

WITS-USDA-OFFICE OF COMMUNICAT (US)

**Moderator: RJ Cabrera
February 25, 2016
9:00 am CT**

Coordinator: You're welcome and thank you for standing by. All participants will be able to listen only until the question and answer portion of today's conference. To ask a question, please press star 1.

Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, please disconnect at this time. I would now like to turn the conference over to Ms. R.J. Cabera. Ms., you may begin.

R.J. Cabera: Julie, may I just add a correction? So we have a speaker line or a leader line and a listen only line. So only people on the leader line can speak and they should, they can be allowed to speak at will so you can leave them in an open.

Coordinator: Okay, sounds good. Thank you.

R.J. Cabera: And also, when you go to small hold, could you hold the music on this side?

Coordinator: Absolutely.

R.J. Cabera: Thank you.

Coordinator: You're welcome.

R.J. Cabera: Look forward to working with you. So good morning. This is...

Man: Good morning.

R.J. Cabera: ...a meeting is now called to order. The Secretary Advisory Committee on Animal Health. And I want to say for the record, I apologize that I wasn't at dinner last night. I'm not feeling well, but I'm actually feeling better than I was. I caught a little bug.

So we got another full day. Actually, it might take up three extra days. I've just been chalk full of just (unintelligible) out the other. I hope to go over schedules. The long view schedules between now and September. I'll figure out times that are good for everybody to tackle the topics one at a time. Just one topic per call.

And then by the time we get to meeting date, we'll be in good shape and maybe finish up or do whatever it is we need to so. So I'm going to turn it over to our chair, Ms. (unintelligible). Welcome.

Woman: Thank you. Good morning. We are going to start out with the discussion of (unintelligible) and Cindy Wolfe, who is the, as a former member of the advisory committee and works with (unintelligible) Minnesota. Who's going to join, as well, on the phone with the speaker line. So Cindy are you on the phone?

Maybe, maybe not. Okay. So if Cindy is on the phone, you know, she will definitely may have questions for her or she may have suggestions. And how are the other committee members? Matt Jones, are you on? (Unintelligible) And I know that Randy and (Sam) are not going to be able to join. Julie? Verizon. At least, (unintelligible), but I think it is. Julie?

Coordinator: Yes, I'm standing by.

Woman: Hi. Are there other callers on the line?

Coordinator: Cindy just dialed in as you - after you asked for her.

Woman: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Coordinator: You're welcome.

Woman: So Cindy Wolfe, can you hear us okay?

Cindy Wolfe: I can, thank you.

Woman: Awesome. Thank you for joining us. And so that, I think we're going to go ahead and turn it over to Diane Sutton. (Unintelligible) surveillance. And you can see she is cheap in the goat health commodity team lead for APHIS. And also been here all week working with the committee.

Diane Sutton: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: The main purpose of being here today is to get your input on how we can better engage our stake holders who keep these to objective. Which is increased on farms commissions by producers and find veterinarians to serve them.

I'm going to give you a quick overview of the program just so you know what we're talking about. But for those of you that don't have anything to do with sheep and goats, that's okay.

Just envision the producers that you normally work with and how you would get them to submit samples for a program of this type if there was such program in your species.

So, for those who don't know, this is what a scrapie sheep looks like. And this is what a scrapie goat looks like. Scrapie is a (unintelligible) disease that is invariably fatal.

This shows how we've been progressive since the start of the revised program in 2002. A surveillance increase are detections of infected flocks increased. And then as they reached the peak of surveillance, we have study bits that decreased where we're now at about four or five blocks being found effective for years.

This shows the estimated prevalence they call sheep. Adjusted for face color, the sheep had a nice complexion down. The little blips that you see are a result of these heavy (unintelligible) given to white faced sheep when they turn up.

You can see they have one or two white faced sheep in those years which caused the numbers to go up. Whereas the black faced sheep has pretty much been a steady decline.

So what are we currently doing to get these samples? We have farm surveillance brand in just about every FSYS inspected plant for a significant number of mature sheep or goats killed.

Also in a lot of the smaller plants, but not all of them. On farm surveillance. There's a requirement where accredited veterinarians reported any clinical suspects.

And of course we investigate those at those testing's. We do trace investigations of known exposed animals and test them if they're not susceptible to the disease. And then we have routine on farm surveillance where we encourage producers to submit and are to call us when they have a dead animal exposed.

We provide the testing at no cost to producers, but we will provide a full test shipping box for producers who are wanting to set methodology. We also have a voluntary (unintelligible) certification program, which requires the submission of samples.

I'll talk a little bit more about that when we get to another spot. Then we have laboratory surveillance, and we encourages the diagnostic labs to submit any mature sheep or goat that comes in for scrapie tested. Some of that is done through cooperative agreements that provides cost assistance with these (unintelligible) sheep and goats.

So just a quickie on what does the industry look like. We have 3.1 million breeding sheep greater than a year of age. Approximate calling rate estimated by NOM at 15%.

If you calculate that out, you get 465,000 sheep being called each year. So about 220 sheep dying on farms each year. There's been testing for scrapie in those animals is our tool for target and surveillance.

And 4.9%, or about 5% - notice they break out here. Sheep is by 2 million breeding goats, about 16% calling rate, 362,000 a year, death losses are reported deaths to be at 160,000. So we're sampling about 1.4%.

This shows you our breakdown on farms surveillance. There's approximately 36% versus 64% goats per sheep. And then you see for RSSS, we don't have quite as good a balance.

Another reason for that is we currently don't have as good an I.D. requirement for goats as we do for sheep. So there are fewer officially identified goats turning out at slaughter.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Would you mind just telling what RSSS means?

Diane Sutton: Okay. That's regulatory scrapie slaughter surveillance, otherwise known as slaughter surveillance.

Man: Okay.

Diane Sutton: Thank you for asking. This shows you our month to month collections over the last five years. As you can see our slaughter collections have declined. Both due to extreme (HCIA) operates and this year we have not yet regained our leverage.

We're investigating this, but they're reported as two factors. One is we've had a couple issues, at some of the - a couple larger plants having thrust their agreement that that had to be renegotiated. And also the field has reported that their seeing a bunch of targeted animals, as far as facilities.

Woman: Quick question. If the slaughter - are there slaughter agreements with the state inspected facilities as well? Is surveillance there?

Diane Sutton: We don't have a lot of mature sheep that go slaughter that are state inspected. We do have agreements with some of them and we do have personnel that actually go in and collects samples at some of those plants. With the - while we're talking that through, I'd say about probably 70% is done by our personnel and 30% is done through agreement.

Man: Ma'am. When you say "our personnel", "our personnel" Veterinary Services, "our personnel" FSIS...

Diane Sutton: Our personnel, Veterinary Services.

Man: Okay.

Diane Sutton: It shows you the breakdown by face color in species. For the goats who are light blue at the top and then the others, it tells you what the color is by the amount of black in them. Black is black face, then marbled then white. And then blue at the top is saying that those didn't fit those categories.

This shows you where we are at meetings. Our sampling minimum's for sheep by state. Sampling meets minimum, it says 1% of the breeding herds per feeding plots per year. What's in dark blue are meeting or exceeding that

minimum. The ones that meet other colors going progressively to red are not meeting that minimum.

Each year when the state doesn't meet its minimum, we ask them to give us a plan for doing better the following year. And we're in the process of processing those responses now.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Has that been very consistent with that pattern you just showed for previous years?

Diane Sutton: Yes, it's pretty consistent year to year. One may change, you know, color from one to the other. Although it has improved, steadily, not rapidly. But steadily it's an improvement, except for the last year where we had HPIA and we install a, you know, an (unintelligible).

This shows you the (unintelligible) and the SFCT. The export monitor and export certified categories are basically being driven by the desired export primarily to Canada. And that involves a yearly inspection. It wasn't a select monitor category are consisting of with our surveillance activity by submitting on farm deaths.

And, but they don't have to meet the additional requirements of inventory control and they don't have to have an annual inspection. But we're acknowledging that they submitted animals for testing and participating in the monitoring program. So that's a part of our surveillance activity, and one that we would like to expand in the select category.

So first the backbone of surveillance is I.D. We do have mandatory I.D.s for sheep and goats. The scrapie program. We provide the plastic and metal tags at no cost to producers.

Most mature sheep are required to be officially identified. It was in commerce. Once we finalized the proposed rule that will make the goat requirements equivalent. Right now only about half of mature goats are being officially identified when they arrive at slaughter. This shows you...

Woman: Can you back to that slide, real quick?

Diane Sutton: Sure.

Woman: So the sheep are supposed to be IDed before they will either enter or intrastate. Do we have any concept that - is that's being - is that how much is being implemented or...

Diane Sutton: Yes. At the floor facilities about 95% of the mature sheep that come in with an official I.D. or our direct to slaughter movement, so we know who they came from directly.

The scope is about 50% that are arriving at the slaughter facilities, with an official ear tag or direct slaughter. So once the rule gets in place, they expect the numbers for goats to come up to where the sheep are because the rule that they bear similar to post.

Man: All right. Thank you. Who keeps the bottom of this slide in use?

Woman: Diane, they are even selling to their neighbor. They're supposed to be IDed before they leave the farm but she has no idea how much that's been done.

Diane Sutton: Right. We've been - it's very hard to regulate private treaty sales. And most of that is left to state. In order to be in consistent state in the scrapie program, you have to require identification of sheep and goats when they're sold to the new owner.

However, there are several exceptions. Some states rely on those exceptions heavily and others have a right across the board all sheep and goats must be identified. And so that does create some differences, and some in the amount of I.D. that occurs at that point.

And, of course, if you're selling to your neighbor, you may just not think about it. This shows you how efficacious the I.D. has been in terms of tracing positive as. Across the entire program, the average has been about 83% of positive animals have been traced to the plot origin.

Woman: Can you say again whether the numbers were traceable on positive animals a year now?

Diane Sutton: Now in the index sample is, you know, 5%.

Woman: Five percent?

Diane Sutton: Yes. Yes.

Man: What happened in fiscal year '14?

Diane Sutton: In fiscal year '14, I believe that was when we had - you have to remember the outbound was just a couple animals.

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: So that's two animals that probably came from the same flock. They went to the same slaughter plant together, let's see. They had a serial tag on them and we couldn't get that serial tag back the way actual flock of origin. Because it went through dealers and markets and so forth.

Diane Sutton: All right. So this shows you how we're doing in terms of getting flocks into our database. That's supplying them flock I.D.s which are used on ear tags. Once again, the states in blue have 100% or more a flock, the number of flocks they've identified in that are in our data system.

Of course we don't have a one to one comparison because NAPs won't give us that information. We just have their numbers versus our numbers so there's going to be somewhere in, you know, not in an actual overlap.

As is for sheep, it will have the actual sheep for goat. You can see there's two reasons why we don't have as many goats there. One is because a lot of the goats have been accepted from I.D. under the cross rule which will change once we finish finalizing the (unintelligible) rule.

And the other reason, goats are much more likely to use tattoos. As if they're using registry tattoos, they don't have to get into our database or deposit (unintelligible). So just a reminder of what the tasks are, for discussion. Yes.

Man: Okay. Can I ask what strategies have been employed so far to accomplish goal number one up there?

Diane Sutton: Okay. So we've published a couple different articles in the ASI newsletter regarding the need for aardvark collections, and who to contact, and how to

get boxes and so forth. We did a direct mail probably five years ago to the mass mailing list encouraging people to report animals showing signs of (unintelligible). And also to get their official ear tags.

We have on the local level, we've had employees go out to various producer meetings and talk about these topics. We also have done a mailing and emailing to accredited vets through the AASRP website. Those are the main things. Just, you know, local communications then there's the national effort.

So what we're looking for is what are the addition - what additional way should we contact people? What kind of incentives do we need to offer, if any?

What approach - what kind of communication do we need? How do we (unintelligible) communication to encourage people to participate? What is it that we need to do to drive a collection of samples because obviously there is some fear associated with this. But by the same token, there's a small, older, organic person.

You know, do you really want to be eating or selling an animal that has this condition? So if you have a problem you probably want to know you have the problem even though it means that the government can come in and take some of your animals.

Man: Is that what happens? Do you come in and take all of their animals?

Diane Sutton: With sheep because there's genetic resistance, depending on the genetic picture within the flock, on average we take somewhere between 30 to 40%. Now for people who are aware of the disease, and have been, you know,

moving forward to resistance, we may only be taking two or three animals out of the flock of 80 or 100. But on average, it's around 40%.

Man: I think if that's going to be one key in the messages because the assumption is if this, you know, the disease is found USDA comes in and depopulates.

Woman: And does - and also does USDA do the genetic testing? At a point and at no cost?

Diane Sutton: We provide the genetic testing; our people do (unintelligible). We provide - we send it off to the lab, we do the testing and pay for it. We pay an indemnity that is reasonable, you know, for commercial and for your run of the mill, kind of, you know, pure bred breeders.

If you're a link pure bred breeders, of course they're going to tell you that the indemnity's not fair. Although probably if you take their whole flock, average is probably about right. But, when we take their super grand champion, no it's not right.

Woman: I think that message, it's important to share that message that you will do the genetic testing and selectively depopulate. And the genetic testing is offered at no cost is important because that message isn't getting out.

Diane Sutton: Right. And as a matter of fact, by then the actual value of the animal is probably higher than the amount of the offer for an individual exceptional animal.

Woman: Yes.

Diane Sutton: Which is true across most every indemnity program.

Man: And you - your positives are coming from the plant? Or are they coming from on farm?

Diane Sutton: Both.

Man: Or are you buying them?

Diane Sutton: Both.

Man: Fifty, fifty?

Diane Sutton: Early on it was nearly all from slaughter surveillance. Now it's getting down to about 2/3 slaughter and 1/3 total suspect supporting, especially in goats. Nearly all the cases in goats have copied from cynical suspect reporting, or from the testing of exposed animals, trace out investigation exposed animals.

And one thing is to know, goats. You know, all the goats are going to be considered exposed and all are going to be considered genetically susceptible. We are working with ARF to identify genetic resistance in goats.

And it looks like there may be a tough (unintelligible) that may be helpful. Unfortunately, they're very rare within the goat population, which means that...

Man: So the goats go when they...

Diane Sutton: So the goats go. But, the other thing to remember is USDA cannot make you give up your animals. All we can do is say you can't move them anywhere except to slaughter.

So, you know, we're not going in there and grabbing your animals off. It's just - we're saying, you know, if your business model requires you to do something other than to take them to slaughter then you're going to have to - you're going to want to take the indemnity and restart fresh.

Woman: So when they move those animals, if you allow them to move those animals to slaughter, how do you assure when they get to slaughter that you're not putting any damage into the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...regular food chain?

Diane Sutton: We can't prevent that from happening. We don't have the regulatory authority to do it. It's not (unintelligible) health pathogen. There's not a mandate to do so.

The proposed rule, well, for clues, putting animals that we pay for through the slaughter channels. But if someone wants to continue to operate, then we can't preclude them from doing it.

And the reason that we don't is because there's no reason to believe that scrapie's is through a nautic disease. Although, we would prefer to keep (unintelligible) out of the (unintelligible).

Woman: But the clinical one...

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: Those animals will not have any (unintelligible). And (unintelligible) animals are required to be reported.

Woman: When is the goat rule going to go into effect for us? This should be written down.

Diane Sutton: As you know, rules can be extremely variable at how long they take to get out. Especially in an election year, due to various forces. We...

Woman: So five years?

Diane Sutton: Right. The draft is in progress and so there's a reasonable chance that it will get out this year. But there's also a reasonable chance that it will - something will come up and it will get delayed.

Woman: But goats are the biggest growth animal in our area, and so as that rule comes on board, I'm sure that there's, kind of, information that goes out to the extension veterinarians and stuff.

Those are actually used pretty well right now because goats are, kind of, a new thing for a lot of people. And it usually starts with the 4H kid and goes on. So they're pretty good about using extensions.

So those are definitely things that need to be pushed through the extension veterinarians and to the 4H agent. I'll get - you'll get more traction through those kids in the 4H.

Diane Sutton: And then maybe that's something you could help us with is identifying (unintelligible). You know, how would you best communicate with extensions?

Man: Well, you know, my understanding was that anything that moved in the state, once it starts going to interstate commerce it has to be tagged. And the scrapie program is the way that sheep and goat producers are moving their animals rather than having some state assigned I.D.

And the people I work with, for the most part, are already aware that everything needs to be scrapie's tagged. And they don't generally differentiate between, you know, this one's under 18 months and this one's over. I mean, I don't. I just sold five rams and I tagged every one of them.

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: Even though a couple of them are less than a year old, because I don't know where they're going to go once that guy gets them. And so, you know, the sale barns.

When you come in the door they're going to tag every single thing you walk in with before it goes through the sale. And they're going to charge you, you know, a dollar a head for the cost of doing it. So...

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: You know, for us at any rate I'm pretty confident that the animals are getting tagged. Most of them at any rate.

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: It would be the small backyard sale to a neighbor or somebody who's coming out. And that...

Man: So, I have a question for you.

Man: You know, the box, I don't mind shipping something. But if I have to cut, if I have to wait to get the box when, you know, here's my - the guy showed up today and said, hey, you have anything to sell?

Yes, I do. But now I have to wait for a box to show up to ship the head. Or I have to drive 60 miles to go my vet and drop off the head. It's not going to happen.

Diane Sutton: Yes, that's...

Man: But if I had the box on site...

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: You know, I get the scrapie tags already. Send me a box.

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: And I'll take that too, you know? It just folded up box. I guess it comes with an insulated deal and a couple of freeze packs.

Diane Sutton: It's a fairly...

Man: Pretty bulky.

Diane Sutton: It's a fairly good size.

Man: But I could fold it and tape it together once I have it. If you send it to me collapsed.

Diane Sutton: Yes, it has one of those Styrofoam coolers in it.

Man: Okay, but all...

Man: But they make the Styrofoam in such a way that it's just an insert instead of an actual cooler.

Diane Sutton: I understand what you're saying and they are key for the, because it's involved with that leaking.

Man: I guess that might leak a little bit of blood, huh?

((Crosstalk))

Man: You put it in the plastic bag though.

Man: Leaking (unintelligible) not good.

Diane Sutton: We are definitely afraid of leakage. You don't want that....

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: Because we don't want to upset our shipper and to help with the use of that and say they're not going to let you ship anymore.

Man: Yes, but, you know. If I had a few of those on hand...

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: Then, when somebody shows up I don't mind, you know, telling the guy, hey, I have to put the head in the box, you can't have the brain. It's got to go. That's not how...

Man: Well, it's almost like you go to county public health for shipping the head for rabies examinations. You know, if you could just have those distributed at a county level. So again, it's not a 60, 80 mile drive, or whatever.

Man: It's still 40.

Man: Yes, big parts of your world.

Diane Sutton: Yes, the scrapie coordinator pre states, preplaced some of the faucets. You get more submission.

Man: If you're aging well.

Diane Sutton: You get my (unintelligible). Yes. Because the idea of having to call somebody and wait, somebody who's no, it's not. I'm sorry. I'm very (unintelligible).

Man: Most counties have an USDA office. Not all of them, but most of them do. And that might be a place where you can stage something working within RCS.

Diane Sutton: We're having the pre ship of the people who want to ship, want to send out pads. We're just a little leery to generically send them out because they are, you know, not so cheap that you can afford to do that.

If someone said, you know, I'm interested in doing this. I'd like to have a box. We're happy to give them a box. You don't have to wait until you actually have a head. You just have to have a, you know, willingness to want to put a head in the box.

Woman: Like the most cooperative extension, there's one in each county. You could pre place one box in the office. And then you could say, well, the cooperative extension office has a box. All you have to do is drive down there and get it.

Diane Sutton: Get it. Yes.

Man: A lot of the extension offices opening, you may not want to store them there.

Diane Sutton: Well...

Man: They have a lot of clutter already.

Diane Sutton: Yes.

Man: But USDA has...

Diane Sutton: Or FSISS Office. So...

Man: And you don't have to work with - yes. You have NRCS, FSA, and a couple other in most counties.

Diane Sutton: So finding USDA office where we could store it.

Man: Yes.

Man: That can work. That's...

Man: Well, it's a - well, that's a possibility. And, you know, how many samples do you really need from my farm, for example?

Diane Sutton: We would like...

Man: The average in Arkansas is going to be fewer than 50 head. Really fewer than 25. And so how many samples would you want off of one farm to say yes or no? I'm satisfied with that.

Diane Sutton: Well, you know, the ideal number is 30. But we don't want that to give them one year. We want that over the life of the program. If we - if you could send us one head a year we'd be happy.

Man: Okay. And so if you sent me a box a year I wouldn't mind sending you a head a year.

Diane Sutton: Yes. You send us a head then we send you back another box.

