAPS list for now as it has a large host range and was previously ranked high on the AHP list.
2. Lisa will talk to Steve Passoa again about ID issues.

- **Decision:** Agree with recommendations; this pest will still be supported for surveys.

Horse thistle and the Federal Noxious Weeds Program List

Recommendation: Refer issue to NCC.

- **Decision:** The NCC will not ask that FNW on the AHP list be removed; they will be supported for survey for the time being.

Pine Commodity Pest List

Recommendation: Add the plant pathogens *Mycosphaerella gibsonii* and *Cronartium flaccidum* to the Pine Commodity Pest List. These are important AHP-ranked pathogens and should be grouped with the other pine commodity pests. This also will bring the number of target pine pests to the level of the other commodity surveys.

- **Decision:** *M. gibsonni* and *C. flaccidum* will be added to the Pine Commodity Guidelines.

- **Action Item:** Melinda will update the Pine Commodity Guidelines, pest list, and approved methods to include these two pathogens.

Validation of Molecular Methods/Cyst Nematodes

Status: CPHST will have internal discussions with Laurene Levy (Director, CPHST Beltsville Lab.) very soon to discuss options for molecular diagnostic methods and protocols for cyst nematodes. This may include signing off on screenings methods and looking for funding to perform method validations. Laurene will look at the literature that Melinda has pulled together and work on getting "screening" methods approved for use in the CAPS program. The meeting between Beltsville and the nematology labs will occur on February 15, 2011. The approved methods will be screening tools, so and presumptive positives will still have to be sent for confirmation by NIS Molecular Diagnostics Lab.

- **Decision:** The NCC supports this initiative.

Common Names for Pests

Recommendation: There have been some issues with common names of pests in NAPIS and elsewhere. Melinda will check with Lisa and send a list to Joel for review (cc: John Bowers) (after checking ESA and APS accepted common name list). If there is agreement with NIS and CPHST, then name change will occur. Melinda/Lisa will then request changes be made to Susan.

- **Decision:** Agree with recommendation. CAPS and NIS will marry common names with appropriate synonyms, and those will be the common names used for the CAPS program.

AHP/Commodity Pests to be Removed?

Planococcus minor

Recommendation: Melinda and Lisa are watching over this. For now, *P. minor* should stay because it is only found in one continental state and localized (currently not widespread –only around Fairchild, FL). Additionally, this pest appears to be at a low population (it took over a year to find a female for confirmation) and also appears to be under natural biocontrol.

- Decision: Agree with recommendation to periodically review the status of this pest.

Pests to Consider and Discuss by PLWG

- Response: The process for considering pests for inclusion to or deletion from a Commodity Pest List by the PLWG is to forward that pest via the NCC member for that constituency to John/Lisa/Melinda, who will add that pest to the PLWG agenda.

National CAPS Conference Breakout Session on Pests

During the "Are We Targeting the Right Pests?" breakout session at the CAPS Conference, the topic of the AHP Prioritized List was brought up. A proposal was put forward to present the AHP list by taxon. Currently, the AHP list contains more insects than pathogens or other taxa, and the implication is that the criteria are weighted towards insects. Some pathologists did not think that pathogens ranked where they should as the present criteria and weights may not be applicable to plant pathogens (due to latency periods, etc.). The proposal would be to separate the pests into taxa, and then run the AHP model on each taxon separately with their own criteria and weights. This would lead to separate prioritized lists that would be smaller than the current list, but all together may contain more pests.

States also were interested in being able to sort the list by criteria that are relevant to their particular state (plant hardiness zones, climate information, etc.). This would allow states to pick pests that were the most relevant to them that initially might not have been on their radar. This could be done through a tool similar to Lucid tools that would allow states to sort pests.

- Action Item: John will investigate with CPHST the possibility and what would be involved into identifying criteria and developing weights for each taxon. Is this something that would have to be started from scratch, or would the present model suffice, just run separately for each taxon? The discussion to continue on future NCC conference calls as to where the NCC would like to go with this issue. Any change will be for FY13 or beyond.

AHP List

The NCC discussed the FY12 AHP Prioritized list as determined by CPHST. Seventy-four pests were run through the model. This includes new pests suggested by the CAPS community during

the course of the year. One change in the list was to lump all the citrus *Meloidogyne* species together since their risk factors are similar. Other *Meloidogyne* species with different hosts were kept separate.