Man: Yes. This is a little bit...

Woman: When the diagnostic labs do a rabies test, do they automatically look for scrapie's too?

Diane Sutton: We've asked them all to do it. We don't know for a fact that they're actually doing it. So if you've asked to do it...

Woman: Is that based on age or any animal?

Diane Sutton: They don't state. Every rabies negative.

Woman: Or any shape?

Diane Sutton: PSE is to...

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: Originally you said the NEH, and then we provide additional guidance that anything over 12 months.

Man: Does the pet store (unintelligible)?

Diane Sutton: And they know that they're all...

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: And the new guys are not...

Man: Yes. I mean just, we had one with a head injury.

Diane Sutton: So you asked for that, but they don't always do it? I mean, what's the rule for that? Are...

Woman: Can I...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We don't give smiling that will get us. We don't have any control over the couple of health laboratories. And we don't have a way of knowing, you

know, what submissions they got or didn't get. And so there's no way we can monitor them to see if they did it or give something to them if they don't do it.

Man: It requires a relationship on - in our state. I have worked a public health lab similar to - it sounds like New York. Every livestock has that it's submitted for can actually test for rabies first.

If negative then it will back - can send it back to us. Our - to get to whatever the appropriate (unintelligible) is. I can't guarantee that always happens, but presume it does.

One of the challenges is when they are rabies positive. Because that's the end of it. Section, so there may be a pellet section of rabies and the figures, you know, we wouldn't.

Cindy Wolfe: Could I jump in here?

Diane Sutton: Sure Cindy.

Cindy Wolfe: This is Cindy. So, a couple things. One, I'll just give you the Minnesota experience. Every sheep and goat over 12 months of age. It goes through our veterinary diagnostic lab regardless of the reason it's submitted, has a TSE test run on it.

And I would encourage Diane's group to be able to look at their data and see. Especially in the states where we don't have good surveillance, how well their diagnostic labs are cooperating and to try to ramp up that cooperation.

So we - there's not a week go by that we don't run between four and six sheep or goat heads for TSE testing. And I don't know if our level is higher because we have our own lab, or we just have people who understand the value of it.

But the other thing that is of challenge to me right now, and I would pull it back to Diane for the committee, is there a value in getting goat heads in if they are not identified?

Diane Sutton: My thinking on it, it's not whether they're identified, it's whether they are traceable. An owner brings the goat in, it doesn't matter if it has an ear tag. As long as we know it came from Mr. (Eckerd).

Just doing random heads, for males that are not showing critical signs, I don't know it's worth trial. Possibly clinical suspects will do - will just have whether they're traceable or not, and then we'll try to figure out where they came from if we need to.

Woman: What...

Diane Sutton: Did you have some different thinking Cindy?

Cindy Wolfe: Well, no. So, you all were talking about sending out boxes. It would seem to me, and maybe (Maryanne) could address this as well. But in our region when we have goat meetings, it may be of value to bring boxes to the goat meeting.

And whether you have a spot or a spot on the program to explain, you're welcome to these boxes at no cost. But here's what, you know, here's what goes in them. And here's what will happen with the information.

So you can reach goat producers directly since they're a little bit behind in understanding I.D. and implementing I.D. and understanding the program relative to sheep producers.

Diane Sutton: Thanks Cindy. That's helpful. (Don) had a...

(Don Ridder): So, we keep talking about property of extension on it. And I think that continues to be something for a group that you could work with to really get method down and I'll just point to Michigan where we have ongoing programs working with small (unintelligible).

And we have two or three people working in. If you worked with them and said, you know, here's what we need. Those folks could work closely with producers. And especially ones that they're working with all the time and maybe leverage that relationship. It all comes back to relationship.

Leverage that relationship to help you get samples. And so, again, that's in Michigan. And I know other states talk with tension, struggles. Or maybe it doesn't have anything focused on small ruminants, but certainly states that have that can leverage that capacity. So...

Diane Sutton: I think that's a scenario where our track record is a little cloudy. Some states, some of our local CF groups have done well working with extension. And others have been challenged in that area.

Woman: So, I have answers from one - from AASRP, the small ruminant group that's questioning, the same questions had a helpful tip. And they come at this, if they get \$1000 funding for scrapie education after finish state from ASI - what's ASI?

Group: American Sheep Industry.

Diane Sutton: Okay. And that they use that to set up an education booth at a small room in the meetings and the state fair. So that would be a place that they could potentially provide boxes, or educate on how to get the boxes if somebody needed them in a hurry.

And they also recommended that maybe the testing be combined with some other evaluated testing like testing for selenium levels the liver, or testing for copper levels in the liver. It's the same. So that there's value back to the...

Man: Patient?

Diane Sutton: ...to the producer. So that maybe some routine nutritional analysis or something that provide a value added. And then input from the New York State Veterinarian Medical Society, someone recommended placing a substantial bounty on positive samples.

And they said it works for FSISS and CB surveillance. That was their comment. And somehow they said pay veterinarians or flock owners to submit samples from farm slaughtered animals.

The other thing that's worked in New York as well, is to identify - actually identify the processors. So they put out a big effort to identify the people cutting here so that they could get CWD samples.

And some of those same processors probably do (unintelligible). So if states have deer processing lists for their CWD program to potentially contact those processes directly.

And to see if they would cooperate in providing brains, or discussing it with the small ruminant people for whom they are processing the deer. And the last recommendation was to make it easier for - so, a sick sheep might not be worth much and people may not call for sick sheep.

But the sick animals that do get called for, a lot of people want to treat them. And they would like to do a live animal testing. And it's possible, but it's an ordeal to get it approved.

So the last one I'm aware of in New York happened in our hospital. And I got the approval for the clinician and it took me half a day. And lots of phone calls and people, you know, sharing their protocol on how to do it.

And here's the pictures. And then it got done. And the animal actually was treated for a different neurologic condition and survived. And so, the people that have an animal that's valuable enough that they are willing to call a vet -

Really want to do the log on with it. And we haven't promoted that for the veterinarians. We're telling them, no, you can kill the animal and send us the brain.

Woman: So can you - either Diane or Cindy or whomever, or Linda give us a little background on why that makes sense?

Group: Yes.

Woman: Is USDA Haven for it? Or how that works?

Diane Sutton: There is a lot of animal tests. We've started to serve out a biopsy and now we're direct biopsy. Because direct biopsy is easier on the animal than what I think will result as a quality sample.

It's about 87% sensitive and now the report came up from age compared to these biopsies. If you have an animal showing clinical find or neurologic find, we will send the veterinarian out to get the sample for you. And at the same time they can train, they can show the practitioner how to view the sampling while they're out there getting the sample from the clinical subset.

If a veterinarian wants to be trained to do the live animal test so they have that in their pocket, then they should contact our ES office and let them know that they're interested in this.

And when there's an - we don't do a whole lot of live animal testing. But, when live animals testing's going to be done. The other option is, is if you have a -

Your old clock where you have a person to walk who's willing to volunteer to have surveillance testing done on their clock, one of our veterinarians can come out and do that with you and train you how to do it at that time. In order to get those extra surveillance samples. Particularly in those states who are having problems getting samples. Right?

Woman: So they were really grateful that they could test that animal that way?

Cindy Wolfe: And the clinicians involved were completely unaware that that was an option and they could do it. But they had to do it that day.

Diane Sutton: Yes. Because the animal was there that day.

Cindy Wolfe: The animal was there and it had to be done that day.

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: I want to too.

Diane Sutton: Do you think it would be helpful to provide the procedures on our Web site or...

Cindy Wolfe: Ultimately that was, kind of, where we got it ultimately.

Diane Sutton: Okay.

Cindy Wolfe: You know, there are documents. But...

Diane Sutton: Yes. There's a veterinarian document. Think...

((Crosstalk))

Diane Sutton: It was photographs and - yes. And it was pretty good and that's how it was done.

Cindy Wolfe: And we - it should be also again part of the messaging along with, you know, we don't necessarily repopulate your whole flock. We do genetic testing. You know, post mortem samples are best. But there is a live animal, or if the animal will make...

Diane Sutton: Yes. If the animal doesn't survive, you know...

Woman: They probably tested. But this animal they wanted to treat it and...

Woman: Let people know that's an option.

Cindy Wolfe: Sort of, up front, so that's just part of the messaging. That was on going on what (Belinda) was saying, or what I said earlier which is - I mean, we've gone to three different state inspector slaughter houses over the course of, you know, several years looking for one we liked.

And I'm pretty sure none of them are doing this testing. And I just think, you know, that would be a, you know, real simple. There's no additional burden on the producer.

((Crosstalk))

Cindy Wolfe: Maybe a little more outreach towards, you know, rethink again, sort of, outreach to those state inspected producers.

Diane Sutton: You could actually go through AMPS or MAMPS, or some of those. There are organizations. Obviously that big one is NAHMSI, with the Meat Institute. But you also have smaller processors, trade associations. I think niche.

Woman: There's the niche meat processors association...

Diane Sutton: Yes. That allow slaughterhouses that are a big deal in New York State. The other thing that I think we mentioned last night, or listing, but you know, there are a lot of mixed down practitioners that may not be a member of the Small Ruminants Association, or whatever.

But I think our state Veterinarian Medical Associations, most practitioners in the state are members of the state VMA and the state VMA newsletters that we are read. And so, I think you could get word out through the state, the state VMAs in additional to giving us small ruminants such as (unintelligible).

Woman: I have one more suggestion to build on that thought and I'm curious what Dr. Thompson would say would be allowed or not allowed in New York. But it seems that the same veterinary practices submit small ruminants to the diagnostic labs and to the veterinarian clinics over and over again.

In other words, in our state, you know, there's 10 to 25 regular submitters if you will. And could we talk with those people? And I use the word talk loosely, and get boxes to those clinics such that when they are using on farming crops using - not sending whole animals, could they collect heads adult animals?

Diane Sutton: So target the people that are already doing it to make it easier for them?

Cindy Wolfe: Yes. And so, if USDA came to you at the diagnostic lab at Cornell and said we'd like to a list of all the clinics that submitted all the sheep and goats to you in the last three, would you be allowed to give that to the USDA so that the USDA could reach out to them? Or would it have to work the other way where you reached out to them and provided boxes?

Diane Sutton: Yes. We would probably contact those submitters and say do you mind if we give your names to the USDA. And I can't believe that any of them would mind.

But we do treat our client submissions confidentially, but in general, we get tremendous cooperation when we contact them. And certainly, we would be

willing to do that at the diagnostic lab. I think most of them would be. It's a pretty small list of submitters in, probably every state.

Man: Linda, are you talking about producers or veterinarians?

Linda: Veterinarians. Our left of and hate submissions (unintelligible). Some of the last two had...

((Crosstalk))

Linda: Our list have to have a veterinarian on the form. They may ask who your vet is, but it's not like I had to take it to the vet first and said...

((Crosstalk))

Linda: Our lab will only take a submission if there's a veterinarian on it. And we don't report back to the farmer. We report to the veterinarian. So, there's always a veterinarian in (Garland).

Some labs are not like that. Directly from the farmer and the lab report goes to the farmer. And the farmer chooses to share that with their veterinarian or not. So, yes. We would participate in something like that.

Diane Sutton: Oh, great. We may pick you up for a pilot.

Man: We're waiting for Max to come in.

Diane Sutton: How are we going to get your sheep heads, Max?

Max Fernandez: Yes, that's right. I never (unintelligible). We move it all the time. Our sheep look very healthy. I think a lot of time we - the sheep people might know they got you, are fine. But the whole time running chief, (unintelligible). Yes

Woman: And that's just the other (unintelligible) that accessed the other day. It's like, so I wasn't clear that you were looking for simply animal, you know, whether they were showing neurological signs or not.

But the goal, part of the goal is simply to get a certain number of samples. Because yes, I mean, ours, I would - if I had ample neurological signs would have thought of it.

Max Fernandez: I was told that you were looking for ones that weren't showing signs?

Woman: Yes. That was a combination from the ASRC also is that even the voluntary flocks that are signed up, they'll contact them and say we haven't seen any submissions from you.

And they said, well, we had some guesses but they were all due to parasites and we didn't really want a goats head. So they are submitting targeted neurological animals, but they are submitting other animals that are ill.

Diane Sutton: That's usable for now.

Man: Is there an opportunity to use, kind of, the social media approach trying to get word out? Everybody is, kind of, out there and, kind of, laying out part of the program and, sort of, what you're looking for in benefits?

Diane Sutton: Social media has been challenging. The use from the governmental perspective, a scenario that we keep trying to work, figure out a methodology and do that appropriately.

Man: That's one of the places where you could cooperate more closely with the extension. Because that's the way I reach a lot of people. They are constantly on social media. They are constantly asking questions.

And, you know, when I'm reaching on social media, my outreach is global. I have people in Pakistan, Australian, New Zealand, South America, Nigeria, the reach is global.

And they'll ding me in the middle of the night with a question. Of course, they know they're not going to get the answer until the following morning, but you know, I can reach anybody through that.

And this idea that I can have my animals live tested and not have to worry about just sending you the head, is - I'd like to know, personally. And quite a number of producers, I'm sure in Arkansas, would also like to know.

And if they know that they can call you up and have a (unintelligible) and then find out and not have to worry about depopulation, I think that that's going to - I might overwhelm your Arkansas office in very short order with requests if you're not careful. So...

Diane Sutton: Yes. And it gets - true. With the live animal testing we're limited in how much we can do. I mean, we can go out and train a veterinarian, so they can then do it. And NAHMS will pay for the running of the test itself.

Man: Yes, but you're not going to pay for the vet fee.

Diane Sutton: The fee that the vet charges you wouldn't be covered.

Man: But there might be ways to work around that where there would be, you know, at a meeting where there's a group and people bringing animals and testing them.

Diane Sutton: And also -

Woman: Or if they can get out anyway.

Diane Sutton: And also targeting the veterinary school's hospitals. They're clinicians are residents and how fast are - they don't know about. And they are, you know, they have an animal that's in there being treated. Or, you know.

Cindy Wolfe: Well, that's a good idea. Come up with they can teach the veterinaries too and we teach them. That's a very good idea. I hadn't thought of that. Actually, all of these are very good ideas. I really appreciate them.

Diane Sutton: (Maryanne) do you want to go to the questions that are back up on the screen? (Unintelligible). Kind of, we have to figure out how to get this message sold back and then we're out. There's a lot...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...only one back.

Woman: No, Max is probably okay because his flock is big enough that we probably have gotten a nice number of his from slaughter. So...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, the large range flocks we typically have covered. Assuming they're putting their tags off.

Man: You know, ASI for example has, in each state - just there's only one ASI affiliated sheep producers group. And so, you know, working through ASI, through the local sheep producers groups.

You get word out pretty quickly at least to the people who are involved in the sheep industry. Goat entry tends to be a lot more fragmented. And that's part of the problem with (unintelligible) now.

Diane Sutton: We started a cooperative agreement with the American Goat Federation to provide similar outreach as we do what they advise. So we should be more and more programmed going out as that progresses.

Man: Yes. But there are things like, well, ASI does also work with Goat (unintelligible). They do have, you know, at least one or two articles in their magazine off for goat producers.

The Goat Rancher is one that is regularly read by goat producers. (Frank Pinkerton) is probably the most widely known goat bed and he's getting up there now.

And there's another one, I can't remember his name off the top of my head now. But, you know, they've run pretty lengthy articles that are fairly difficult reads.

And so, you know, people are not expecting it to be an easy read when they pick it up. And they might be able to read a group of people through that. And they'll talk to each other once they understand that there's an option to depopulation, or that there's a way to live test. I think you'll start getting some requests for that. And so, having an article there wouldn't hurt.

Man: Yes.

Diane Sutton: And this is in what?

Man: The Goat Rancher. And I'm just throwing out some outreach ideas right now off the top of my head, but...

Diane Sutton: I would say the other - the most thing that is important is for all those that are extended through a veterinarian, make sure that veterinarian gets a copy of the report. That's been an issue where the reports are going back to the scrapie coordinator. And they're going back to the state veterinarian and then the -

We've had calls to our lab where the veterinarian said, you know, I did this three weeks ago and I haven't heard. And, you know, I said, I will find out for you and if you haven't heard I'm sure it's negative.

But, will, you know, and then I'll track it down. And I think if you want the cooperation of the private veterinarian, they have to get a copy of the report. Yes.

Woman: Yes. I agree with you. There should be a copy of the report. And we need to emphasize that more often. We put that back together a few times, so we probably need to say it every time we have a meeting.

Man: I guess there has to be a way to look at once I am, kind of, free, or at least as free as I know I'm going to get, how do I stay that way? You know, I need to be able to link up with other producers then.

That, you know, if I buy something in. Because right now that's one of the issues with being export certified. You can only buy from a very small number of people who are also export certified.

Woman: Right.

Man: And that's very limiting. And I have to go a long way. I'm in Arkansas. There is zero. So I really have to get out of state to get anybody. And that's kind of limiting.

So there's a way - there needs to be something put together for a producer to say, once you've gone through this here' show you can stay free. You know, here are some other, we have a group of people who are in this boat with you who are free, or tested anyway.

Woman: We passed OIE to consider other options for certification to occur. They've tabled it though until they considered other issues associated this great (unintelligible) where they're going to take that on. So, I don't think we're going to see action. And until they take action we have to go with the international guidelines, unfortunately. Cindy, did you have something that you wanted?

Cindy Wolfe: Yes. I agree. I'm sorry. I'm not - I have to say I didn't hear you. I understand we need more messaging around how to stay free besides from the program to be....

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well, I guess I'm saying that at least you could say we've tested that one. Doesn't necessarily mean that I'm free or export certified or anything, but I've been tested. And if you want to find people who are tested, you know, here's where...

Woman: Here's this.

Man: Here's how we can say you've been tested. Or here's our little official seal that you can stick on your Web site or your Facebook page, or your marketing material saying we've been tested.

Woman: So NVRT has list in states. And it's pretty much run by the state where some producers voluntarily say I want to be on your list. And it's on a - it's actually on a NVIP is poultry.

Man: Oh.

Woman: So, as an example of how small ruminant people could have organized around that, it's having a Web site where you can go and see who's there.

Man: Yes, having a voluntary...

Woman: A voluntary list where you can list your farm as...

Diane Sutton: Right. That's what the select category of the (SFSSU) is intended to do that basically says I have tested an animal based on the size of my heard or flock. So, for flocks over 100 it's 1 per year per flock.

Under 100, it's 1 every two years. And if it's a very tiny one, there's one every three years. There's a guy who sits here at this meeting and Google that and find that list with the NAHMS and the phone numbers of those farms.

Cindy Wolfe: Yes. All those...

((Crosstalk))

Cindy Wolfe: We may need to do some optimization to make it come up quickly and easily for you.

Man: Because a lot of people will say, you know, I've been CAE tested, CL tested, you know, I've participated in (unintelligible). And that's - those are all marketing tools that I can then use to say, okay.

I really want to buy from that person because I know I'm not going to bring these things into my flock. And I'm getting spring values that's going to be worth spending some money on, as opposed to going down the street to the guy ten miles down the road and buying \$150 animal. And getting something nasty.

Diane Sutton: Go ahead.

Cindy Wolfe: Diane, I was wondering if you could share with the group some of the Web sites where we do have educational materials so that they could have the opportunity to look at those.

And even possibly provide some feedback being that we're at a stage of revising some things if someone, I'll speak for you Diane and you correct me,

that we are revising things so that we can be ready as soon as the rule - the new rule can be published. Is that, kind of, close to accurate?

Diane Sutton: Yes, that's correct. We have cooperative agreements with both ASI and NIAA to provide educational materials and they have additional funding in their last agreement to update all of the materials that can be consistent with the changes that will occur when the rule is finalized.

So it's like - we go the majority of our education and material is on the eradicate scrapie Web site is at IAA. And ASI also has salvage. Not as much. And if you want the (unintelligible) long.

If you go to the APHIS scrapie Web page, you'll need to spot black sheep, because it's black scrapie. And you'll see a list of reads for education materials and all the links are there. So you can go directly to the material.

Man: Diane, one last thing. I just was looking up, I don't know if you're familiar with the E extension Web site system. And Dave, I don't know if you're familiar with that.

David Fernandez: I am. I don't generally use it. It's not...

Man: Yes. There's not much from the sheep side. There's actually quite a bit on the goat side there.

David Fernandez: Yes, it's, kind of, helpful. But...

Man: Yes. But there might be an opportunity to get through the information there that, again, would reach out broader.

Woman: You know the long site?

Man: It's extension, talk extension. I can show it to you here.

Diane Sutton: Okay.

Man: Over break or something.

Diane Sutton: Right.

Man: But again, just another opportunity to get information out.

Diane Sutton: I appreciate that.

Man: Yes.

Diane Sutton: Any more questions? On there? Cindy? Anything else?

Cindy Wolfe: No, I think I'm okay. The biggest success story here is that the availability of ID tags and the fact that initially for sheep and very few in for goats in the marketplace will be driving that animals are tagged.

And even though we had a federal and some state regulations, it's the marketplace that helped our producers come onboard and be so successful with their tagging and traceability which is, in somewhat limited to this one disease, but not necessarily should we need to use it for other diseases.

Woman: There's something. Can I say one more thing? The whole issue of ear tags for all species, when those are distributed we need to come into the modern era. So, when those are distributed there should be a bar code on the box.

And then those numbers ought to go into a database. So, I mean, we're still to the point where we're recording individual ear tags and papers. And state vets offices are getting papers. And if, folders with papers.

And when you have to do a trace back, somebody has to find that ear tag on a paper somewhere. And at some point when states and governments buy ear tags from Matco or whoever.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: There ought to be a system where a barcode is scanned and tags go into a system and they gave them to this farm, or they gave them to this vet. When I was in practice I got boxes of tags and there was a card I was supposed to fill out when I gave a sleeve of tags to somebody else.

And it just doesn't get done. It - and it effects - the scrapie system is better. We're recording, you know, there's farms that gets tagged. And there's veterinarians that get tagged. But in general, for tagging an animal I.D., something needs to change.

David Fernandez: Well, there are...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We're at - we need to move into a modern era of electronic recording as tags are distributed.

David Fernandez: The RF I.D. tags are available, but I don't know if that's what's being shipped out with the new ones because mine are several years old now.

Woman: Yes.

Diane Sutton: I would say there's a big industry when I said we've done. You know, when we've gone to requiring the packers, requiring a premises I.D. (K) veterinary style report, I mean slaughter.

Most of those have barcode on them. You know, there is an ability before the tag manufacturer. They know the premises, they have the barcode. So, printed on there. Then we did a pilot actually when (Jack Sheer) was at the eastern region. And the ability to read barcode to slaughter was pre formed.

Woman: Right.

Diane Sutton: I mean, it was, you know, it was a nice idea. You can't read them real time. But, again, if you clean them up a little bit and try your barcode reader again, you still would have that electronic record instead of having to go back into another slide.

Woman: Right.

Woman: Of course, at the time they're distributed, if the barcode matches the electronic RF I.D. and goes into a database, then when the RF I.D. tag is read, automatically...

Cindy Wolfe: At some point we just need to think about this stuff.

Diane Sutton: For sheep and goat, just for those who don't know, the tags are initially issued through the A system, adaptation management system. So they all do start out in a computer. And probably 90% of them are direct ship to the producer.

So there is a direct linkage to the flock that they are assigned to. The rest go to market dealers and veterinarians for the most part. And those do get reapplied and do require keeping of records currently.

When they go to our office or to a federal veterinarian and they're redistributed, they're either redistributed within the AIMS system, or they're redistributed as FDF.

So there is a computer record of those that are redistributed federally. Once they get into private hands, though, correct, there isn't a system for those. Unless you sign up to be a non-producer participant and are willing to go into the system and reapply the tags.

So it has the capability to do that. And if you're willing - and most people aren't willing - they - "Well, I have a barcode reader on my phone (unintelligible)." I mean, I - and the - in...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...this generation of...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes - of the sheep and goat tags have those - they're not the old-style barcodes. They're the new-style - the barcodes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: They're on there. But they're so small that if you don't have a high quality barcode reader, they're challenging to read. I mean, you can read them with your iPhone, most of the time. But you really need one of those professional readers to get them to read at a pace that's worth using them.

Woman: Yes, the scrapie system is ahead of a lot of others systems for tags.

(Cindy): And the scrapie program is now working with another tag company. So the RFID tags are incredibly affordable. They read very easily on the phone. I would say, in my experience, easier than the barcode tags. Because you don't have to clean them off, which is not much fun to do in a live animal that doesn't want to hold its head still.

So the option is out there for - well, the tags are very affordable. The reader, obviously, comes with some cost. So for those producers who want to move to that level, it's now doable. And, I think, for - has been doable for, what, about 1 year, 1 1/2 years, (Diane)?

(Diane): That sounds about right. It might be a little longer than that, now. I'm always thinking things are less - shorter in time than they are.

Woman: Great. Thank you for this discussion. I think that - (Cindy), do you have any last comments or questions? I think we'll probably move on in a little bit.

(Cindy): They only last comment is, as you know, eradication programs cost money. And from the sheep perspective, we're appreciative of the support to have this program evolve, which it did, in 2001, to its - and has been evolving since then.

And we could be five or so years away from eradicating scrapie if we can continue the path that we're currently on with the adjustments that have been talked about today.

Woman: Okay, great. Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

Woman: Thanks, everyone, for the opportunity. I really appreciate your input.

Woman: Thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I've got an ignorant question.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Do we know about scrapie in wild (unintelligible), like, out West and - I don't know.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...wild sheep.

Woman: I think that one or two heads have been submitted. We haven't found any. It's unlikely that they have scrapie. Of course, we can't weed it out because there hasn't been a lot of testing.

You know, (wood fawn) have been affected, naturally, not in the U.S. So I'm - obviously, they're probably susceptible. But we really don't know.

((Crosstalk))

(Don Ridder): You know, one of the theories about the origin of a chronic waste is the scrapie getting into serial...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Like I said, in Arkansas, most of the ferrets are very, very small. You know, fewer than...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes, California does. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Leanne): Okay. So let's take a break. So we're going to take a ten minute break because the next piece might go on a little longer and we won't be able to break after lunch. It's...

((Crosstalk))

(Leanne): ...Avian sign of a spotted animal health center. We're going to be talking about emerging diseases. And since they haven't been with us for all three days of this meeting, we thought we'd go around the room. Just go ahead and introduce yourself quickly as far as who you are, what state you're from, and what industry or group you may be representing.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I am (unintelligible) elective chairs committee and I'm representing the pork industry.

(Jean McGeary): I'm vice chair of the industry - of us industry. Vice Chair of the committee. I'm from Texas and I represent small scale producers.

((Crosstalk))

(John Prichard): Hi, I'm John Prichard, representing wildlife veterinarians. Hello (Dana), Hello (Leanne).

Glenda Davis: Good morning. Glenda Davis. I'm the tribal rep from Navajo Nations, Arizona, New Mexico and Utah.

David Fernandez: David Fernandez. I'm from Arkansas, and I represent the small ruminant producers, sheep and goat producers.

(Steve Crawford): (Steve Crawford), New Hampshire State veterinarian eastern state animal health official (unintelligible).

(Maryanne Smeable): (Maryanne Smeable) from Kansas. I'm a Rancher, represent cattle producers.

(Dan Grooms): Hi. (Dan Grooms) from Michigan State University representing veterinarians.

John Mahoney: John Mahoney from Minnesota representing veterinarians.

Max Fernandez: Max Fernandez:, rancher representing open range sheep herder.

(Valinda Thompson): (Valinda Thompson), New York State representing veterinarians and the veterinarian special organizations.

(Sean Trowser): (Sean Trowser) from New Mexico representing cattlemen.

(Michael Blackwell): (Michael Blackwell) from Tennessee, I'm representing animal welfare organizations.

(Don Ridder): Hi. I am (Don Ridder), representing poultry from the Del Mar rep peninsula.

(Liz): Thank you. So, (Leanne) and (Dana), I'm just going to turn it over to you. I believe you should have control of your screen. So let me know if we have any technical issues, but we will turn it over to you.

(Leanne): Thanks (Liz). Can you hear me okay?

Man: Yes.

Woman: We can.

(Dana): Great. So we really appreciate the time with you this afternoon.
(Unintelligible) morning in Texas.

(Liz): (Dana), you're breaking up.

Man: That's just (Liz).

(Dana): Oh, is that (Liz)?

Man: Yes.

(Leanne): This is (Leanne) and I picked up my hand set. Is this better?

Group: Yes.

(Liz): Yes, it is. Thank you.

(Leanne): Okay. So, as I was saying we really appreciate this opportunity to talk to you today. And hopefully we will keep the talking at a minimum. We do have a short presentation to just give you some background on emerging diseases. And then we hope to get your input on several questions related to immerging diseases.

Man: Okay.

(Leanne): And we should have - just to check the technology, we should have advanced to the second screen

Man: We have.

(Leanne): Okay. Great. So, we've all heard about emerging disease and how emerging diseases are impacting animal health. We have globalization of our industries of world trade.

And we no longer have the situation where animal or animal products are simply moving within the continental U.S. or within a state. But we see both animals, animal germ plasm, and products coming in from any number of locations throughout the world.

We also have quite draconian changes in our farming practices. We no longer have the small family farms that predominate. But we have large organizations that are rearing large number of animals under consignment activities.

And so all of these, when you look at globalization, changes in business practices among the commodities and business and management practices in the commodities.

The level of interaction that may happen between animals in the environment, human and animals. Is - this all leads to an increased risk of emerging diseases.

And you can see on this slide that there's been any number of publications, this one in specific from the National Academy of Sciences. But, there has been - the issue of emerging diseases certainly is not new.

And accordingly, what VS has done, in the past there have been some previous efforts. Particularly the swine futures project, as well as looking at identification of emerging diseases in previous VS strategic plans in our commodity business plans.

And we also established, or we developed an emerging disease framework document. And it was presented in June of 2014 to the National Assembly into our AAVLD lab directors.

And it was also posted to the APHIS Web site for comments. And so, the discussion that we have here today is going to be based on that framework document.

But in the even that some of you are not familiar with that document, we wanted to go through and just hit some of the high points about the emerging disease framework.

And probably the best place to start is, well, what is an emerging disease? And so, I'd like to spend a little time just going through this list on what's considered an emerging disease.

And it's any animal disease or infection that's not known to exist in the U.S., including a new strain of a known disease occurring in any wildlife species, including wildlife.

And one example, although there are any number of examples of this, but, we've talked about with the swine industry, concerns related to a strain of pseudo rabies virus that is circulating in China that appears to have a much higher virulence than pseudo rabies that are eradicated from the United States.

So that might be one example. Another one that unfortunately it comes from the swine industry, would be back in 2014 when we saw cases of gastrointeric disease in swine, that turned out to be porcine epidemic diarrhea virus that subsequently went on to develop into a situation that had significant impact for the industry.

Another definition for an emerging diseases is a disease with zoonotic potential. One that we see that has a consequence for man, because of the ability to effect humans.

Another emerging disease could be a situation where we have an unusual and unexpected increase in the illness or death rate caused by a particular infectious agent.

And then when there is evidence of a change in the epidemiology of a known disease, this could be increased pathogenicity, un-expanding of the animals that are infected by this particular agent are then just a new clinical syndrome, if you will, caused by an agent that's new.

And while I don't have a good example regarding clinical signs, but for instance, if you had a virus that in the past had caused respiratory signs, but then turned into more of a neurologic disease, then and an equine herpes virus one, could be an example of this type of virus.

So as we talk about emerging diseases, these are the criteria that we are using to term something an emerging disease. And certainly, we have some questions related to when does a disease become an emerging disease later in the (unintelligible).

Just wanted to give these definitions as a start for our discussions. And now to move onto the framework document itself. There are four goals in the framework document.

And it - the document explains how we approach dealing with an emerging disease. And the first goal is to survey the situation in the United States as

well as internationally to determine what new diseases are we seeing are being reported?

What would be the possibilities - not only the possibilities for introduction, but what would the impact of these diseases entering the United States? Then we would - the second goal is to detect, identify, and characterize these disease events.

Again, which could be internationally, or they could be domestically. What is it that we're seeing within the particular commodity that's effected? Is there high morbidity? Mortality? Just goal too is to provide more clarity around the situation.

And goal three, is related to communications. What is it that is being seen either nationally, domestically, or internationally? But we want to make sure that there is good communication with stakeholders regarding what actions might be taken.

But more importantly, what is the information and the assessment that has been done related to an emerging disease? And then, number four is being able to quickly respond to the impact of these emerging diseases.

And I want to stress here that when we say response, I think particularly when somebody from veterinary services, or from a regulatory agency starts speaking about response, the immediate thought is that we're going into some sort of eradication and control program.

And I think in many cases it's actually (unintelligible). That the action may be related to some other sort of activity other than taking some sort of a

regulatory action where veterinary services is putting in place either eradication or control principles.

And those would be such things as depopulation, testing requirements for interstate movement. While certainly that those are possible responses, it is not our intention that when we talk about responding, is that that would necessarily be our only sort of response.

There is any number of levels and different type of activities that would be defined under response. And certainly, one response would be, be aware of the information.

Be aware of the situation, disseminate information at it becomes available, but that there not be any, sort of, formal regulatory action. And these next group of slides, just to give you an idea of who is involved with the particular goals.

And so, Goal 1 was the global awareness assessment and preparedness. And the group that is intricately involved and, this is - these activities is actually the group that (Dana) leads.

And (Dana) has been, perhaps in some cases it's been trial by fire as she is new to the position. But she's dealt with such issues as most recently (SEMICO Valley A) virus.

And (Dana) played and (Encia) very much played a role in assessing and providing information and trying to define what the situation with (SEMICO A) virus which was a swine disease.

Quite an interesting scenario that played out earlier this year - excuse me - last year. And that it causes - causes vesicles that are indistinguishable from foot and mouth disease.

So this was a situation that caused a lot of concern related to our foreign animal disease preparedness. So, the next goal, which involved really a number within - of individuals and groups within veterinary services is to detect, identify, and characterize these agents.

And we currently have existing systems via our comprehensive integrated surveillance that we are using to, if you will, survey the domestic environment for determining what is happening in the commodities.

We also have the National List of Reportable Animal Diseases. This was a framework document that was released at the same time as the emerging diseases framework document where we requested input.

Although, the developing a list of reported animal diseases has been an option with USAHA and state veterinarians for a number of years. And we currently are developing a proposed rule with the desire to codify a list of diseases that we require reporting.

And therefore, this source of information would be used to help characterize any foreign animal - not foreign animal disease. Emerging disease that enters the U.S.

And one of the things that while this is - presentation has been somewhat via centric, is that when we talk about emerging diseases, regardless of the goal, is the need to collaborate with stakeholders to investigate and assess the situation.

Emerging diseases takes a unified approach to fully address. In regards to how we detect, identify, and characterize emerging diseases, there are a number of consideration that you can see on this screen. We frequently talk about trade impacts when there is a disease in the country.

And while certainly it's unfortunate that highly pathogenic avian influenza is - I don't think that there would be any argument that unfortunately it has been an emerging disease in the United States. Particularly in 2014 and 2015.

We certainly hope that trend does not continue in 2016. But tremendous, tremendous impacts with an emerging disease that also happens to be a foreign animal disease.

And there were significant trade impacts when we announced our first case of HPAI in the U.S. And as you can see form the slides there are a number of criteria that we need to include in our consideration when we're evaluating these diseases.

And you actually may have others that you would like to see us consider as we evaluate data. Or, as you as an industry evaluate disease information that you may be aware of.

As I mentioned, it doesn't do any good for this not to work with stakeholders or not to communicate with stakeholders regarding the information that has been developed.

The analysis that have been developed. And it is certainly our intent that we will publish analysis. And this later point of the slide is to stress that we certainly recognize with, when you begin talking about a national list of

reportable animal diseases is when you start talking about doing investigations, further analysis on disease situations that issues of confidentiality.

As well as in some cases even the identification of a state so some commodities can be sensitive. But it's certainly our intent to provide aggregate data such that issues related to confidentiality and privacy that we abide by those and we don't unintentionally provide a mechanism for negative impact to a producer via our release of information.

As I said earlier, response to emerging diseases can mean any variety of actions from information dissemination to full dissemination or full mobilization for rapid eradication.

And as I said, that part of this - one of the major focus for (Dana) and I in the next year is to work on further teasing out an emerging disease response plan. And by that I mean the framework does a good idea to providing the initial look into emerging diseases providing a description of what we'll do specifically related to those four goals.

However, it doesn't provide a lot of granularity. And one of the products that (Dana) and I will be working on will to further define what actions this may be taking including collaboration with stakeholders regarding an emerging disease or response.

While we - it would be impossible to develop an emerging disease response plan for every diseases, we certainly want to be transparent about the processes that we plan on using to make sure that we're able to respond nimbly.

And transparently regarding emerging diseases that may enter the United States. So with that, I'm going to turn the discussion over to Dr. (Dana Cole). And (Dana), I hope you're still good and online.

(Dana Cole): Yes. I hope so. Can you hear me?

Diane Sutton: We can (Dana).

(Dana Cole): Okay. Good. So, yes. So with that as background (Leanne) and I want to work through some questions with you and get some feedback on - that will help us try to strategize and move forward on developing specific planning around the four goals for the framework for that - in response option.

So our first question has to do with the definitions of emerging animal diseases. And I'll in a moment probably back up to that slide where we provided those.

But our question is around (unintelligible) thresholds that should be established before disease is considered to be emerging? In other words, what criteria or what consideration should we have to call a disease emerging?

And this has - this touches on a couple of things. Not just the framework and, of course, our planning about various options for responding to. And as (Leanne) said, we want to response is a broad umbrella, sort of, term meaning a response could be just sending out information to the industry.

Or to stakeholders about, you know, what we're observing and that sort of thing, but not really, you know, taking any further action. Or, it could be so far as to actually engage in response activity.

So given that, you know, that we have, you know, we want to be nimble and that sort of thing. We're interested in your input on how we should think about labeling diseases and emerging. It's easy. I'll go back now to that slide where we have the definitions of emerging disease on Slide 4.

And I think all of us here could, sort of, have a sense of when these are emerging. But in reality, when it comes to say, under the NL RAD or under the National List of Reportable Animal Diseases emerged reporting and emerging disease is in that.

And so that raises questions about, you know, what internally and with stakeholders to date talking about NL RAD for example. There's been a question well in, is it a one.

I mean if you - in other words, if you identify a new whole genome sequence associated with a stream in a herd, for example, that may be showing evidence in a change in epidemiology, can we - should we go ahead and consider that an emerging disease, or are there other considerations regarding geographic spread?

Or timelines and time space considerations and that sort of thing. So, you know, we're interested in getting your input on how we should look at this emerging animal disease definition and criteria or thresholds we should consider before we go ahead and maybe call a disease from merging. And I'll be quiet now and open it up to input and questions around us.

(Don Ridder): Yes, I have a question. (Dana) or (Leanne), this is (Don Ridder). So what happens once a disease is labeled emerging?

(Dana Cole): That's a good question. And this is (Dana). We - you know, there's a variety of options. You know, and so maybe that gets at the heart of this question that we have about the criteria threshold. Maybe we have levels of emerging.

For example, they'd have, you know, back to your question about what happens when a disease is considered emerging. Well, if we decide that a disease may be emerging or is, you know, at risk of emerging, maybe we want to call it, sort of, a potentially emerging disease.

And then, our action would be - our response would be for example just to look at, okay. Given the scenario of this emerging situation or this new whole genome sequence.

Or, you know, however this comes to our attention. Maybe our response would simply be to sit back and look at, well, what is our diagnostic capacity if this, sort of, spread geographically?

What are the design response options in advance? You know, just in case under different scenarios and that sort of thing. But not really take any further action other than maybe look at research needs, diagnostic needs, and that sort of thing.

You know, so that - like (Leanne) said, that's part of our goal here when we're designing a response plan is to do this around scenarios. Because we know that these definitions are disputes enough and different enough that we can't develop a one size fits all response option when a disease is declared emerging. It depends on the dynamics of the newest emergence.

(Don Ridder): Yes. So I guess what I'm hearing is, it would enter into a decision tree of some kind that's a flexible one. And it would free our resources to be directed at this new thing.

(Dana Cole): Yes.

(Don Ridder): If it's a - if it's developed in a diagnostic test. If it's depop in animals. If it's making people sick, whatever. It's going to be a different response. So, but, once you identify it officially, I guess, then it would be available for this support from V.S. Is that what I'm hearing?

(Leanne): So (Don), this is (Leanne). And so, in the other component and is creating the understanding with stakeholders of when we're going to, if you will, engage in this process.

And (Dana) referred to a situation where something has just been identified one time. And particularly when you start talking about resource issues. And another example might be if there is a situation where there is a publication where a group or a university has published a paper regarding a new virus that's circulating within a commodity.

And I will intentionally keep it safe. So it's all commodities. And so, it's one publication. The - one of the other (unintelligible) to this question that we (unintelligible) too is that should we even put that on our radar screen?

Because there are lots of publications potentially about new agents. And it gets to the workload issue that you addressed. But it's on the front end of that question is, what is the - while we would certainly like to be able to address every scenario, or every report of an emerging disease, my concern it -

Number 1, is that we be very transparent between what the trigger is, or what the criteria for us to consider something as an emerging disease. And (Dana) eluded to one option is put it on our radar screen.