- Decision: In order to maintain a program focus, the 2012 AHP list will be abbreviated to the top 54 pests (top 50 ranks). Pests that have approved methods will be clearly marked on the list (through the addition of a column?).   The lower ranking pests will be moved to the Additional Pests of Concern List so that they stay on states' radars. Only four of these pests are not already on a commodity or taxon pest list. The 2012 list will not be broken down by taxa. Eventually, all the older additional pests of concern should be run through the new AHP model.

- Action Item: John will communicate the NCC decision to Gary Cave.

- Decision: The NCC decided that the AHP list with the commodity matrix and other pages would remain as Appendix D of the Survey Guidelines, as in past years, for context. However, the pests on the AHP list would be presented as part of the Priority Pest List in alphabetical order without ranks. This was based on the discussion above about the possibility of unequal weights for the different taxa. This list of pests, not technically the AHP list, but consisting of pests on the AHP list, would be renamed Pests of Economic & Environmental Impact, or something similar. The caveat is that this list has been amended from the 2012 AHP list. This will be revisited next year.

- Action Item: Update Appendix D (explains AHP process) to include all pests that were submitted for CAPS consideration and have an explanation for why those that fell below the cut they did not make the list (increases transparency). Keep the host matrix for Appendix D.
- Action Item: John will talk to Dan about updating NAPPFAST with the current AHP list.

- Decision: Pests on the Additional Pests of Concern List will be annotated to include the source and/or reason that pest is on the list.

How to Reconcile the AHP and Commodity Pests Lists   Return to Contents

- Decision: The NCC will not consider this issue at this time. The pests on each list will be left on their respective lists for the time being (except the two pine pathogens from the AHP list that will be added to the pine commodity document).

How to Use the AHP List in the Future

The NCC discussed several options on the AHP prioritization process going into the future (2013 and beyond) based on the discussions related above, and to determine if it meshes with program priorities and direction. This discussion was an attempt to bring this issue more into focus and have some sort of overall feedback from the states on the usefulness of a prioritized list. Four general options were presented; 1) Leave the AHP process as is (no pathway element), 2) Divide the current list by taxon and run separate AHP models (same or different model?), 3) Run a prescreening filter on the AHP list (analysis of pathway, biology, etc.), if the pest does not make it through the prescreening filter, it cannot be run through the AHP model, or 4) Do not use the AHP process at all: instead the CAPS Program will use a pathway/establishment model of some design. If the pest makes it through, then it would be included on a list.

The general NCC consensus was that a pathway criteria needs to be explicitly considered; pests that have a pathway should be elevated over pests that are not likely to follow a pathway. The present AHP model includes pathway indirectly as a condition of establishment. All options have advantages and disadvantages. Some states currently only use the AHP as a last step in the decision process while others go to this list first.

States should realize that the AHP list is based on impact (economic and environmental) with no pathway factored in directly. The prioritization process is subjective and not data driven. It is not a risk rating; it is a ranking of alternative choices due to criteria that are set. It cannot include pathway as it creates biases in the model. However, a list is useful because it helps focus on certain pests (the AHP list drove research on pests that did not have approved methods).

There was an initiative to look at what has been found (intercepted at ports, new finds) versus what is on the CAPS lists. However, interception data may not be complete and may not be representative of what is really coming through. Also, some taxa are intercepted and/or reported at different levels (order, family, genera, etc), not necessarily at the species level.

The CAPS Program also needs to look at how we respond when a pest is found. There have been high ranked pests that once found did not have much of a response (chilli thrips). If there will be no response, CAPS may not need to focus on them. Also, should CAPS include line item pests with no line item funding?

- Decision: The CAPS Program should look at how to incorporate pathway into the overall process, whether this is through a filter before the AHP process or in an independent process. This is subject that the NCC will have to discuss with CPHST and the states over the coming year, and determine how it meshes with other issues discussed above.
- Decision: Pests with line item funding, regardless of whether the line is funded or not, should not be added to CAPS lists, but they may be supported for survey under state discretionary surveys. Funds for these surveys will have to be taken from other state

discretionary surveys as there is no increase in money for these pests. The purpose of CAPS is to look for potential pests that are not here yet so funds should not be used for pests that are already here, like *P. ramorum*. States should consider using outreach.