But even before, to put something on our radar screen takes - is a resource need. So, does - to turn your, to turn the question around or maybe rephrase it, is -

You know, at what level does there need to be this - these actions taken? If it is an end of one, we're interested of getting the - this groups feedback on that. But it's just so that we can better manage expectations.

But, yes, I think to answer your question, the expectation is, is that if something is identified as an emerging is that we follow through on all four of those goals which include outreach and dialogue with stakeholders. Ultimately to determine appropriate responses to the new emerging disease.

(Don Ridder): All right. And you're including FADs in this also, right? Or no?

(Leanne): And - well, FADs are unique in that they have response plans that have already been identified. And they're also codified in the regulations. So, but an FAD can be an FAD can be an emerging disease. It's just we have those response plans that have already been outlined.

(Don Ridder): All right, okay. I'll turn it over to others.

Annette John): This is (Annette). Can I ask a quick question?

(Leanne): Sure

(Annette John): (Annette John) from California.

(Leanne): Welcome aboard, (Annette).

(Annette John): I was wondering, you mentioned - I completely agree that you need triggers because otherwise you are setting yourself up to failure. Because everyone's going to question why you respond at one time and why don't at another. You - I think that's a really brilliant thing to be thinking about. But, I don't have the right answer to what they should be.

But we could probably, everyone can put some thought into it. But my question was, you mentioned confidentiality and I think that's a big road block to actually be more proactive with emerging diseases. If you look at it historically it's always been confidentiality and money that basically has, kind of, hamstrung any proactive response to emerging diseases.

And so is that specifically - is there considerations to specifically build in confidentiality protections for, you know, under some, you know, under some specific circumstances. I know VS has been very, actually quite very successful at protecting confidentiality. But I think that is mostly policy and effort. Whereas a sharp attorney could probably extract more information.

(Leanne): So (Annette), I'll paraphrase your question and see if I captured it correctly. Is this looking into ways that we could further codify exemptions to FOIA regulations or the federal advice, Freedom of Act...

(Annette John): Freedom of Information Act.

(Leanne): ...Thank you. Is -

((Crosstalk))

(Annette John): Yes. For specific studies on emerging diseases or something like that. You know, it would be a little narrow. But an exemption, yes.

Woman: No, we have not received that.

(Annette John): Is that in - my guess if it's, you know, it will a challenge for us in California and probably many other states as well. What about can you do to use names, you know, some of the protections built in under there to do some of the emerging disease work?

Woman: Does this say you have protection?

(Dana Cole): So, yes, the - this is (Dana) - the confidentiality question, you know, since you raised NAHMS is being addressed, you know, as part of, because again, the National List of Reportable Animal Diseases does include emerging disease it it's, you know, in the framework for reporting diseases.

And so, the confidentiality issue as it pertains, you know, to reporting of emerging diseases through the NAHMS labs and through laboratories in general, is definitely being addressed through that, you know.

It's being addressed through that reporting mechanism. So, you know, those protections are in place and it's being dealt with as we plan that the national list in reporting emerging diseases under that national list framework.

(Annette John): Okay, and actually that's good to know. And I think that will be helpful for developed, you know, for actually succeeding and improving our response to

emerging diseases. But actually what I mentioned was the Animal Health Monitoring System. So that's those studies...

((Crosstalk))

(Dana Cole): Yes. Yes. So that (unintelligible) also. Yes.

(Annette John): I'm wondering if - I wonder if we could use those studies as a way to, when you start to detect an emerging disease and have a NAHMS study that would delve further into it. I wonder if that would lend some confidentiality.

(Dana Cole): Oh, so you are talking about on the response end. If I understand, you're talking about, on the response end, once we are suspicious or...

(Annette John): Right.

(Dana Cole): ...you know, need to know more about the time. Can - yes.

(Annette John): But to develop the information toward as a trigger. I mean, you can't - if you have a trigger, for when you should actually respond, either you will need more information than what you may get from a lab report.

(Dana Cole): I see. Yes. So, you're hitting at one of the, you know, what we would consider one of the response - on the response side, one of the response scenarios.

So going back to the example that (Leanne) referred to earlier, say the Seneca Virus A emergence is that, we in , you know, we and VS, while we were dealing with that and determining it and, as you suggested, talked about, you know, trying to get more data through lab systems and that sort of thing, you know.

The actual, you know, and this is one of the things we were trying to sort out here in this discussion is we never, you know, we responded to that and we did activities, we conducted activities, studies, and that sort of thing to learn more about the virus and that FVA was emerging, you know, it's just what you hit at.

Do we declared it emerging and then that triggers are these things or do we declare it potentially emerging and then do all these things as developing data for triggering the declaration that it's emerging.

It's - I guess what I was trying to, sort of, get at that before as far as, do we need different categories of emerging? Potentially emerging, definitely emerging. Because one of the things to consider is once a disease is declared emerging, like we say this Disease X is an emerging disease, then there's the question about, it gets back to the question about reporting.

Okay, so, you know, it's, sort of, fuzzy until you get to that point and then all of a sudden it's emerging and then a whole host of - you know, that, that in itself declaring a disease emerging is a potential trigger for response actions.

(Leanne): And (Annette), you know, I guess to your question, specifically, is would we be able to use NAHMS studies and - this is an area because of concerns related to confidentiality and other situations that are out with the emerging disease discussion. But one of the questions that we really need to get legal guidance on is this issue of voluntary participation.

(Annette John): Okay.

(Leanne): Because there is this - and it's loosely put, if a producer participates voluntarily in a program, that information is protected under Freedom of Information. It's protected from the release of that information. And I think that, you know, specifically to this question, is we need to pursue the discussions with our legal counsel.

If we have a scenario where we doing, for instance, field investigation. We need to find out, because it is not regulatory action, I would assume that therefore the producer's participation is voluntary and we would be able to protect that producer. But that's my own legal interpretation.

So - it's a good point to bring up with our legal counsel to figure out how the voluntary nature of that producer's participation and perhaps, the issue is that particularly, if the state has put a quarantine on that facility or a hold order on that facility, does that make the producer's participation mandatory versus voluntary?

So if I can, (Annette), would you have any read on whether or not something becomes voluntary for a producer if he has a hold or quarantine order placed at the site level?

(Annette John): Yes, I have a hunch that if the state puts anything like that on, the state would have to turn that information over. You know, our own quote unquote "Sunshine Laws" would apply. So regardless of -

Usually if there is an ongoing investigation we can hold the information until we've completed it, you know, for bar security and other reasons. But my guess is that would be public information.

If the state takes regulatory action. I'm not sure how it would play out for you guys, but I would guess you're correct on your hunch. Also being a non-lawyer, but, I just want...

((Crosstalk))

(Leanne): So we have someone here in the room, a (Zack Blackwell).

(Zack Blackwell): My recommendation is that, we should in the spirit of one health, use the same definition as the CDC which is the same, pretty much, as the World Health Organization.

There is no reason, in my mind, that infectious diseases amongst animals, including non-zoonotic, should enjoy different definition of emerging. The simple definition used the, "New infections resulting from changes or evolution of existing organisms, Known infections spreading to new geographic areas or populations.", and it kind of goes on from there. I think some of these other issues are secondary truly to whether you call it an emerging disease.

I don't think that privacy matters should dictate whether we, from a scientific standpoint, consider a disease emerging. There are privacy matter that should be attended to and protected. But let's don't confuse what we call an emerging disease with the privacy issues. That's my suggestion.

(Annette John): This is (Annette). I totally, totally agree with that. The trigger should be what you - something that - you know, what emerging disease triggers a further response. And maybe the spot could be, as someone else suggested, the decision tree, or different levels.

(Zack Blackwell): Yes.

(Leanne): (Ronnie)? And I'll get to you John next.

John Mahoney: Okay, thanks.

(Leanne): The response from - that I've gotten back from veterinarians is that the trigger really needed to vary by the disease. And it needs to be related to what's known about the disease.

The contagiousness of the disease. So, you know, we often see reports on the human health side of an imported disease. A person comes into the country infected. And they refer that as a, you know -

We've had, for example the Ebola patient in Texas was not a domestically acquired disease. But the nurses got it. There was evidence of transmission. And then you start having evidence of transmission.

This is still - either case needed to be reported. You know, the first case of foot and mouth disease is always going to be the index case. But in some cases -

For example, I think changes in the disease acquiring resistance to either antimicrobials or (unintelligible) might be a reason to add it to the list. And a single occurrence of a resistance may not get it into the emerging disease category. But when there's evidence of that being transmitted from premise to premise that may (prove) it into the realm of consideration.

So I really think it - in some cases, it has to depend on the disease. (John)?

(John): Yes. (Leanne) and (Dana), this is a kind of a multi-step question. Your definition casts a pretty wide net there, and I guess the first thing I would ask is are we speaking only of infectious diseases here or perhaps some toxicological issues too.

Say if we had changes in epidemiology of botulism or blue-green algae, toxicoses. Those kinds of things. And then when we look at some of the diseases that currently are regarded as emerging, they primarily have wildlife implications without significant implications or direct implications for the traditional commodity species.

So there I would mention something like white-nose syndrome in bats which has devastated some populations and may alter the epidemiology of some of the zoonotic arboviruses such as Triple E.

Another one would be the bee colony collapse disorder - would then certainly OID regards bees as animals. And that has an environmental impact issue there with pollination of crops.

And one current one that we do not have in the United States but a lot of people are concerned about it is the chytrid fungus that affects salamanders because it's feared that could potentially lead to extirpation of some of the salamander species here.

So again, that's kind of a long multi-step rambling question. I guess how do you get your arms around exactly what an emerging disease is? Toxicologic, infectious species that it affects and indirect implications for human or domestic animal health.

(Leanne): So (John), I'll take a stab at that. And to answer some of your specific questions and then probably to broaden it to the global picture of emerging diseases and what VS can or can't do is that - actually one of the comments that (unintelligible) on - I believe it was actually in (LRAD) which is not specific to this conversation, but certainly related is that toxicosis needed to be included.

I would say in its current form is that our focus is on infectious diseases. And I think in part that is due to the infrastructure of veterinary services and the number of employees we have in our expertise levels. Because other than a few, perhaps, individuals in VSL is that our expertise in toxicoses would be limited.

But certainly one can use the melamine example as perhaps, you know, VS should have played a bigger picture - albeit, you know, I think the significant impact on the melamine situation was perhaps small animals and not the livestock commodities.

So your point is well taken. The question that I have is would we, in our existing infrastructure, be able to support that? That being said that's my bias. Certainly we would be interested in hearing whether or not there's a strong support from this group that that needs to be included.

So (unintelligible) specific to - and I'll use the last example that you gave and that's the chytrid fungus.

And actually (John), we've been very much involved in that chytrid discussion, particularly the concerns that have been raised in the domestic aqua culture regarding the penalties associated with the unintentional

movement of 201 species of salamanders across state lines that would be subject to felony charges if that happens.

So in regard to the three diseases that you listed -- white-nose, colony collapse and chytrid fungus -- is - I think VS's role here is through our existing collaboration and interactions with other federal agencies is that we certainly need to participate in those discussions.

We need to be aware of them and we need to coordinate, collaborate. But it's not clear to me that we have the expertise nor the infrastructure to provide the expertise to these issues. We can certainly chime in where we can and collaborate.

But be the lead? I don't see that we can be lead nor is it our role because if we become the lead then, unfortunately, I think our livestock industries are going to suffer from a situation that may be related primarily to a wildlife disease as opposed to an agricultural issue.

(John): I understand. I understand all of that, (Leanne). I only brought it up because of how wide this net is that you're casting when you're defining an emerging disease.

(Leanne): Yes...

(Liz): Is it - oh, go ahead (Leanne). I'm sorry.

(Leanne): Yes. No, I think (John) and I - I'm sorry, I should have kept my mouth shut. As I would like to ask the group, given your roles is that - how does the group feel we should address wildlife diseases?

Should we only be focused on those diseases that clearly have an impact on agriculture? And the best example might be the abortus. Where actually the abortus in bison is an area that obviously VS is not going to walk away from.

But certainly there are other groups within Interior that are certainly very much involved in that - in the abortus situation. So what is the feedback from - the thought from the groups about how we should, if you will, prioritize wildlife issues?

Should we only be concerned about those that affect or have an impact at the wildlife domestic livestock interface?

(Liz): So (Leanne), I think that's going to take probably some major discussion. Can we put that in a committee report to - after we've had time to discuss and get back to you?

(Leanne): That'd be perfect. Thanks.

(Liz): You bet. And so I've got - we've got all sorts of hands up here. It's - and I've been sitting on my hand and I can't do it anymore. So what I'm hearing is that we have a general consensus that it's a good idea to have triggers.

We just don't know how long - will it affect the triggers or how has to be (unintelligible) or the impact of naming something as an emerging disease. Actually what those - what the impact of those are?

And so, I think that's one of my concerns is that I think we have to have proper surveillance to identify a scope of an emerging disease. So that one laboratory that says a microarray and finds something funky on (unintelligible) may be causing clinical design disease.

You know, is that a trigger or how low should that trigger be? And secondly, if we name something as emerging disease, I think there's a need for industry and APHIS and others to - be all of us understand and know something might need to be - situational awareness needs to be heightened.

But if you name something as an emerging disease and it then becomes a reportable through OID, what are the potential trade implications, et cetera. So I think we need to be careful of what those triggers are of what you call something.

Not that we need to hide - you know, it's not that we need to push something under the carpet. But also do we want to pretend to have potentially really serious consequences to something that maybe a laboratory finding without clinical consequences.

So I don't have the answers, but I'm going to throw that out and (Steve) has his hand up. So maybe he's got some answers or recommendations.

(Steve): No, but it may be something that might help me to think about how to prioritize that. I've heard a couple times resource concerns and I understand those.

How many bodies do you have in your center and what is the scope of work other than emerging diseases that you already have to do that might get supplanted that you have to expand this work?

(Leanne): (Dana), I'll let you start and then I will try and go through an example from the commodities side.

(Steve): I didn't mean for that to be too big a question. I know it is. But whatever you want to say.

(Dana): So - this is (Dana). So as (Leanne) shared in one of the earlier slides, the Risk Identification Team is sort of the body, if you will, in Veterinary Services that is, you know, in large part engaged in the sort of global awareness component.

Establishing global awareness, assessing risks and that sort of thing. And also, trying to keep our finger on the pulse, if you will, of what's going on domestically. But although we - in that group, you know, risk identification it is - was our - team name. So (it has sort of) a big part of our activities.

And we do have, you know, a wide range of activities. Not all of them are dedicated to those two functions. But all of them are sort of dedicated at least indirectly, if you will, to those functions.

Developing models to determine risk of introduction for (unintelligible) between the wildlife/livestock interface, for example. Doing projects, trying to evaluate early detection systems and that sort of thing.

So now we do have a team for that, but while I say that, the resources in that team aren't the only resources being used because we rely heavily on others throughout Veterinary Services that are in regular contact with industry and other stakeholders to sort of, you know, be our eyes and ears, if you will, and we - and give us a heads up or notify us or asks us questions and that sort of thing about things.

Because it's just impossible, if you will, for a small team, you know, to just have their finger in every pie, if you will. So I can answer the question, you

know, that way as far as the Risk Identification Team is dedicated to this activity.

And, you know, and we're trying to develop, you know, doing everything we can to develop the resources that we need and we're still working out how NLRAD might impact. Like it - when that goes into rule.

How that might change things. Anticipate that. But as far as other activities that would be compromised, I think that's more related to sort of our eyes and ears throughout VS that we rely on and how an output of foreign animal disease like high path avian influenza, for example, redirects everybody's activities, you know, quite a bit.

And especially our ability to sort of keep our finger on the pulse of other issues.

(Steve): How many people are on your team?

(Liz): (Dana), did you hear the last question?

(Dana): Sorry, no. I was trying to re-mute my phone. Yes?

(Steve): So how many people are on that team that you work with (Dana)? Sorry about that.

(Dana): So that team as I said has a variety of activities, but right now it's composed of about 11 people.

(Steve): Okay, thanks.

(Leanne): And if I can - because (Dana)'s dead-on that there are a number in Veterinary Services. But an important component of emerging diseases are your individuals that are in the commodity teams.

And so I did a quick check. So for swine, there are four VMOs in the swine program. Poultry currently has four, although a fifth has been recently approved. Aqua culture has 2.5. Equine has two. Cattle, I didn't get to do the count.

But sheep and goats have six. And actually, I do have the count for cattle. It's seven. So I will use - specifically I'll just use an example of the activities, for instance, that the poultry team supports and that's the National Poultry Improvement Plan.

The live bird marketing system as well as all issues poultry have. So if you were to add a significant component related to poultry emerging diseases and staffing remains static, is there - yes, there would be potentially some impact or some stretching of personnel needs associated with the poultry emerging issue.

Depending on what level of granularity you use related to the triggers for taking action or considering something to be an emerging disease. It's not a lot of people on the commodity side.

(Liz): So (Leanne), what is the impact or the contribution of people like in emergency programs to the health as well as the emerging diseases?

(Leanne): And thanks (Liz), that's a good reminder. I was - I had my blinkers on when they responded. And I would say in 2017, there would be a greater ability to respond to emerging diseases.

If Congress approves the increase in funding related to emerging diseases and the capability to respond to other diseases, it would be much better and I would actually have to look up the number of individuals.

But certainly, they could and should play a role here with the impact being as that they currently have significant efforts underway related to fine-tuning FAD response plan as well as probably just as important those response plans, but the secure food supply plans.

(Liz): All right. Thanks. (Michael)?

(Michael): I have to confess, I'm a little troubled that we are complicating what was a simple question with - it sounds like we don't - we may not want to call something emerging if we don't think we have resources. Personnel. And I'm uncomfortable with that thinking, if that's correct.

And generally, no we don't include practical logic situations with - and it's usually infectious diseases. And at least on the human side, one case doesn't yield that definition.

Let's say in the lab or - I mean people have to think if something has happened, what's the likelihood that this represents a problem and you may not be able to make that decision on one case.

Notice I'm not talking about personnel or privacy matters. It's a simple question. Do we as a nation have a new disease showing up? And we shouldn't complicate that with any other matters. They all should be called...

(Dana): I agree with you - this is (Dana). I completely agree and I hope that's not - I hope we haven't really indicated that's the message. I mean from the risk identification point of view which, you know, we're really in that position of collecting the data, assessing the data and that sort of thing.

And trying to determine if a disease is emerging. We're - our focus really is those triggers. And, you know, listening to the discussion today, it sounds, you know, like we're all convinced that, you know, an (N of 1) isn't an emerging disease.

Yes we would like to - as we would say earlier using the Ebola example, we need to know if there's a first incursion of a new disease but we wouldn't - that would not necessarily trigger the definition of this disease as emerging.

And so then, the next step would be well what would be the trigger? Well evidence of sustained transmission. So, you know, in the case of Ebola that was brought up earlier, you know, a direct contact transmission. You know, again we may be watching it.

We want to know about that, but still it wouldn't reach the threshold for saying this is emerging. So I mean it sounds like if I'm understanding the input, you know, this sustained transmission either in a new geographic area or, you know, new in the country.

And that's where we think it should be one of the top considerations.

(Liz): So we've got (Charles) - and how (good) (unintelligible) because (Charles) triggered it.

(Charles): Oh okay. (Leanne), you've got a perfect example of vesicular stomatitis. And this disease has been around for a number of years. And we've seen it spike and reduce. And so, please tells us how you determine that it's now an emerging disease.

(Leanne): And are you referring to the slide that refers to the USAHA news clip that vesicular stomatitis is emerging?

(Charles): Yes.

(Leanne): Yes. And actually, I think that's why we're actually having this discussion because it's how people use emerging diseases. And we actually - there hasn't been - although the equine group and those most closely related to the issue or more involved but - and I've certainly been leading that.

And I think that's one of the reasons why we wanted to - number one, that we use that particular blurb and number two, is to have discussion because in my mind, as you pointed out, is that vesicular stomatitis has come and gone.

Although it seems to me coming more than it's going recently. And so if you look at a scenario given the breadth and the timeframe for the infections that are being seen, some can rightfully argue that it is emerging.

If I may ask you, is your thought that, you know, perhaps we shouldn't be labeling vesicular stomatitis as emerging?

(Charles): Well I think - and dealing with the consequences of this disease for 30 years, I think if you charted this in that 30-year period, you would see that it spikes, reduces, spikes, reduces. And I think you'll find that it follows a weather pattern.

(Liz): Okay. (Judith)...

((Crosstalk))

(Charles): But one other thing I would say is that if I'm correct, it's mainly transferred by mosquitos. Is that correct? That's the main source of transfer?