- Action Item: Rick will liaise between the AHP team and John to explore new options for the model as directed by John and the NCC.

Caribbean and Pacific Rim Pest Lists
Currently, Puerto Rico and Hawaii are having trouble fitting within the CAPS program. Their environments are vastly different from most of the conterminous U.S. Right now PR and HI have more leeway on their state discretionary funds. There is currently a PPQ group, the Greater Caribbean Safeguarding Initiative (GCSI) that deals with offshore surveillance. They have shared their pest list with CAPS. Does CAPS want to take a subset and make our own pest list for PR and HI? Should they be a part of our Priority Pest List? Their list includes fruit flies (not CAPS pests) and citrus pests (now CHRP pests). Many other pests from their list are already on the CAPS Priority or Additional Pests of Concern Lists.

- Decision: There is no benefit to having a separate list for PR or HI. This may lead to other states wanting their own lists and many pests on the GCSI list are already represented by CAPS. Currently PR and HI are putting together dynamic surveys that work for CAPS. There may be language/culture barriers, but their surveys are improving.

- Action Item: Pests on the GCSI list that are relevant and not already represented on any CAPS list should be added to the Additional Pests of Concern List. Eventually these can be run through the AHP model along with the other pests on the Additional Pests of Concern List.
- Action Item: Brian and Kristian will relay these pests onto PR and HI, as well as the tropical pests that did not make the top 54 on the AHP List, to ensure that they are on their radar; these pests are available for survey and they are still a concern of the CAPS program (e.g., macadamia nut borer).

Other Pest Issues
Should CAPS deal with exotic *Phytophthora* spp? Should this be a taxon survey? An example is *P. kernoviae*; is there a pathway?

- Decision: This will be discussed at a later time. There are pros and cons to these types of surveys. Diagnostics currently may not be defined enough and sample processing may be expensive. This will be considered next year.

- Action Item: The CAPS Program will determine what diagnostics are available and whether *Phytophthora* can be a possible taxon survey for 2013 or later.
- Action Item: Lisa will talk to Russ and discuss PPQ's view on *Phytophthora* spp; she will report back to the NCC.

Tier 1-2 Funding

Some states have questions on Tier 1 funding. Is this only be used for salary (infrastructure) and Tier 2 only be used for survey? Some states are having trouble with this as their salaries are tied in with Tier 1 funding. They would like to see more flexibility in the guidelines and have the fluidity in funds mentioned.

- Response: The Survey Guidelines define Infrastructure as consisting of Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding. Tier 1 supports the SSC and support of that position. Tier 2 is still infrastructure, and is requested when justification can be provided that Tier 1 funding is not sufficient to meet the needs of the position (examples are given in the Survey Guidelines). As a general rule, survey funding should not be included in the request for Infrastructure funding, but should be included in a separate work plan. The correct terminology as found in the Survey Guidelines should be used to facilitate communication.
- The CAPS Program recognizes that accounting systems used in different states may not fit well with a strict definition of what is infrastructure and what is survey, and in many instances the situation is very fluid. Attempting to reconcile every state's budget system in the Survey Guidelines is not feasible. States that need clarification on cooperative agreement budgets should send questions to Brian or Kristian, who will work with the states in resolving these issues.

J-2 Workplan and Cooperative Agreement Language

The J-2 work plan template needs to be updated to fit with language and regulations of the cooperative agreement.

- Action Item: Kristian will develop a draft J-2 work plan for the NCC group to review for the 2012 guidelines. The "APHIS will…" section should have more information describing what APHIS will do. The approach section will also need changes. Kristian also will make format changes to J-2. The narrative boxes will be removed to improve formatting of the document.

IT Inventory and Equipment Purchases

States need to track their IT inventory on equipment purchases better. Kristian is noticing that some states are requesting equipment before the end of a typical life cycle. CAPS funding is not meant to supplement the State Departments of Agriculture IT needs, but rather the needs of the

SSC position. There currently is not a good mechanism to track these purchases. It would be advantageous if the CAPS program had a general inventory that is put on a realistic replacement schedule.

- Decision: IT equipment purchases will be put in the reporting template (notes below). If equipment listed in the work plan was not purchased, this should be listed along with the reason. This issue needs to be discussed with each member's constituency, and oversight should be at the state level (e.g., ADODR of the agreement).

- Action Item: Brian and Kristian will look regionally to determine if equipment for the IPHIS switchover is needed.

J3 Appendix and Capturing the Approved Methods   Return to Contents

The NCC is worried that states may not be putting the right trap and lures in their work plans. There have been some slip ups in the past. The suggestion is to add an extra column to the J-3 work sheet that gives the approved survey method that can be used as a cross-reference. If states do not use the correct method, they cannot enter negative data.

- Decision: Do not modify the J3 at this time. There should be enough checks in place already. The J-3 is currently serving as a bridge until IPHIS comes into play; IPHIS will have approved lure/trap ordering through the system. The AHP section should be renamed "Priority Pests".

Standardized Reporting Template   Return to Contents

The breakout group at the CAPS Conference supported the development of standardized reporting. The discussion group wanted to have two reports, one for infrastructure and one for survey, and wanted them kept simple to ensure that states would use them. Two templates have been developed.

- Decision: These templates will be released with the 2012 Guidelines, and will be the required reporting template for 2012. However, these templates can be used in 2011 (for all reports).

- Action Item: Julie and Chris will provide finalized standardized reporting templates (Word document) for infrastructure and survey to John for the 2012 Survey Guidelines and for release through the CAPS R&C site.
- Action Item: Julie and Chris will add a section for equipment purchases under Part A for both the infrastructure and survey template.
- Action Item: Julie and Chris will complete an example for each of the templates for states to use (can be completed after March).

- Action Item: Julie and Chris will change the language on IPHIS under survey and instead reference "database submission". Also CAPS funding should read "Pest Detection".

Cerceris **Wasp as a Survey Method**

Should the NCC include this in the guidelines and how should we deal with negative data? Should this be left as an outreach/volunteer run program?

This can be a good outreach opportunity. State CAPS Committees should ensure that efforts are not being duplicated by other programs (Forest Service, etc.). ID resources are not a limiting factor on conducting *Cerceris* wasp surveys for *Agrilus* spp.

- Decision: The *Cerceris* wasp survey method will be added to the approved methods for 2012 surveys for *Agrilus* species only. It should be conducted along with purple traps. If there are no *Cerceris* in your state, then using only purple traps will suffice. Visual surveys only should be used for *Agrilus* spp. during nursery surveys.
- Decision: States interested in conducting surveys using *Cerceris* wasps should have a test run this year to see if it is feasible. Sites can be identified and practice should occur to see what is involved in such a survey. Since *Cerceris* research is focused in the East, Western states can see if their species of *Cerceris* acts the same.

- Action Item: Lisa will work with Nicole on developing a protocol to be included under the approved methods section. The protocol should include how much time to spend at each site, etc. to strengthen negative data. Negative data should only be entered for target species, although states should realize that other *Agrilus* spp. and Buprestidae may be found.

IPHIS and Data Management

The plan for IPHIS for 2011 is that all programs will be using it except CAPS. Currently, IPHIS cannot handle CAPS. John is working with Kathy and the IPHIS team to come up with templates that can be used to enter the data required for the CAPS program. CAPS is responsible for its own templates within IPHIS. Other problems that need to be resolved is how to add pests for state discretionary pest surveys without having administrative rights, how to input bundled survey data, etc.

IPHIS will be used for CAPS in 2012 if all the programming is completed and the templates are available. Data does not need to be collected through IPHIS, but data MUST be entered into IPHIS. For 2012, NAPIS will not be the primary data repository. The amount of information CAPS is collecting and the data management effort will be different from what has been done in the past. States must adjust to the change, but the NCC realizes the challenge it may present to some states. However, NAPIS no longer fits the reporting needs of the program, and we must move on. Questions of how it will look for CAPS can be better answered at the NCC meeting

next year once the required programming and materials are complete. The CAPS Program will observe how other programs adjusted to IPHIS and will be in a better position to offer guidance.

Input of data from FY2011 may not be timely because ISIS can no longer be used. Surveyors cannot use PDAs for commodity based surveys due to practicality. Most states have to transcribe data into the system at the end of the year because of this. There is a problem getting data from the field into the system. Chris has heard that states were having betting luck inputting data with net-books vs. PDAs.

- Action Item: John, Brian, and Kristian will craft general language for the guidelines referring to data management to be updated in early summer until the NCC gets a feel for what needs to go there. ISIS information will be removed, and IPHIS language will be included for 2012. A draft will be completed and sent out for review. The guidelines will be updated as information is gathered.