(Leanne): Yes, it's insect born.

(Charles): Okay. And then I think you'll see as that disease becomes prevalent when the insect population is higher. And usually that's in a humid climate. So when you have dry weather in these areas as in Colorado, if they have a dry year they have less prevalence of vesicular stomatitis.

In a wet year they have more of it. I think you'll see that pattern. I've seen that pattern for 30 years. But I know I'm not saying we don't make it an emerging disease.

I'm just questioning just an example of there is information out there and if you chart this disease, it may not be an emerging disease.

(Dana): Yes, that's a good point. There's a, you know, that you're touching on is that do we want to - there's a difference between sort of cyclic disease, epidemiologic disease patterns, (faded) weather transmission factors.

And does that - do those cycles - does recognition of those cycles or a rising component in those cycles, does that qualify as an emerging disease?

Do we say we're in a phase of a cyclic lie, if you will, on this emerging - in this disease, so that, you know, that it's driven by these factors? Climate - and as a risk identification team we're looking at climate change and what can we anticipate based climate change, you know, having an impact on emerging disease.

Are we going to see Vector-borne diseases moving to new geographic areas or that sort of thing? In which case, then I think we'd call it an emerging disease. But is its cyclic changes in itself constitute emerging disease?

(Charles): Exactly.

(Liz): Okay. So (Judith), Belinda and then Glenda.

(Judith): So in some ways, I think I'm just trying to put together sort of process and structure from what I've been listening. And I think (Don) was the one to use the term decision tree earlier.

And I think that - what I'm hearing and what I'm seeing that makes sense is there's a definition of emerging disease. And asking us like what should trigger an emerging disease definition doesn't quite make sense.

It's - either it meets the definition or it doesn't meet the definition. But issues like what's the attraction with state and regulatory systems? What are their resources?

When does it become endemic and by the way what are the implications of labeling it endemic play into the decision tree? And what happens after it's already called an emerging disease?

And probably, I think this committee would have a lot to say about like how that disease - you know, important factors that should be part of that decision tree.

And that's a conversation we can start today, and maybe I'm inclined to say this is an issue to bring back in our fall meeting with some more of those facts and some more depth into looking really at that decision tree model.

(Liz): So let me ask you a question (Don), you said cut and dry definition is up there. Because I'm not sure it's cut and dry is an example of increase in morbidity and mortality as one of the examples.

So if I have a nursery that not only runs at 2% mortality and then it goes to 3%, is that an emerging disease?

(Don): No.

(Liz): And so, those are...

(Don): (Unintelligible).

(Liz): That's what I think it's not as cut and dried as we want it to.

(Don): From an epidemiologic standpoint, one would want to understand what the prevalence is and with many diseases, there's a certain background level.

(Liz): Right. Right.

(Don): And then you have these epidemics or epizootics where it pops up. And that's what you call that. It's a new epidemic or a new epizootic. But it's not an emerging disease.

(Liz): Right. Right.

(Don): And I have proved it - and I'm trying to be consistent with the human side.

(Liz): Yes. Sure.

(Don): And just want to state the system because it gets confusing when we come up with a new definition or animals and we're talking about one hell of a...

(Judith): And I don't think - I don't have his expertise on this. But just flipping back to the definition I think, you know, the questions to help, you know, is this unexpected, unexplained or it is something that's in that same cycle?

(Liz): Yes. So I mean my nursery's been running at 2% for the last five years and all of sudden it goes to 3% or 4%, its unexpected or perhaps even unexplained, but is this the trigger, you know?

And so those are - that's where I was getting confused. I'll turn it over to Belinda and I'll shut up. Sorry.

(Don): No. It's all right.

Belinda Thompson: So I have a couple of examples that I personally think would show up in emerging diseases. So I think USDA and USDA ARS have traditionally played a role in helping with it then - and what I see is that this is really a way to codify the activities perhaps with USDA.

But the nation's production and agriculture has always relied on USDA. This isn't new. Emerging disease. But I think the definition needs to be evaluated for when endemic diseases potentially become codified as emerging diseases.

What changes go there? So the examples that I would give from the cattle industry would be (unintelligible) emerging and new states and affecting cattle.

And when whether or not that would be considered emerging. You know, when BVD2 hit the country, the current vaccines couldn't control it and there were high death losses. And USDA played a role in helping with the diagnostics and the research and still are.

And now we're watching for BVD3. Epizootic hemorrhagic disease virus says it's emerging in new regions possibly related to the climate change. Possibly not. Has significant trade implications because you can't export semen from EHD-positive bulls.

And then you've also - they located an area so they're traditionally EHD-negative. And potentially that one would have, you know, really significant trade implications. But the one next to the bull is what will determine that.

It's not our reporting it. We already know we have that in the country. So knowing that we have EHD isn't a significant issue. And then EHD also caused a significant burden on our farm animals in these investigations because of them having to investigate them.

And then the last two examples I have are changes in antimicrobial sensitivity perhaps. So we have anaplasma marginality emerging in cattle that is potentially resistant to tetracycline.

It's very difficult to control disease. Insect-borne but human activities play a role in transmission as well. Because this was a (needle) transmission. And then, you know, (unintelligible) doubling in cattle.

In 1996, that was (pan susceptible) to antibiotics and now it's a significant multi-drug resistant (unintelligible). Contributing to misuse of antibiotics and potentially further resistance developing a - the animals are just dying.

And so, those are all examples of it. That I think actually would fall under this definition of emerging diseases.

(Charles): That's spreading the - part of that is the spreading of the disease?

Belinda Thompson: Yes. But the emergence of that resistance pattern...

(Charles): I was speaking of - it goes through the state.

Belinda Thompson: Yes.

(Charles): We call that spreading not so much emerging.

Belinda Thompson: And I don't know when it's emerging and when it's spreading.

Man: Right.

Woman: Okay.

(Liz): So I think, let's have (Glenda) - have her comment and then we've got two or three more questions that we need to...

Woman: Mine.

(Liz): Yes. That we need to get to. So I think we'll have less of active discussion with (Glenda).

Glenda Davis: (Leanne) and (Dana), this is Glenda Davis. I just had - as far as your data collection and kind of your looking at information that's out there and available.

The World Health Organization on the human side, I don't know what avenues they have. And then are those types of things. But I know the USAHA has a committee on emerging diseases.

So the industry and a lot of the commodity groups, they have information. And how you're going to filter it through all that data, I think is really important that you have that decision tree done and/or completed or have a process for - I come from Native tribes.

Some of the emergent diseases as far as tribal land could be the dog and cat problem. And the issues with public health on the children with parasitic worms and all of these other issues. We have a comeback of tapeworm because we don't have the economics to deworm our animals properly.

So that could be emerging in various populations. So I just think that what data set you have and kind of the environment as well as the location and your

demographics and regions is going to be really critical on how you're going to prove that some of these diseases are emerging. Thanks.

(Liz): Thanks Glenda. So (Dana) and (Leanne), do you want to go to the next question and we'll see if we can be a little more helpful and concise - not helpful but concise.

(Dana): Okay. Thank you. It's - this has been great discussion. On the next question, I'm going to sort of present them together because I think, you know, given how the discussion on the first question expanded, I think we can probably think about these things.

And it helps us to think about this question and about the criteria together with the next question. So I'll just go over both of them together. So the first one is up here on the screen.

In addition to the 13 criteria that we outlined for consideration about informing how we would respond to emerging disease, are there criteria that you want that you were expecting to see there that you didn't?

So we're interested in additional criteria that we need to consider as we develop our decision trees or scenarios for response. And then in that same context, are there criteria or combinations of criteria we need to really focus on when - in order to determine our response activities around control or eradication?

So as we mentioned, there's a variety of response activities. It could be simply just, you know, communicating information or, you know, assessing our diagnostic capacity.

But then our response activities can go so far as control and eradication programs. So as we think about the criteria that we've outlined for a response, are there additional criteria we need to consider? And I'll go back to that slide where we outlined those. Here it is.

And as we consider the context of response, should we focus on not only additional criteria that you may be able to provide us here, but also how to, you know, what we should emphasize or really focus on when our response activities - when we're trying to determine if our response activities need to include, you know, eradication or movement control as part of that.

(Bill): Have you all talked much about the whole risk management approach to this? Risk assessment, risk management, risk communication because I think that's really what you're getting at here.

Okay? I understand that when a lot of things happen in our country, we need to be responsible about how we talk about that particular occurrence. For example, what trade implications may be there?

But that's managing your communications around an incidence - an incident. Is that answering your question in part at least? I mean it's partly a question on my part.

(Dana): So - I mean, (Bill) this is (Dana) again. So in context of your particular example of a trade impact for example. You know, you're certainly correct. There is that risk management, you know, as far as (Leanne) has said - indicated earlier.

You know, there is a risk that certain response activities will trigger, you know, unintended consequences and that's something that we need to be aware of.

But in the context of this question, you know, my thinking is that one of the criteria for determining a response - so let's say we've triggered - we've decided something is emerging.

Well as far as how we respond to that something that we feel like may have very real trade impacts, you know, we may - well - you know, depending on those trade impacts - so you may just decide, for example, that well this disease doesn't have a lot of trade impacts.

It's a local disease or we can't anticipate any. So maybe our response could be very conservative or we're saying we don't really need to go so far as the stop animal movement, for example, because there is no real risk of a trade impact if this sort of runs its course as we see it's likely to do.

I mean that's just a hypothetical. So we're really looking at how we should - the criteria we should consider as far as determining to what extent or how we scale up or scale back, you know, our ideas about what's needed for responding to an emerging disease.

Woman: So we've got a (unintelligible).

Belinda Thompson: Belinda Thompson. Under the animal health impact, I think people has always relied on the USDA to help determine, for example, cross-species sensibilities to give them (agents) as they emerge.

And there really is nobody else doing that. You know, every once and a while, there'll be science grants from other agencies that may (hire) people to, you know, (have some) pathogen and the different species.

But even with things like influenza species, you know, the USDA has always, you know, catered (unintelligible) on that. You know, we have - as things emerge, you know - for example if (unintelligible) emerge in the United States, we'd need to know what our alpacas and llamas get that.

And, you know, we have other diseases that, you know, we expect that funds - (unintelligible) under animal health impact is important to designate, you know, things like chronic species and sensibility.

(Liz): If this changes essence - okay I'm struggling a little bit with understanding the criteria in terms of how much of this is about criteria for determining we're going to ramp up the response or criteria that's - are concerted in what type of response is it.

And it - so I'm struggling with it and I suspect it may be both. But having said that, it's a fact that you're following - it's going to be a new criteria. But it's something that I'd like to throw out there specifically under probably both production impact and animal health impact is the concern in our community very often is the issues for rare or heritage breeds or unusual genetics.

And - yes and just having that mind with different types of response activities are considered - is what does it mean for the diversity of the genetics in different species in this country?

(Dana): The silence on my part is just me taking notes.

(Liz): And we're looking around the table going why isn't she talking.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Because I think of all - you got the - (unintelligible) categories. But, you know, I could look and say well is the ability to move animals to different - you know, in a tree site production system.

Well that's kind of under production impact. But think these categories are so broad that they cover, you know, a lot.

(Judith): You know, economics falls under production impact and that...

(Charles): I would just like to say VS -- Veterinary Services -- is not a regulatory body. But these questions are every day kind of questions with regulatory agencies. They're not (facing fact) again to FDA where you've got to make a rule that has to be supported.

It may negatively impact certain people. It may cost money. And so going through that process of justifying any action is really what we're talking about. I think one question I have for USDA VS is are you really sort of migrating more towards a regulatory posture without calling it that?

Because in a practical sense that's what we're talking about.

(Liz): And for your information, VS is a regulatory agency.

(Charles): It is regulatory?

(Liz): We just have some things that are voluntary.

(Charles): Oh so you are regulatory?

(Liz): Yes. (Unintelligible) programs and regulatory programs.

(Leanne): So this is (Leanne) and I guess I'd like to dispel the thought that the reason we're moving forward with this is specific to develop further regulations related to disease control in the United States.

Why I certainly can't preclude that happening in certain situations, that's not the intent of this discussion. In fact, if we did a really good job on both one and two, we might not even have to even consider taking regulatory action.

So it's not the intent here. And we have a number of non-regulatory programs, initiatives and they're actually - given the issues related to getting rule-making through that we're looking - that we have done in the past.

But just - I don't want folks thinking that this is - that our goal here is to develop a framework for a regulatory process or a regulation. That's not the intent.

(Liz): All right. We kind of have not a whole lot of people with hands raised here. I know we're bumping against our lunch break, but did you have a fourth or fifth question that we should at least put on the table and get any questions out before we break? Okay.

(Dana): Sure. This is our last question if we have some time for this one. So we talked about sort of the nuances, if you will, of declaring - of determining a disease as emerging and we touched on this.

You know, the difference between an endemic disease that is going through a sort of uptick - a cyclic uptick in its transmission versus a truly emerging (unintelligible) disease. So we have the same - a similar question in reverse, if you will.

Once we've declared - let's say we've reached a trigger and a disease is emerging, are there - what - how would we - what evidence should we consider or what triggers should we consider to scale it?

To go back and say, "Well now it's an endemic disease." Or we have evidence to suggest that this is emerged to the point that now it's endemic and our response is going to be tailored toward, you know, that - an endemic disease versus a newly emergent disease.

(Liz): Okay. So let's do this. Let's limit our discussion here to questions that we need ask (Leanne) and (Dana). And then we'll come back to the discussion later just because I know with our public calendar and time, we need to be cognizant of that.

So any questions for this question for (Leanne) and (Dana)? So what's your proposed answer to this so we're not re-suggesting what you've already decided might be the - an appropriate response to the question?

(Leanne): Well this is (Leanne) and I would hate to bias the group by my response.

Man: Exactly.

(Leanne): But I mean, you know, we really want your input. And there is no wrong or right here.

Man: All right.

(Leanne): But it is something that we have discussed internally because we do seem to make that distinction between endemic and emerging. And, you know, if it helps, perhaps, put it in another context is if you have decided to take action on an emerging disease, when you do stop taking that action? Is there an endpoint?

(Don River): Yes, hi (Leanne). This is (Don River). I've - I guess to your point, you know, obviously there's going to be some subjectivity in this. It's not going to be a one-size-fits-all.

And you have some ideas about criteria, you know, state-to-state spread, a certain level of prevalence and a commodity group or whatever. But I do like (Dana)'s suggestions that you create kind of a - either a tier or maybe you just have a watch list and things are going to go on that list and hopefully just fall off the list.

But some of them may elevate to become a real emerging problem. Right? So I kind of like that kind of entry-level watch list idea that you kind of presented or a tier approach.

But maybe I think it'd be easier just do a watch list and then if it elevates, it gets on the real list. And - but hopefully most of them will fall off the watch list.

And I do think a disease becomes an endemic at some point and it's no longer emerging. And I think PEDV would be a good example of that. So yes, there's got to be a way to get it off the list.

But kind of once you get it on the list. And that's a subjectivity - it's going to be a subjective, you know, point also.

(Dan): But (Liz) as an example, can you share where PED is right now? I see...

(Liz): Sure. As of 6:30 this morning, (we were off) on the call. We as an industry, you know, with as - hesitation or delay in - as they call it PED emerging or at least starting a federal reporting program for it.

The - so first emergence risk case is April of 2013. It did not become a reportable disease and the federal order was not issued until June of 2014. So we had it a full year before we issued the federal order.

We've done a tremendous amount of research and diagnostic testing. So biosecurity came in. They came out of the CTC funding that came with the federal order. And so now, we're winding down to having spent all our money.

And from an industry point of view, we are at that discussion where we think we're learning how to control as we've learned a lot from the diagnostics. Do you live with it or do you ask for help in creating an eradication program?

And, you know, I think that it may be an easier disease to eradicate because of it being a (interior) disease rather than respiratory and some of those other issues.

And so I think as an industry, we're working closely with USDA, but having really worked hard as industry to say do we have the backbone and the stomach to want to have an eradication program? Make it a true program disease?

And so you've got your choice of going from emerging diseases, federal orders. Now do we make it endemic and live with it? Or do we make it endemic and make it a program disease and try to eradicate it which would put it right back into - if we get it eradicated would put the next occurrence of it into a (FADDR) emerging disease again.

So you - once you eradicate something, I think you start the cycle over again if you were to have another identification of it.

(Dan): But I think the point here is that there's active discussion with the industry in trying to come to the conclusion...

(Liz): Yes.

(Dan): ...whether it becomes...

(Liz): Right.

(Dan): ...endemic or we keep trying to...

(Liz): You know, (Dan), I would say we had that discussion before the federal program or order was ever announced. We were like it's already endemic, why should we announce it.

You know, so we've struggled with whether it was still emerging before we ever had the federal order. And I don't know, (Leanne), you know, you've been walking hand-in-hand with this on this. I guess, you know, did that fairly characterize it?

(Leanne): Yes, (Liz). That's a good job.

(Liz): But while, I know we're running into lunch hour. If there's not any last burning questions for (Leanne) and (Dana), I can promise you that we will have significance and robust discussion on this and work hard to put together reports and probably look at, you know, this may be one of the (unintelligible) of what we need to do at our future meetings as well. You know?

Man: Yes.

(Liz): Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

(Leanne): Thanks everybody. Appreciate the time.

(Dana): Yes, thank you.

(Liz): Excellent. Okay. Great. (Julia)? (Julia)?

(Julie): Yes? I'm standing by.

(Liz): I'm sorry, (Julie). I called you (Julia).

(Julie): That's okay.

(Liz): We're going to break for an hour and some. We'll probably be back at around 1:30.

(Julie): Okay. Sounds good. I'll go ahead and put you back into the pre-conference.

(Liz): Thank you.

Man: Thanks.

(Julie): You're welcome.

(Liz): We're on (unintelligible) farm and then the other strategies for increasing fiduciary vet reporting of the clinical animals. And so, we can definitely in our report expand enforcement on these recommendations.

So if we're totally missing a concept, you know, let's make sure it gets added here. And I'm not going to read my writing to you or typing to you. Can everybody read that?

Do you need me to make it larger or is everybody okay with that? So the concept of educating the students...

Man: Yes (Liz).

(Liz): And so it's in the options once an animal has tested positive. Where it...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): And then there's the data - you know, (prove right) in depopulation genetic testing - just, you know, you keep pets live under quarantine. All of those options.

(George): It cuts down under your reporting rather than...

(Liz): Well (George), it is official?

(George): Well I don't - I haven't gotten that far yet. But that's where it would go.

Man: Kind of looking out at that.

(George): Increased (risk) reporting.

(Liz): I have the (digital printout). And I - yes. Note that I'm going to have places where (unintelligible). We can clean that up later.

Woman: Fix that.

Man: Under the net value and testing, add copper to that. I think that'd be important for the people.

(Liz): Okay.

Man: Selenium and/or copper testing.

Man: He just was (unintelligible).

(Liz): So down there. Do we have the cooperation with non-USDA water or meat process and facilities somewhere up there?

Woman: Yes. So.

Man: Right there.

((Crosstalk))

(Charles): Got them all. Customer processors.

Woman: Yes, there.

Man: I see salamanders across the state. They are - is the state in cooperation with state facilities?

(Liz): (Nearly) complete? Okay, great. Let's move on next to - and I don't know where this fits. The (unintelligible) modernization of distribution of pigs. But that might be a concept we want to big even under comprehensive surveillance or whatever.

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): (Kim) actually does the best with that. So keeping it under scraping may not be the best place.

(Judith): Right. You know, I didn't - you know, that sort of had gone away from the scraping discussion and...

(Liz) Right.

(Judith): ...so I didn't want to get into like do we agree, do we disagree. And the electronic aspects are a big deal. So I say, I mean I'm not fit to make that

recommendation. You know, if we want to say that topic came up for discussion...

(Liz): Right.

(Judith): ...but not for recommendations. I'm just comprehensive surveillance. There was questions about how to engage stakeholders and veterinarians and (warp) such comprehensive data and - I realize that was too much...

(Judith): And I sit there. I don't know.

(Liz): Okay. So let's at least keep it as a discussion point.

Woman: Yes, I heard a lot of parking lot discussion. There are like, you know, are they - I'd hate think a non-starter in my industry just because, you know, you can spend \$100 a year buying RFIDK for pigs for every sow if you have the retention as how (it'll fold up).

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): So this is the background on emerging diseases and then we have three questions. And the first one was how do you - should there be a trigger or threshold considering whether a disease is emerging.

You know, what I'm wondering is (Annette)'s still on the phone and that you're not able to see any of this. Doesn't sound like she's still on.

Man: Or she's on mute.

(Liz): Could I say I could...

Man: She could be on mute though. I don't know.

(Liz): Yes, otherwise I could be able to...

Woman: She's not on. She (unintelligible). Send her an e-mail.

(Liz): And we have a lot of - some of this is more discussion and recommendation. So I think, you know, these are the discussion points. And we didn't really come up with recommendations that were clear.

So let's - you know, if I can make sure that we've got the discussion points captured, we can develop recommendations without having - next time we do a public meeting.

Woman: I think we will have to do a public meeting but it'll be a shorter one on the phone.

(Liz): Right.

Woman: Under the health point on trigger needed, the question I have is the impact to call something of (importancy). We're talking about emerging diseases. We're not specifically talking about reporting.

Man: Yes.

Man: I'm not sure I see any reference to the one health approach.

(Liz): It's right there.

Man: Oh.

(Liz): You know, in the spirit of One Health is the same definition.

Man: Is the - yes. But you got to, you know, (fancy of itself).

Woman: Is there anything in there about the working group's authority?

(Liz): No.

Woman: Okay. So there could be something?

(Liz): One of things that we have thought actually at lunch with (Maryanne) is that the fly industry has put together an emerging disease plan that we have worked with USDA on. And one of our concepts is to have we what call a (fly) disease response board.

It would be a working group with veterinarians and producers, diagnostic labs, you know, a variety. We're trying to make it like an 11 person voting board.

We'll then have USDA, we'll have hosts on there, we've had D-labs, you know, people - experts have needed in that group would then - we've got kind of a menu of options from do nothing to stamp it out.

You know, and a lot of things in between. And that menu also includes who should be responsible for leading that option and where it should - or could money come from.

And so, one of our concepts is that, you know, for the swine industry is that potential working group that would have no authority. You know, it would have absolutely no authority.

But hopefully it's as sound as USDA are at the table going through the decision-making with that working group. The recommendations would hopefully be picked up and people do have the authority to follow those recommendations.

And so, you know, that's a - I don't know where it goes. You know, how it fits, you know, with anybody else's model. But that's something that, you know, from the swine industry we could recommendation, you know, for our industry.

(Charles): So (Liz), and I think you're the only one here who has the first-hand experience of this whole thing happening. Right? It's some (half-ass) do. It's just figured out. Need a test. You know, list.

You know, so and I think you implied that it was late to the party a year later. So at what point should - if you could make it happen again, how would that go?

(Liz): Yes, good question. I'm not so sure that it's a - the fears we have over making it reportable were overstated. So I think looking back now we could say making it reportable is not the end of the world.

You know, it didn't impact trade like we thought. And how it (unintelligible) it could potentially impact trade. You know, that was our biggest concern. The trade impact.

Did making it reportable really get what information that we weren't already gathering and help us stop, spread or help us control the pathogens clearly.

You know, we didn't have those net restrictions at the time. By the time we found it, it was already in multiple states. We as an industry have spent millions of dollars on research.

It's the CCC funding that's provided a lot of money to ARS was - you know, has been valuable actually with other emerging diseases. They've - the post-docs they hired under the PED money have worked on senecavirus for instance.

Man: Have worked.

(Liz): The other thing that was important is the paying for diagnostic testing allowed people to evaluate their control protocols because they're able to serial tests and say if I'm doing this, I'm going to send in stools from this barn every two weeks to see how quickly I go negative, you know, and if I do this, how quickly will I go negative.

So the diagnostic testing payment was very valuable. I think we've got to split that industry. I don't think we would ever recommend it again. That we've spent way - a lot, a lot of money on what they're calling biosecurity payments to farms to help control biosecurity.

And, you know, farms collecting money for washing tractor-trucks and disinfecting that they would be doing anyway. And so, it would be ongoing expense whether we have PED or not. And so a significant - you know, millions of dollars were spent on that.

(Charles): So money was available for that?

(Liz): Yes.

(Charles): Really?

(Liz): Yes.

(Charles): I had no idea.

(Liz): I know. Yes. And now, well all of sudden people were made more aware of it, but the federal order was changed to no longer paying biosecurity payments.

So we're getting some, you know, hundreds of thousands of dollar bills from companies...

(Charles): Really?

(Liz): ...to pay for biosecurity. It was money they were going to spend anyway. And so, you know, the concern over that would be how do you charge your costs to what will probably help you understand and control the disease?

But that's what I - that's part of what I was looking through the concept. And I mean - just - we threw together this PED strategy group of people who were interested, people who have the first cases, people over at the D-labs, (unintelligible) dealing with it.

I was (Judith) this morning we have a 6:30 am every Friday morning conference call for probably 15 months. Now we're down to where it's just

every two weeks or every once a month. But, you know, the USDA as a (silos) has listened to that group.

They've been part of that group. You know, the federal order was modified on the advice of that group. So even though there was a lot of, you know, conflict about how we handled this, there's been a lot of cooperation as well.

And so it's been an interesting experience. And to me that working group, it's real easy for us as an industry organization to come in and say, you know, USDA - we want to do this. And they say, "Well do you have" - I mean what about all the other people in the industry.

And you're not a real stakeholder. And then when you get more of these other (unintelligible) at work, there's multiple types of producers. You've got whether it's (unintelligible) people or, you know, it's extensive versus intensive.

And you've got consulting veterinarians who work across many, many states, it gives that (unintelligible) a credibility that they actually do have their pulses on what's going on in the countryside and it's not just somebody sitting in a, you know, organization office somewhere or thinking they know what's going on.

So I think that - that that working group concept was something we decided for our industry is going to be a way to go forward on the next emerging disease.

And when senecavirus came out around last year, we kind of marked our PED into a Seneca group and added a few people. Changed a few state vets around and, you know, came to I think a much more reasonable conclusion.

Or not reasonable. Much more timely conclusion in the (unintelligible). Oh and that was excellent. So (Annette), would you like me to - can I e-mail (Annette) this (unintelligible)?

Woman: I don't see why not. I mean we wanted to get everything done at the same time, but the recommendations from the (S&D) if you want can be expedited.

(Liz): Yes. Okay. So anyway, I guess the question is do you want me to put the working group concept on here?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I mean you want something that's already formed so it's received very timely. And you can't call it the - you can't try to call it together after something's already hit. You have to have kind of something in place.

Man: Oversight. You could look at like the - think of something complete. Like the cattle side of - national cattle data. (Unintelligible) veterinarians, producers (unintelligible)...

(Liz): Right.

Man: ...again that's a starting point. But those potential (unintelligible)...

(Liz): Right. But do you have one for each species or do you have one...

Man: Well I mean...

(Liz): ...for (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I mean I think what you could do is create...

Man: ...one of those mining groups. It's part of the working group.

(Liz): Right. Right.

(Judith): I mean what you could do is create basically the framework for the working group...

Man: Right.

(Judith): ...and then like here's who would be in all (change). Here, you know, we plan to meet - here's the trigger for calling a meeting.

(Liz): Right. We don't have to be meeting ahead.

(Charles): We would have subject experts pretty well identified and ready to go.

Woman: Yes and we plan to meet a contact here and maybe even with our group. Maybe even exercise, you know, here's a - no one outside the U.S. (trap). So like this pseudorabies from China they mentioned.

So the goal would be let's exercise and say if we had a first, you know, I guess (indication) of this Chinese pseudorabies, what would be the recommendations?

What do we need to know? You know, what tests do we have? What vaccines do we have? So that's...

Man: Well I think that's helpful because we really are almost maudlin on what the swine industry is starting to work out.

(Liz): That's all...

Man: They just make it - instead of just focused on swine, focused on, you know, all of nine groups and - yes.

(Liz): Well done. Yes.

Man: I was just going to say, yes, beyond the commodity groups here, I mean this bothers stakeholders. I mean they...

(Liz): So (Annette)'s saying she's having a hard time hearing some people.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): You may want to speak louder and then, you know, just you guys...

Man: And like (unintelligible).

(Annette): Yes and I know it's kind of my bad for not being there. So.

(Liz): Right. We can't hear you. Thanks (Judith).

(Judith): Sure.

- (Liz): And once you're done typing that, I have one more which would be...
- (Annette): Sure.
- (Liz): ...and I'm not sure where it would fit in there, but when they were talking about the surveillance, we've got IADD that then some of these, you know, past the surveillance.
- Do you want to try to merge those with the plan? Will APHIS work with IADD? Is that something that they're amenable to?
- Woman: And is that under competence of surveillance or emerging response or both?
- (Liz): It'd be more surveillance.
- Woman: Yes, I wonder if we...
- (Liz): That's why I'm not sure where...
- Man: Didn't we have the past surveillance programs that...
- (Liz): Yes.
- Woman: Yes.
- Man: We did have that comment yesterday that they're actually working with this. We - so we'll be working closely together.
- (Liz): I'm going to stick it in here and we can always move it under comprehensive surveillance but - and I never remembered - IAD or...

Man: Isn't it the infectious animal disease...

(Liz): Yes.

Man: ...or IADD?

(Liz): For those who don't know that, it is. It's the DHS center Texas A&M. I don't know why Skype thinks I've got a new message being that I don't know anybody (unintelligible).

(Judith): Maybe (Annette)'s trying to Skype.

(Liz): Yes. (Mike)?

(Mike): So I take we're proposing, you know, kind of a half-baked surveillance program? So.

(Liz): Yes. It's the advanced (unintelligible) that they call it, right?

Woman: Right.

(Mike): Yes.

(Liz): Okay. Oh (Annette)?

(Annette): Yes? Yes?

(Liz): We're hearing things. I don't know if that's coming from - are you muted? I mean you're not muted now but...

(Annette): Yes, I'm not now. No that was me.

(Liz): If you're rustling things, we're hearing it.

(Annette): That's my microphone on my jacket.

(Liz): Oh no.

Woman: Oh wow.

(Annette): I'll - I'm going to go back to mute and I'll just listen and speak up if there's something that you're - that I thought up different than what you're already saying.

(Liz): Thank you. Okay. And (Annette), did - were you able to get the e-mail -- now that you're muted -- on PED? The e-mail that I sent with this list?

(Annette): Hi. Yes, the - yes.

(Liz): So anyways, again if there's anything this list - the thresholds and then we didn't get very far on criteria to be considered other than those 13. And, you know, should - the chief criteria should focus - specifically focus on determining response activities.

And we have that concept that's usually in the children's assessment risk management, risk communication approach. And then the rare heritage breeds and genetics - the perceived genetics.

And the other one is where (Leanne) - I think somebody probably had talked about what they intended on response and probably - but this is more up in the discussion where she said, you know, this approach wouldn't necessarily preclude new regulations, but that wasn't the intent of the framework.

And that's not one of our recommendations. I need to move that up to the discussion.

Man: Right back there?

(Liz): Yes, good. Does anybody else have anything we - like I said that I'm missing?

(Steve): So (Liz), I'm just thinking about those 13 criteria and there's a lot of criteria. I mean from my perspective there are some that rise above the others as far as importance. And I don't know what the rest of the committee thinks, but the four that I - and I didn't put them in any specific order.

It's trade, it's food security, it's public health and animal health. And again, not in a specific order. The other things are important but if it's a decision or if somebody had to focus on, you know, a 1/3 of those things, those would probably be the four I'd think about.

Did anyone have the same thought? I don't know what other people are thinking but I...

Man: The first four?

(Steve): The first four. Public health on top. Actually, I rank that number one and then, you know, and then - I mean I think you can look at the...

Woman: You know, I have contagious and it's in there.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Because some things are really transmissible and some things are not. Even though they're not - you know, it - they may be the sector (requirement) or something that limits.

Man: And I think you said that earlier in one of your responses.

Woman: Yes.

(Judith): Contagious within animal health or within all of us?

Woman: It's in the considerations for what actions to take.

Man: It's sort of an epidemiological characteristic or...

Woman: Yes. Yes.

Man: ...or been a mortality (unintelligible).

Woman: Right. Right.

Man: What happened to the criteria?

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): So are you trying to add it in the criteria...

Woman: No.

(Liz): ...or are trying to add it to the response?

Woman: And I think the price - it has to be considered in the prioritization level of criteria.

Woman: Okay.

(Liz): That's all.

Woman: Just prioritizing the list of 13, right?

Man: Yes, and so I mean, you know, what is it right at the top that I'm starting to think about whether it becomes the emerging infectious disease. Like, you know, politics in on the list from lack year - I know that's it going to matter. I know it matters but I would hope that they're to avoid that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: With animal health, I would probably put, you know...

(Liz): Well that's a factor in public health. I'm not involved, right? Right.

Man: But it's the - yes.

(Liz): And these were the right four that you had listed, right?

(Steve): Yes.

(Liz): And do we want to - well and we can get into details. I just want to get these - you know, we can decide if we're going to agree that we want to, you know, prioritize or not. But at least we need that concept on paper.

Woman: I guess contagiousness fits under your risk assessment, risk management as well. I'm mean they can't fall apart.

(Liz): So is our brains ready to wrap around going back to foot and mouth disease? I'm going to push way up here and (Annette), I'm going to see if I've got foot and mouth disease in the one I sent you or not. I mean...

(Annette): Yes, I have it.

Man: (Unintelligible) easiest...

(Liz): Okay. Perfect. Okay, we wrote a book on foot and mouth disease. And oh wait before I get that, (John), I've got - I'm up at CWD.

(John): Oh.

(Liz): Say again, what was the concept you wanted to...

(John): Well I think we should encourage BETH services to complete visits, internal evaluation that they are investing and also to say, again, the consideration of epidemiological information from positive herds to (unintelligible) necessary revised or refined, a disease control program.

Man: (John), is that something that's ongoing or they just haven't done it or its stalled or what's the...

(John): It's the investment. The internal evaluation is new and is ongoing. The - that'd be the investigation assembling all of that. 2014 USA (j) resolution...

Man: Okay.

(John): That they were going to work on until I've passed AI. I've stopped all the courses.

Woman: So improvised or what's the attribute - you had to....

Man: Refine.

Woman: Okay. Okay.

Man: Another thing in that introductory statement up there is that the - depending on which state you're in, the agricultural agency - animal (ag) agency or the state wildlife management agency has regulatory authority over the farm service.

And they should definitely be consulted in this valuation process as of...

Woman: They pulled her...

Man: Again, they pulled her. But the AVMA policy I think states that they support kind minimal federal support regulations that, you will, will provide a foundation for the states (unintelligible).

(Charles): Right. So the vendor providing minimal requirements and space agreed to develop our strengths the right way.

- (Liz): So I've talked about giving this program evaluation, but they should also in the potential revision evaluation and/or revision?
- (Man): Well the revision - I don't know what whether the product of the evaluation is supposed to be. I would assume it would be revision or revisionment of program. Why evaluate it if you're not going to do anything? Would have stood a minute with the revision or a revisionment of programs. Why evaluate it if you're not going to do anything about it.
- (Liz): I think - on there.
- (Man): You're almost out of report.
- (Liz): Captured? Okay?
- Woman: First thing that I want to do is called unnecessary (unintelligible). We encourage you to complete internal evaluations - it's for your program evaluation here.
- (Charles): Yes, the one that Alicia laid out to us.
- (Liz): Tell me which programs so they know which one...
- Man: Okay, program.
- (Liz): So we've written a book on foot and mouth disease. And we tried to think to (Judith) and her edits in her brief writing skills. For the, you know, divided out by topics, they're not - I guess I would ask that we consider what is recommendations, what is question points versus, you know, hard and fast recommendations. Emma

You know, I know if I recall in previous committees we've had a notebook written and then come up with background information, discussion topics and then come up three or four really strong recommendations.

And so what we've got here is everything we've talked about, pretty much tried to divide it up into areas. So we've got vaccine capacity. We've got any issues that could mitigate the impact of an outbreak and I think we've got prevention.

And so we've got - and then the other thing is we had talked about reiterating what the committee had - the previous committee's recommendations that we read the response to. But we also had a lead date earlier.

In that response, we said that they should consider all the responses from the committee before. And we don't have that report that, you know, I think that, you know, (unintelligible), you know, can you distribute to the group.

But one of the things I'd like to do before we make that a hard and fast recommendation, let's distribute the reports of growth and say make sure that you're comfortable with those recommendations.

Man: But I think it is one state that we applaud the work of the previous - any work at ease depending on what number has been (applied).

(Liz): Right.

Man: Because, you know, basically say, "Hey we've been a partner on this for a number of years"...

(Liz): Yes.

Man: And, you know, we're two to three years later and I think that supply is lasting. We're still - and I'm talking about is.

(Liz): And then (unintelligible) rather than making that a recommendation. We would - because it's starting to get fun because our 2014 recommendations are broken.

Maybe what do is we do in the background intro and say something more like, you know, committee wants to, you know, support the work that's been put in already.

And, you know, these are what we now see at this moment in time as our top priority recommendations.

Woman: But there's concern about the last movement on previous button.

(Liz): Absolutely.

Man: But just one question for the committee that I would ask. We have a lot of stuff there on (S&D). You know, listening to the committee talk, I mean - and talking out in the halls and everything. The vaccine thing keeps rising to the top.

(Liz): Yes.

Man: It continues to rise to the top. One of the worries that I have is if we come up with all these recommendations that are outside of vaccination, we'll just get watered down. I mean I'm just thinking.

Should really a major focus be on driving home the recommendation that we need this vaccine thing fixed. Because if we don't get that fixed, all the other stuff maybe moot. That's just - I'm just asking.

(Liz): Well the first will in the past is when you had like this just explained - a recommendation that's flushed out.

You're thinking (bonus points) rather than what has been referred to as the laundry list. It doesn't really have any needs and anywhere to go, you know? But these are good. I mean innovation-specific and, you know, action-oriented.

(Charles): So but his point, you know, if we just could find a way to pay for vaccine that the - and the timely manner. I mean like that's it, right? It's what they need from us.

Man: Guys, there's credibility all the work we're doing on a secure food supply means nothing if there's no vaccine because then it's such a cluster. What's going to happen is going to happen, right?

(Liz): Could we find someone maybe though - I mean what I - I am with you guys that they've got to fix this vaccine thing. This is like third shift obligations I've worked on. (Unintelligible).

And I'll be back by this evening. And that's part of what worries...I'm a little worked about not making out a recommendation because we know it's not going to get fixed.

Even if they - even if (UCH) says fine because we really buy in. This is our top priority. We are what four years out? You know, so maybe what we could do would be something that said like emphasize - like the outgoing top priority we think is package deals. Basically I think that blah, blah, blah.

Recognizing that which you haven't done it yet, we're years away from a solution even if you start now. Here's things we think you should be doing to help producers prepare if there's something in between. Blah, blah, blah.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And I think that was explained in the chapters right there with one and two.

(Liz): Right. You know, and maybe they can or spell out a bit more and just sort of be like we really need that vaccine started up for a while.

Man: You know, meanwhile back at the ranch, (we all) worked on to help secure food supplies and kind of coordinate her agencies. I'm telling her that's very, very important but (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: But be sure to (unintelligible) it's whole thing is, you know, having vaccine available when you need it.

Man: Because when you look at their plant on the face of (Venice), it clearly depends on vaccination.

Man: Yes.

Man: If you don't have a vaccine, you can't bring that plain to fruition. No matter what. I don't care how big or how small the outbreak. But in the meantime, Granny's back on the ranch and she's got to do something.

(Liz): So there's animals. They had some very specific questions about which is (cloud) and which is non-stop (rule bent) on day one or, you know, when you're in space on that first 96 hours.

And the other thing I would like to point out is without premise IDs and a good (annual) ID that 96 hour - just the things that have to done might not be doable.

((Crosstalk))

(Annette): Yes, (Liz)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Annette): This is (Annette). So I like the - I think the emphasis on vaccination and then if you just lumped that body of other recommendations into USDA response plans, should focus on maximizing the use of valuable proteins including milk and meat and working trading partners to accept those products in the case of a disease.

That's kind of the key. Trading partners and processors. You know, and then that would get - then you can have the details of the risk assessments and not...

(Liz): Help me understand where you're thinking about and that's...

(Annette): Yes, we...

(Liz): So we've got the vaccine number one and then do we have a next category that says background for the next category. It says USDA needs to maximize...

(Annette): Something like response plans to embrace the concept of maximizing the use of - or, you know, it's kind of like the genetics and the protein which is basically what we tend to just kind of wrap into secure food supply. But that's jargoning.

I mean that's the concept. It's shift from staff just pure stamping out to now we want to have our response plans to balance the - I'm not coming up with the right word, but the preservation of genetics. (Staple) genetics and protein sources.

There's a bunch of things you can do to do that. Just a thought.

Man: Well (Cynthia), I'm so (slippers). We're kind of supported off as, again, this whole concept of vaccine. We will vaccinate the Web. You know, and I know that's - what is it?

(Annette): Yes?

Man: I had created about a fake elephant. But I think in reality maybe that's (unintelligible), you know, you were the Type II in that response.