Sentinel Plant Network

States should be aware of a Forest Service project that focuses on a pest detection education and outreach effort in public arboretums, gardens, etc. The goal is to educate and perform outreach to public gardens (members, staff, visitors, etc.). NPDN is developing training for staff and visitors of gardens. This effort does not actively target specific pests, but it is more awareness of what pests are out there. Participants will be given contact information for their state if they see something out of the ordinary.

- Response: State CAPS Committees should be aware of this initiative. Cooperation can occur between CAPS and SPN to help increase public awareness (hanging and discussing traps in public, etc.). If you or any constituencies have any questions contact John.

Outreach

Does CAPS want to institute some sort of requirement to report performance for outreach if it is funded? CAPS needs to know how funds are being spent and outreach is no exception. What needs to be reported to determine how successful the outreach was (how would this be measured)? Todd Dutton's presentation at the CAPS Conference was intended to start us thinking about this issue.

It is hard to measure impact of outreach, but states still need to discuss what outreach was performed and how effective it was. An example of a good outreach program that can be tailored to individual states is stone fruit. For good outreach with Tribes, discuss with Phil Bell of the EAB program.

Currently there is no increase in funds, so if states want to spend more on outreach, it will have to come at the expense of survey.

- Decision: CAPS should continue to support some level of outreach that helps support survey and program recognition in states, but should not push for an increase in outreach as there is no increase in money available. This should be re-examined if there are budget increases in the future. Guideline language will not be changed. For now, the CAPS program should keep an eye out for what the agency is doing, where they are going, and how CAPS can use what is developed. CAPS should determine if any outreach can be developed nationally to be used by the states. CAPS should also consider going after Farm Bill money to develop outreach on a project by project basis.
- Decision: States will be encouraged to report outreach activities in the new reporting template. States should state whether the outreach was successful or not and why/why not. The CAPS Program will combine the outreach information from states and post on the CAPS R&C site.

- Action Item: If there is outreach that is CAPS related that can be developed at the national level, inform your constituency and forward up through the NCC for consideration of a national effort (i.e., the stone fruit outreach project).

Toolbox for Survey Planning

During the Pathway breakout session at the CAPS Conference, a toolbox for survey planning was discussed. The general agreement was that developing a toolbox for states to use would be a good idea. Tools would provide guidance for states as they plan surveys. States need to know what is available, and could use these tools as a starting point when planning surveys. If not, states could be missing out on pests that are potentially important to their state.

An example of a tool available now is the NAPPFAST interactive matrix. This is a tool that is available to states, but not all states are aware of this. The tools developed can be included in the "CAPS 101" materials.

- Action Item: At the regional Plant Board Meetings, the SSCs should discuss with others what tools they would like to have developed, what needs should be met with these tools, and if they are using/know about current tools.
- Action Item: Lisa will try to obtain the PERAL excel sheet containing websites for different taxonomic groups to distribute as a tool for state use.
- Action Item: States that would like Brian, Kristian, or John to attend their state CAPS Committee meeting should inform them. This will be a good way for them to answer questions that come up regarding the state committees and planning for surveys.

Molecular Diagnostic Assessment Team (MDAT)

This initiative is headed out of CPHST, led by Greg Parra, and deals with molecular diagnostics of insects only. States should be aware of this initiative.

- Action Item: If there are any molecular diagnostics needed that deal with insects, states should inform John, who will submit the project to MDAT. Suggestion from Nancy: Silver Y Moth; suggestion from Lisa: *Adoxophyas orana*.
- Action Item: John will put minutes from MDAT conference calls in the NCC folder on the CAPS R&C site.

Forest Service Urban Tree Initiative

The purpose of this project is to look at urban tree inventories. CERIS is developing the database for this project that will collect standardized data from participants and will be available in a standardized format. Municipalities will be able to upload their data to a national database. Currently the project is focusing more on damage assessments (forest health) and not so much pests.

At this point, it is difficult to see how the data will be used. A test run is planned for 2011. They have shown interest in having CAPS data put in their system and vice versa, but this is still a long way off.

- Response: States should be aware that this initiative is underway. NCC members should check that constituencies know about this and make sure that this initiative is aware of CAPS and what the group does.