(Annette): Yes. And with that comment, it's probably true that every recommendation from this committee that I'm reading here is aimed at shifting to preservation of or sustainability of farming including preserving genetics, replacements and protein. And that includes a vaccine. Vaccine to live.

Man: Okay.

(Annette): Or maybe that's too broad. Maybe I'm jumping in too late. Maybe it's better to have those specifics that you guys already have.

(Liz): So I'm wondering if you look at that, that becomes kind of a segue into talking about some of these specifics because a lot of this is, you know, easily grouped under what can we do to preserve the animal and protein resources.

(Judith): And that might even just be the way we frame bullet two. I mean I think that's sort of the first (unintelligible) and that's part of consensus for some, right?

(Liz): Right.

Man: Well so one potential is to work with the national animal germ flies lab because they do store semen and they're working on storing embryos of rare breeds or breeds that are very small and disappearing.

Now there's an opportunity there to put some of that away. But it's available to the future. It wouldn't be an immediate recovery for that, but if (AVAGI) was still around.

(Liz): That's something inherent to heritage breed.

Woman: We do - and I wouldn't mind having that as the sub-point, this protecting heritage breeds. But a lot of this - know all the breeding that's going on is specific to different regions and different areas.

Man: And they do that. They collect sub-populations of - this - so for example there's an enormous argument right now on - among them about Spanish goats and whether the Florida goat is really this kind or that kind.

And, you know, there's just two sub-populations. And they've gone all the way down to the genetic levels. Yes indeed they are separate sub-populations. And we need your (plasma) for both.

(Dave): Well I'm kind of wondering in reality whether the first risk case was now the - to - sort of - we have the first (alibi). How much pressure there'll be from industry? That - let's say the first outbreak is in California.

They'll be first. Wisconsin and New York, they'll want to start vaccinating.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Great point, (Dave).

Woman: Oh yes and I think...

(Dave): (Unintelligible).

(Liz): The other industries would start vaccinating right now.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We got - we have some industries - (unintelligible) you could start getting some kind of support aid. And you got prioritizing this.

Man: Yes.

Woman: You can't just give it then to somebody who asks.

Man: I'm sorry.

Man: Yes, no it's sort of - on Google (unintelligible).

(Liz): Well there has been (community) recommendations. That's one of their sources.

(Judith): But I think the problem is trying to come up with priorities. And I think one of our biggest community recommendations was you need a task force just on that that's ready to be activated because is it in an area, you know, is it a situation where we think that re-vaccination would (unintelligible) in itself.

Obviously that's where you prioritize. But we don't know if it's an area where re-vaccination will (unintelligible). We have no idea what we're dealing.

Woman: There's contention on size and location of the outbreak and then...

(Judith): Yes.

Woman: But the judgment of the instant command and let's face it who's going to be the instant command?

(Judith): And what we would - and what would a (recommender) give as (unintelligible) for 2015 or 2014 was put together a task force that's ready to be activated when and - you know, if and when this happens.

And who needs to be on that task force to help make that call. But I don't know.

(Liz): Right. And the instant command should make the best use of the resources to prevent the more...

Man: The very spread...

(Liz): ...the worst case scenario.

(Judith): Yes.

(Liz): I mean they should be trying to come up with worst-case outcome for nation and for all the animal production groups involved. And that's going to be very varied depending on what happens.

Woman: Yes.

(Liz): And so the priority has to be based - situational...

Woman: Yes.

(Liz): ...and it has to be to try to prevent the outbreak from...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Liz): ...from standing in type and base or whatever.

Man: So it's point of source that this is somebody's (unintelligible) to this.

(Liz): Yes.

Man: Yes. You know, we could easily say okay we're going to (vastly) (breed stock) high value animals that are not going to go to (unintelligible) in a short period of time. But, you know, that's pretty general. That's not going to help (unintelligible).

(Liz): So I can hope that the breeding stock people are more advanced than the biosecurity farm except for (unintelligible). But, you know, that may not be the case at all. I don't believe there's a dairy farm near state that has a foot and mouth...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We told them.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes, very.

(Judith): Basically come on. I mean the (Russian) expansion also may not be an option. I'm not sure about actually creating - putting it in that specific order because again, who knows. It depends what the first breakout is. We may already be past it. It might be an expansion and be into...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): (Stock) rules that on day one it's (man). When you realize that people are on (31 to 3) within the first seven days. That wouldn't - be not (unintelligible). And so may not - both industries - you know, the milk industry, the dairy

industry doesn't want to stop the movement of milk because it's perishable in two days.

Woman: I don't think anybody would argue that to stop movement of everything for 24 hours in the event of evaluation. So it would be basically the same thing. What we have to stop on day one, I would say everything. But, you know...

Man: But the industry is trying to...

Woman: If it's in New York, milk should be able to move in California on day two.

Woman: Right.

(Daniel): But I do have comment how the U.K. experience - I mean most of the - in the U.K. most of the spread was due to animal movement.

Woman: Right.

(Daniel): It wasn't due to people moving to (unintelligible)...

Woman: Tropics.

(Daniel): ...tropical - I mean there was lots of concern about but when they did the (EPI) almost all new outbreaks were traced back to animal movement. And so in my...

Man: Excuse me, what most did most move?

(Daniel): Animals?

Man: Yes. Like - exactly.

((Crosstalk))

(Daniel): Everyone tried to move them around. They tried to get them out of...

Woman: Trying to get them out. Trying to escape control...

(Daniel): Illegal movement - I mean...

(Liz): But, you know, I think if you look at, you know, the way a lot of the production systems in the United States are set up, we have an estimate that there are million pigs a day that are on wheels and about 400,000 cattle.

So these go above and beyond what the U.K. could ever, you know, think of.

Man: What I think - (unintelligible) is hey if you're going to slaughter, let them go to slaughter.

(Liz): Right.

Man: You know, they either go back to where they came from or they go to slaughter.

(Liz): Yes. So what we did add here was that idea that the instance-in-command should prioritize actions that would - and I don't know if minimize expansion if you already are at a Type 5, you know, but maybe it's - you evaluate - I mean that's what it, you know, if you can ask what they're doing with it.

They're supposed to evaluate and type an outbreak. And if it's Type 1, you would be much more likely to control one way and prevent expansion than if it's a Type 5. You know, I mean I don't know if that captures the concept or not. I think it does.

Woman: And I would say that they should use the guidelines of the secure food supply to guide the movement of animal commodity.

Man: You know, there's a lot of good people working on this.

Woman: Yes.

Man: So.

(Judith): For those who have been working on it, I have a question does it address issues of (unintelligible) processing of the smaller scale issues than it would - and I'm - (unintelligible) defined the majority of people. You know, it's about everybody. It's about making sure that there's a main (unintelligible).

But while we're at it, has there been any discussion on those groups about what's going on with the growing number of people who are doing livestock production like direct to consumer and those markets. Is that even considered?

(Liz): Pretty much not because that's not seen as a (unintelligible).

Man: In some states.

(Judith): And in (unintelligible)?

Man: We are discussing it in New England on an individual state basis. And the example being someone raises and sells their own broilers. And I've got 500 broilers in my freezer to sell and now there's an AI outbreak.

And I've still got live birds. Can I move the processed product because it's not (unintelligible)? But we're trying to figure that out on a state-by-state. So in some places but...

(Judith): Yes. Okay.

Man: ...generally it's going to be done in those secure plans and that is on individual state basis trying to get the rest of them. So.

(Judith): Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Judith): And obviously, this isn't the place to try to deal with it but all I say is - for me rather than endorse what, you know, just specific secure milk plan. You know, secure food plans need to be - you know, because it's...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes. Okay.

Woman: Secure food supply plan.

Man: Sort of this is a jam.

((Crosstalk))

(Annette): I kind of wanted to go back to the comment. Someone mentioned the different types of outbreak because I think it's important that the message from the committee is so strong on vaccine and so strong on, you know, secure food supply concepts which we all agree with.

But what I've seen sometimes with some people that aren't just familiar with the details of those guideline documents, they think that secure food supply directly translates into you don't stop movement.

And just based on that last couple of minutes of discussion that makes me a little bit nervous because our first priority has to be don't move virus...

Man: That's right.

(Annette): ...which would usually involve a stop movement.

Man: Yes.

Woman: That's right.

Woman: Yes.

(Annette): And then the second step is safely move stuff. I just want to make sure we're not too strong on that.

Man: Right.

(Liz): Correct. No, I think you're - you know, those concepts obviously deal with typing and outbreak first. Not moving it. And then once you have - proven uninfected - like for the secure food supply.

Once you have uninfected premises within a control zone then how do you get those animals to market or how do you get them proven to be safe to move, you know, so. Obviously, an infected premise needs to be locked down likely (de-populate). Vaccinate.

I mean you're not going to be moving animals out of an infected premise and I think that is similar to any of the other plans. I think secure food supply right now is further along than beef and it's one of the few plans that is looking at trying to move animals versus move product.

You know, and that's where the difference in some of those because milk, you know, you're moving milk not dairy cows. And...

(Annette): Right. Well for AI, I mean we're looking at moving broilers and chicks...

(Liz): Right.

(Annette): ...and poulettes. And...

(Liz): Yes.

(Annette): And we have developed guidance documents to be able to mitigate - substantially mitigate the risk of moving virus. So.

(Liz): So how far along is the broiler (line)? I knew turkeys was underway. And I knew eggs was very mature. I just didn't...

Man: The broiler one is about done. We had a call Monday, you know, it's a still a bird and now we're back in the workshop with it now.

(Liz): Yes.

Man: But it's basically useable now.

(Liz): Good. Excellent.

Man: (Liz), can I ask real quick, the comment that you struck there. (ICS) should minimize expansion type as opposed to what? As opposed to - because isn't that what they're going to do anyway? I mean...

(Liz): Yes and I think it's that, you know, we have concerns about were we nitpicking at some of these other things? You know, so it's the first priority to prevent spread for...

Man: Okay.

(Liz): ...the expansion.

Man: Okay.

(Liz): But, you know...

Man: So can we get people that's doing that and...

(Liz): Yes.

Man: ...you know, to prevent spread? Because I think that's what I heard from (Annette). Is that who's still on the line?

(Annette): Correct.

Man: Yes. And I think that's what many of us think here is important is prevent the spread of disease.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): And that's - (wind out in these).

Man: Secure.

(Liz): Yes.

Man: Okay. All right. But I'd like an explicit (unintelligible).

(Liz): Yes. It's not from the spread of a new virus or - so do we need and expansion or just spread of the disease...

Man: Spread of the disease.

(Liz): ...probably utilizing the concept? Okay.

Woman: (Liz), you speak lawyer.

(Liz): I know. It was lawyer stuff, right?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: She was on the committee and was - oh sorry. We're not...

Man: That's lower case. Expand the disease, utilize. Okay.

(Liz): Sorry. You can delete that.

(Charles): And should the first step in a disease outbreak not be de-populate herds - that herd or herds in any possible manner as fast as possible until the population is no longer - not until we've gone beyond that. Should that not be...

(Liz): If you look in (unintelligible) as they've - do you have your chart with the - yes. You made your party spell that out. I think - yes, that chart there.

Man: The other one?

(Liz): No, no. You have the...

Man: Do you want that one?

(Liz): Yes. So if you look at that, then I don't know how many of you were able to...

((Crosstalk))

Man: It's been a while.

(Liz): Let me see if I can spell it out for you guys. Here it is.

Woman: So that certainly was a conclusion following the initial AI outbreak that was quicker and (does the) flocks could have been de-populated. So that better control would handle the disease.

Woman: And I think the...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: It's on information in cattle that you have with the - period of (vile) shedding shorter than what they had thought and that may be allowing for each to run the course before (every animals) might actually do. And there's some discussion around that.

Woman: Right.

Woman: That they manually shed for three or five days.

(Liz): So I think if you look at it, this may be the question they're asking us on what should be done. They're kind of revisiting (unintelligible). Is this granular enough? Do we agree with the concepts?

So if you've got your little (focal absent) the outbreak in one state, you may be able to stamp out and do it quickly and get it - but then if you're a Type 3 where you're a large regional, stamping out may not be - you can't stamp them all fast enough for - get rid of all those animals.

So that would be a vaccinate to live. Vaccinate to slaughter. And then, you know, do you discontinue a vaccination and try to go free without vaccine?

Woman: And they have...

Woman: I think you consider it without active sufficient vaccine supplies on all the solutions...

Man: Right.

Woman: ...within (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Because I think it's best to stamp it out.

Woman: Right.

Man: And, you know, (Liz) one thing I offered actually was we either have a volume of stamping out or a time period of stamping out. Like for the first two weeks, we're going stamp out wherever we find it, no matter how big they are.

Because I'm telling you what happens -- and it happens in poultry anyway -- is it turns into a Monty Hall Let's Make a Deal Game when, oh that's a big farm. That's going to cost a lot of money.

Well maybe we can just hold onto them for a while and get them to a plant somewhere. Or - and when you stop following the plan or if (Sue) has more weight or influence to change the plan that's when it all goes south.

(Liz): Yes. (Annette), just for your information, we've pulled up that chart that was in the (bag) prep that said - called differentiating between types of (SMB) outbreaks.

And there are recommended, appropriate strategies for each of the types. And unless it's small, (focal), it is stamping out.

(Annette): Right.

(Liz): You know...

(Annette): Right. Yes, I'm familiar with that. I was following you. Thanks.

(Liz): Okay. And I do think that that's, you know, the one thing that surprised me yesterday in listening to Jon Zack was it's the first time I've heard him say - or USDA say well is it - do we want to be going in and stamping out animals that we've waited long enough to get to because there's so many that now we could...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Yes. And that was a somewhat disturbing concept to me in that it's outside of a plan that, you know, are we really going to go now and - are they asking us to totally revise their plan? You know...

Man: I mean if that's what we're going to do then we just wait for all them to recover. I mean why stamp any of them out then?

Woman: Right.

Man: I mean, you know what I mean?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Well there might be - there - I mean with the limitations and resources, they want to cut the USDA personnel and budget. That there comes a time when you want to do this, but you may not have the resources to do it.

And then it gets ahead of you. And then new decisions have to be made. And now you're not at a Type 1. Now you're at a Type 2 or, you know. And then the decision tree changes.

Woman: And it's one thing - sorry.

Man: No, go ahead.

Woman: And it's one thing also - I mean so - what - for whatever reason, you know, you've got the animals. There's an infection. If we can reach them in time to kill them so that it doesn't spread that's a justification for killing, you know, killing animals.

But they're already recovering. It's not shedding anymore. Ergo that's what - that herd isn't spreading it anymore. That is a different calculus. I mean that's a different calculus in terms of to the animal, to the producer and to the risk to the rest of the country.

I mean I think - I could - I wouldn't want to see someone stall, you know, with - it's not like let's encourage stalling. But right now, it depends. So that would be my reaction. Okay.

Man: And my concern or at least my constituency's concern is that when relatively any humane methods are being called for that - it's truly justification in doing so.

And the current AI issue, it would be an example. I have argued that containment is absolutely pre-eminent in this strategy. And if you take that step properly, then there's no reason why all the birds have to be dead in 24 hours.

And therefore, one would have time to use more humane methods. I don't think that that issue will go away. And we've looked at what happened in the U.K. It came up yesterday and with (S&D).

And I mean the public really, really reacts like badly. They get horrified when some of these images start to fly by. And so we shouldn't walk easily in there. I guess what I'm saying is somewhere in this chart, I'd hope that we are trying to at least honor the principle of humane methods and have that be reflected.

(Liz): Not to mention emotional. The whole...

Man: Oh yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): You know, you say the public is horrified. And I know how horrifying it is for somebody who has never seen a dead animal. The Ukraine picked up the body of a dead cow. But that cow was already dead.

The farmers would have to kill their own animals. The emotional pull and the increased suicide rate. And the inability to function. And the chronic depressions. And the things that are tremendous in the - you know, you talk about your family's experience. And there...

Man: You know what, we didn't want to talk about it. It's still hits me in the (gut).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Back-flashes).

(Liz): Yes.

Man: It's like they're never going away.

(Liz): And then if you found out that your animals were killed after they had recovered and were no longer infected then - and so I think from that becomes a balance - I'm trying to get your - capture your humane message here.

It's a balance between what is the goal in returning the country to a negative status with or without vaccination. And I don't know how to exactly trace containment of...

Woman: And containment of spread.

(Liz): Right.

Woman: Yes. I don't know how many of my little e-mails have...

(Crosstalk))

Woman: You have no private life.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: So (Liz), you know that my (nice pastor is going on)...

(Liz): So did you have her senior husband e-mail you yet?

Woman: Wait until you get home.

(Charles): So we almost circle back to taking some of these animals to slaughter if they're (angitory) in the initial outbreak. And (Daniel), didn't you say in the U.K. that the spread wasn't from transportation.

(Daniel): It was animal movement.

Woman: Where the animals were unloaded from someplace but not...

(Daniel): The animals were moved.

Woman: But does that...

(Charles): But not a trip going down the road or trucks?

(Daniel): Well trucks with animals on it.

(Charles): Trucks with animals on it.

Woman: But no. I guess...

(Charles): Moving these animals.

Man: Just so - people...

(Daniel): It wasn't people or...

((Crosstalk))

(Judith): I don't know if you may have already have answered it but I'm not sure a question got asked explicitly enough. What - with it being a movement, was it actually spread from literally where the truck went...

Man: Was there a linear or was it one point?

(Judith): ...like was there - or whether they - gee it's where they got unloaded at this end was where...

(Daniel): The animals from (park to park).

Man: So it's point to point.

((Crosstalk))

(Judith): So it wasn't from the truck - in trucking animals...

((Crosstalk))

(Annette): It's possible that...

(Judith): Because what we're trying to figure out is that they're - oh sorry (Annette).

(Annette): It's possible to move animals safely. But it's not going to be done easily. It's not going to be done fast. And it's not going to be done cheap. And I don't think we need to solve it with this committee because, frankly, I don't know that we have enough time to do the risk assessment.

And we don't necessarily have the finance to bring to bear on it. But I think the point is valid that there should be an effort to salvage, you know, as much - A, there should be an effort to use humane - I don't think that's even a question to use humane methods where possible. You know, the number one thing is to minimize the spread of disease because that reduces the impact on everything, then the number two thing is to minimize the impact on farmers and the environment which would be, you know, use as much (protein) as you can, save as many animals as you can, when it's viable use vaccine. Vaccine doesn't work for AI but it might work for FMD. So I think if we just try and frame it with...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: That more positive response...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And we're really backing up what USDA's already, where they're going I think.

Man: (Isn't) there also a technology play here trying to (permit), perhaps (when the) herds go negative in terms of (shedding). You know, obviously there's been talk in the dairy industry of a milk-based test where they can actually screen that. So you could potentially be (monitoring just) like a (bulk) milk tank sample that they're using...

Woman: (Unintelligible) (it is) very (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, so...

Woman: (And those) bulk milk (PPR), it's not going to work on a lot because there's no milk...

Man: Right.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: But if for dairy...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Maybe a guy could answer a (question).

Woman: Absolutely.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (And so) (Unintelligible) can sample (kind of where the environment)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Very sensitive, it's going to be used to save for having to sample...

Man: Yes.

Woman: Individual dairy cows.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: The herd is going to be screened if they're suspect to be infected and, yes, that, that's a very good...

Man: (But it)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: That is ready to go).

Man: (Unintelligible). (Right).

Woman: That one, that one's right.

Woman: I'm trying to capture what (Annette) said. Are there certain of these, I mean there are certain of these we can group (under) minimizing the spread of disease, certainly (we can) spread under, the capture under minimizing environmental impact, certain we can perhaps capture under minimizing human emotion, you know, mental health and worker health impact.

Man: (And what)...

Woman: (Unintelligible) (have)...

Woman: To group them that way), I mean...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) or is it just like do your bloody vaccination, here's our point about...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Vaccination and, or if and when something happens when we don't vaccination or it, (used, if you) decide not to use it here (are the) options.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Well), even in, even if we had (the vaccine)...

Woman: Even if, there are going to be things...

Woman: They're going to have to...

Woman: Yes, there are going to be things - yes...

Woman: There are some things we have to do that we don't like to look at.

Man: (Liz), I have on a question on the swine side of it, very intrigued by it but will we test for the actual appearance...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Of live) or will they (have to go some central) ropes in...

Woman: Yes.

Man: Pig pens, let them chew on it and (after then look) (unintelligible) virus.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Have they looked at that with FMD as a way to kind of (use)...

Woman: Yes, we've...

Man: (Operations).

Woman: Well, our (funding) research at Plum Island with actual (viremic) pigs to make sure that (pigs with that scope) will go chew on ropes and that's (Unintelligible) and then clean up salvia well enough to do your PCRs on that. So I don't know that they've actually, you know, originally they thought pigs were going to be too sick to go chew on ropes but I don't know that they've gotten an answer one way or the other. You know, they're definitely looking at saying is that something you can do as part of the secure pork supply to have negative rope tests where you've gotten enough salvia that you can actually test...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: (In), non-clinical pigs. You know, obviously if they're clinical they're, it's a little different story, you're not going to be trying to move pigs (where they have vesicles). If you're in the recovery phase and you're trying to prove that that pig farm was never effected.

Man: (To look at the antibodies).

Woman: The salvia test for antibodies will work. The antibody test as I mentioned has not been rolled out fully by the (Unintelligible), (right), the only piglets (done that) have been negative (cohort) study while the disease...

Woman: Yes.

Woman Is in the United States.

Woman: Right.

Woman: But from a recovery perspective potentially you could have (all kinds) (Unintelligible) saliva you could because the virus is so infectious the belief would be in a recovered herd, 100% of the animals would have been exposed so you probably be able to go in and test 30 animals or whatever. You wouldn't have to test everybody...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: To show that a herd is negative.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: But the test hasn't been fully rolled out. PCR test (is protecting the) virus haven't been rolled out.

Woman: Yes, and so early on you could do the PCR...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Antigen test looking for antigen in saliva.

Woman: (Right).

Woman: (It has)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: If they'll chew on a rope.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You know, seeing) 100 animals in a confined area...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: When the first animal, when you first see signs of hoof and mouth disease and you determine this animal has it, what amount of time is it till the rest of them are infected and...

Woman: (Moves its way through)...

Man: What amount of time is it till they become non-ambulatory? Do we...

Woman: If they're all in one room...

Man: (Well)...

Woman: So let me tell you what they do at Plum Island, close proximity.

Man: (Unintelligible) yes.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So they inoculate pigs, they inoculate two pigs and then they put them in a room and they put a negative, they put two negative cows and a couple of sheep in there and they do it on, you know, the class starts on Monday and they inoculate the pigs maybe on Friday.

And then on Monday those of us that went (as) students to that class start examining the animals and by Tuesday the pigs are miserably sick and they don't want to stand and they don't want to walk. And on Wednesday some of the cattle are starting to get vesicles in their mouths and on, and we never found any vesicles at all in the sheep...

Man: Sheep.

Woman: And we didn't see any signs of illness. And by Thursday or Friday we euthanized all the animals and did complete (Unintelligible) and looked at all the lesions. And the pigs, (we) were grateful to have euthanized, they were suffering so much, most of them wouldn't stand. The cows are very lame but most of (them) still get up and walk around. Some of the cows lost the entire surface of their tongue.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So they definitely don't want to eat, they definitely don't want to drink, they're drooling, and it's, this is (was) happening in less than ten days. So, and it's so contagious that the belief is that in animals within the same room or confinement house...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (They're) pretty much all be exposed in that week to ten days.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You probably clinical findings in all of them. If you had different buildings on the farm and maybe different...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: People going into them, you know, you might (break it up), like the AI could appear in one building on a farm and not in others but it's so contagious that the belief is that all the animals in the same confinement setting would be...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Pretty well exposed within (the)...

Woman: Did you find any (more) in the sheep after you killed them?

Woman: No.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So what would be the...

Woman: (The) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (in that every areas) of recovery, right?

Woman: Well, the sheep may never show clinical signs. They may have warts, they may get little tiny vesicles either in their mouth or...

Woman: But you showed an active infection in (them)...

Man: (Yes, that's right).

Woman: Oh, yes...

Woman: (Okay).

Woman: They all have a virus.

Woman: (So they)...

Woman: (Oh, yes), they have a virus.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: They just didn't become symptomatic.

Woman: They were (bleeding every day)...

Woman: Okay.

Woman: And demonstrating virus.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: And they could (unintelligible).

Woman: (We didn't get) (unintelligible).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Did the cattle recover?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Peter) was, (Peter) had said he saw animals with...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: The after effects (of) lameness of...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And stuff.

Woman: A year later.

Woman: A year later.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: They didn't make full recoveries. Many of the cows (though will, the pigs)...

Man: (Okay).

Woman: Their hooves fall off.

Woman: (Yes).

Man: And that...

Woman: Recovery is not really reasonable to talk about with (pigs).

Man: (No).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And that was the experience in the U.K., I mean they would identify a cow with a lesion on today and by the time they would get there the next day to start the depopulation or whatever there would be 10, 15 other animals starting to show lesions. I mean that's, of course, they had already been infected.

Woman: Yes.

Man: They had already been infected but it just starts ramping up very quickly.

Man: (Unintelligible) incubation period.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And those are in, not confinement...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: But, you know, European dairies...

Man: (Unintelligible) (dairies)...

Man: Or English dairies which are...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: You know, they have housing but they're out on pasture so it's not like a confined area in the United States or a feedlot where it's much more confined.

Man: (Unintelligible) you see some of these herds that...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: They didn't (catch) it in time to euthanize...

Man: (Yes, they're) (unintelligible).

Man: (For recovery).

Man: Well, I'm sure there were, while they, I mean it was all stamping out there, okay, so all...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: It didn't really matter.

Man: (Unintelligible),

Man: I mean I'm sure there were herds that were recovering by the time they got to them...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And got them euthanized...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (They) were starting to recover...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: But (they), it was all stamping out there, the vaccine (was) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And...

Man: (What)...

Man: (That's) why they were...

Man: (Is working)?

Man: However many million animals (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay.

Man: (Right) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (I hope). So...

Man: (It'd be dangerous) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Is there...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And I think, you know, if we want to...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We can look at combining some of these under, we can (work) them (as), we can add a background (piece)...

Man: We can...

Woman: Right.

Man: You know...

Woman: Play with the structure but...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Are people good with what the substance...

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think we're all in agreement, focus needs to be on the vaccine part...

Woman: Right, yes.

Man: But I think we also need to state that certainly industries are going to continue to move forward with planning...

Man: (Yes).

Man: You know, (that that's so important what I think we're doing) (unintelligible).

Woman: Right.

Man: (But)...

Man: I know that, and I kind of heard it (peripherally) mentioned and I haven't seen it stuck up here and (Joe) mentioned it yesterday too in relation to the one health initiative and that's the mental health of the farmer, and we kind of

started to put in there (when) we talked about stamping (out is practice)
humane methods because (Michael) brought it up.

But, you know, what's the plan to deal with the farmer and the farmer's
mental health at the end of the day, you know, when they've been depopulated
and they're out of business and now they got to wait an X amount of time
before they can get back in business (and I just killed daisy).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Yes, (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, and I would broaden it beyond just the producer and I can speak from
(TB)...

Man: (Small towns).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: T.B. eradication in northeast Michigan.

Woman: Veterinarians have to deal with it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: It's, veterinarians, it's the local...

Man: Local economy.

Man: Economy, everything...

Man: Yes.

Man: Is impacted. So it's, you know, producers certainly are acutely impacted but (there would be)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Responsible)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Damage, (yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Yes, and then there's)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Collateral damage.

Man: (But that's where) HHS (could respond to) that where they might be able to work with Health and Human Services.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (To get off) that kind of response.

Man: I think it's worked even (unintelligible) (it's) that important.

Man: Yes.

Man: In practice each state has its own (unintelligible) (FAD) plan and in some cases by disease. These are things that are in those plans, these are things that are in my plan in New Hampshire.

Woman: (Oh really)?

Man: Most of it's going to happen on the ground, it's not going, USDA is not going to drive the disaster behavioral health folks, that's going to be - when the incident is being run, here's a problem that we need to (report) out. We need to send the behavioral folks to this town and that will get done probably on a state level. I don't know, I mean did any of that stuff happen with the (high pass) outbreak (we're there)...

Man: I expect there'll be (unintelligible).

Man: (So it's like) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Was it) state or was it federal?

Man: (Unintelligible) I, (you), don't quote me (but)...

Man: That's fine.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I don't know.

Man: Just curious.

Man: But there were actually articles (in the Minneapolis St. Paul) newspapers about producers and the trauma they've been through.

Man: (That's)...

Man: I mean (so it's written) (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: And that (there)...

Woman: Yes.

Man: I'm just...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think it's important not to keep up (the)...

Woman: Yes, (this is addressed)...

Man: With...

Man: Yes, I think USDA...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: They're aware of it and they should be aware of it, and I think in practice it's going to be state...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Resources that do that most.

Man: Or Department of (unintelligible).

Man: But it's still, (you know, important) (unintelligible).

Woman: Health and Humans (have services) (unintelligible).

Man: Health and Human Services, yes.

(Annette): Yes, this (Annette), during...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Annette): Exotic Newcastle disease...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Annette) We did use...

Man: And with all of that.

(Annette): State mental...

Man: (That) (unintelligible) outbreak.

Man: You used state folks in that?

(Annette): Yes, we used state, our...

Man: (Yes).

(Annette): State mental health people.

Man: Yes.

(Annette): For outreach and USDA also assigned kind of what they termed an ombudsman and their sole (person), purpose was really to help with the trauma that the response inflicted, and recall that at that point we, it was a lot of backyard bird owners, about 2,700 of them and 22 commercial facilities.

So there was a large mental health impact and we did, both the federal government and the state government committed resources to deal with that, probably inadequate because...

Man: Yes.

(Annette): You know, it's just hard but there were resources committed.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Should - (Annette), should we say that the USDA should reach out to state and federal agencies with expertise or should we just say that (unintelligible) issues should be covered in USDA preparedness plans and in...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Secure food supply plans?

(Annette): Yes, you know, frankly I like the idea of saying should look to state and federal and the reason I say that is I hope that the advisory committee's tone is really embracing the local community which would be state from a USDA perspective and (for a), from our perspective (as) a state person (that's), you know, the counties or parishes or whatever they're called in each state.

But I think, I like the tone it sets by we say include especially for mental health because that's so community based, you know, there's trust factors there.

Man: And that's also highly variable by state. Some states...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Fund that very well and other states.

Woman: (Don't)...

Man: It's really not much of an issue, they don't put much into it at all and that's why that federal component might be so important is to backstop some of those states that are not as committed as others.

(Annette): Yes, I agree totally.

Man: (Liz), I have a question. So FMD has been addressed by previous committees and I think (understood you) to all say that (while) either the recommendations have not been acted upon or what, what's not working as (you) understand it?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Why are we addressing it in such detail again as (the fourth) time around, I think it's the fourth time around...

Woman: Third.

Man: Third time.

Woman: But we haven't done this part before I will say. I mean I don't think, I'd have to look back at our previous two sets of recommendations. Our previous two sets of recommendations very heavily focused on sort of around not, sort of even discussing because I mean I guess the first time (it) came up, our discussion was like should (we be) vaccinating.

I mean I think the first question you see (unintelligible) was like do you approve of the idea of possibly vaccinating to (live). So I mean it's sort of gone through those iterations. The part that's not working is something, you know, broader than this advisory committee which is get USDA to (find) funding for a vaccine bank, you know, and that's broader even than just this advisory committee.

Man: (What)...

Woman: I think this part is a whole new angle that we're taking. I don't remember it in our previous pieces.

Man: And do you think we (need to have), or the committees have previously been clear about the urgent nature of the matter or...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Oh, yes.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, (it's)...

Woman: Absolutely.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (It's) been the number one...

Woman: I just wonder if we need to put something in there about USDA has to find a separate income stream to support this.

Woman: That's, (that)...

Woman: We actually did, (I), on the first one where we talked about vaccinations - take a look at that again.

(Annette): Yes, this is (Annette), I think they did, because even in the, when I looked at the President's budget it looked like there was a, you know, a small amount of an increase to try and start to improve the strategy of maintaining the vaccine bank.

So I think would behoove the, (or) it would be helpful (unintelligible) (to) reiterate (it) the importance of that because it wasn't enough, and some of the vaccine recommendations in this report are more specific than the last one and I think very good.

So I think we're worthwhile, they're, they support the previous report but they don't, well, I guess that one where we referenced back but for the most parts it's push, continuing to push forward on the issue rather than just reiterating.

Man: Yes I mean this is my - and like these sub-points under the vaccine bank are much more specific than what we did in previous years. I mean...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Well...

Man: (It is)...

Woman: (Unintelligible) (need a report), (they're on your)...

Man: The website.

Man: One reason I'm asking is first of all if there's no movement that's problematic and that we need to probably understand why but given the sheer volume of issues I just feel that one like this shouldn't be consuming as much time as it

seems that it's doing. If it's the third or fourth committee and (we're) still talking about the same issue, what's not being discussed because of that time not being available.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So one of the issues is the Secretary of Agriculture may fully agree with us that they need this vaccine bank at this point. They might not have (it) in 2004 but they may now but the money, they don't have the money. The money comes from the President's budget and then the Congressional budget and then the appropriations.

Man: Right

Man: Right.

Woman: And the Secretary going to Congress or going to the President may not get the money.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So the last recommendation not only went from a, this committee to the Secretary but it was discussed and (formed like) (U.S. Animal Health) and then U.S. Animal Health presents a resolution asking Congress to appropriate the money and then you have political...

Man: Yes.

Man: Political...

Woman: (Strain)...

Woman: Behind the (rest). So this committee's recommendations (could) potentially go further than, to the Secretary of Agriculture and may actually be able...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And may actually be able to (serve a) (unintelligible) from a different direction or a different avenue because, you know, they just had a hearing in front of the Senate and the Secretary for Agriculture and the vaccine manufactures are there and Congress is sitting there shaking their heads but our Congress hasn't done anything.

Man: Yes.

Man: And it's...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) well, (partnering with) industry, industry (has an okay) (unintelligible) that's the route that they're taking right now to (unintelligible) (do about it) and this creates further delay (for)...

Woman: But I would say, you know, now we've got this additional tactic that APHIS, that the administrator anyway has already brought up to the House Ag Committee, I don't know that (they've been to the) Senate Ag Committee as well, or as much but, you know, to make a Farm Bill play, well, the next Farm Bill's going to be 2018...

Woman: A long ways off.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: For 20, you know, so we're still years away from a Farm Bill play and we get it in the Farm Bill and then you still have to come back and get it appropriated.

Man: Right.

Woman: (Right). You know, so we could get a billion dollars in the Farm Bill that's authorized, but unless we appropriate, you know, that money, you know, in 2019 after we have a 2018 Farm Bill which may or may not happen in 2018, you know, we're still...

Woman: Right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (A long) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) three or four years away.

Man: (Unintelligible) the vaccine (people)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Most of them through the proper...

Woman: Yes.

Man: Maybe that should be (unintelligible), maybe we should (point that out).

Man: I'm sure everybody knows the budget that (R.J) sent out to us earlier had \$1.7 million in it for FMD vaccine.

Woman: (But additional) - yes,

Man: One point...

Woman: Yes, we have 1.7 additional so I think it gets it up to three point...

Man: What was it, additional?

Woman: Yes.

Man: Oh, okay.

Woman: You get \$3 million.

Man: Okay, (well, and)...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It's still \$3.5 million...

Man: (Okay) (unintelligible).

Woman: (When the)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Right, and so the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Estimates (are in) or losses are in the billions, billions and billions (of) dollars.
I mean AI was \$3 billion in cost and \$3 billion in losses.

Man: (I think it was) (unintelligible).

Woman: To the poultry industry (minimum), conservatively.

Man: (Well) in trade, yes. Trade yes.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Are we...

Woman: So we're talking about \$150 million a year for (vaccine) which is a drop in the bucket to prevent an outbreak that far (exceeds) (unintelligible).

Man: (No, that's) (unintelligible).

Woman: The USDA's modeling has done the estimate cost.

Woman: Right.

Woman: They presented that to us last year.

Woman: Right.

Woman: And...

Woman: They're just not getting...

Man: (Unintelligible) (with they're at).

Woman: (I)...

Woman: (That's)...

Woman: (And at least) I can't remember what it was but it was, and that was not industry putting that forth,

Woman: (That)...

Woman: That was the modeling.

Woman: Right.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Right, but I've actually heard from industry and vaccine companies and I think maybe others on, in the committee (might have) also that they want to be asked how much they think it will cost because they can...

Woman: Right.

Woman: Do it cheaper because they don't necessarily need to have 40 million does there. There's lots of strategies to deal with it.

Woman: Right.

Woman: Right.

Woman: So...

Woman: That's where that...

Woman: (That's why)...

Man: So they can actually manage inventory on a global basis.

Woman: Absolutely.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Absolutely.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: They are now for everywhere but us.

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) (the) advantage of how they actually.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: You know, utilize resources (because now they can do it)...

Woman: Right, and that's...

Man: More efficiently.

Woman: What we're trying to say in Point A that they need to issue that call for information on what costs would be. Do we want to have a follow up to Point A that once they get that information...

Man: (But first) do we ask them...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Is, what, why is our policy right now that we have to the concentrated antigen in Plum Island (I mean) is that (mandated)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Is that a regulatory deal, is that, you know, kind of protecting the fact that we will have vaccine if we need it?

Woman: Why can't the North American...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Right.

Woman: Bank (be)...

Man: Well why can't...

Woman: Be stored in England.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Woman: With...

Man: (Unintelligible) (stored in) England...

Woman: (Where the rest is)?

Woman: (Unintelligible) (is).

Man: (Unintelligible) yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible) that's the way they've always done it.

Man: (You know), getting closer to the vaccine bank (factory) which would speed up the whole process in terms of getting this vaccine.

Man: Another question about the, I'm not definitely opposed to the concept that the vaccine bank should be government funded but that to me seems to be the reason that they have not acted.

Woman: (Absolutely).

Man: That was their direct response last time.

Woman: Yes.

Man: That's not our policy. If (this) vaccine bank is important enough to this committee to make it a recommendation should be say by any means of, that they can it done? Leave it open to them to figure out. It doesn't have to be industry because I understand the reasons that industry may not want that, by any mean appropriate.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: The Gates Foundation - by saying government funded or - if the Gate's Foundation thinks this is a big enough deal that they want to fund it...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: This recommendation doesn't, wouldn't support that. Get it done however you can get it done...

Woman: I (hear)...

Man: If it's that big a deal.

Woman: I hear what you're saying, I will say, I mean maybe one way to phrase it then is (to think) of banks (in), should be government funded (if, and) emphasizing more the statement that the producers not be expected to pay for the initial vaccine bank since we don't have (guarantee, until) unless you want to give us a guarantee we can use it...

Woman: (Right).

Man: Because that makes the (unintelligible), that's the fundamental part...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Even that...

Woman: You still pay for it, you have no control over it.

Man: But even that, maybe, get it done however you can because it may, there may, if we're thinking creatively like an insurance plan...

Woman: (All the pitfalls) (unintelligible).

Man: I'm paying for insurance...

Woman: (Sure)...

Man: But I'm not allow to use it except when the insurance company tells me I can but there's an arrangement (so it says) qualifying things. There may be a way (to), I don't, I...

Woman: (I hear)...

Man: I understand what you're saying...

Woman: No this, (when I think of insurance)...

Man: (I wouldn't limit it).

Woman: If I'd met their conditions I get paid, I get insurance.

Man: (That's what you're)...

Woman: That's not what they're telling us.

Man: (Well)...

Woman: (They get)...

Man: (But do it for) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: If the existing arrangement is I will fund part of this if as long as one of the conditions is that when we have an outbreak I get to use it, that's what...

Woman: (Yes).

Man: (I'm saying about), by saying this is...

Woman: (But they're not, but they're)...

Man: We don't know that they are, we're recommending get (this) done however you can and force them to think differently about it. I would (agree), and I'm not, I wouldn't...

Woman: Yes, I know I (and)...

Man: (But saying) the industry needs to pay for it...

Woman: Yes, I hear what you're...

Man: (I would) not on board but if we limit it to government only the, we're going to be back in the same boat when we get the response back.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Sorry that's not our policy to determine, you know...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: It's useless.

Man: (Unintelligible) (creative) funding for...

Woman: Right, (unintelligible).

Woman: There's...

Man: Yes, it's creative (unintelligible).

Woman: (Department of) Homeland...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: On industry funding...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You know...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: That's why it's part of the...

Woman: The agencies look at the guarantee access to the vaccine.

Man: That translates (unintelligible).

Woman: But well, (why then)...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Do it easier).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: That's (what they do it) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (But we)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: But we just (need) (unintelligible).

Man: (Big hit with this weight).

Man: (But we're just for an example to that)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (But you do it in poultry and)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Swine (unintelligible)

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: They can see...

Man: (And so others have to look what's happen to)...

Man: (I think) (Unintelligible).

Man: Poultry and then trying to put things in place (it's a) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Is that)...

Man: (I think so)...

Man: Yes.

Man: I think the example is (there) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I don't think they have to wait for (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (since they left the plan and)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I just don't like...

Woman: (Access to the plan)...

Woman: (And do to the) vaccine.

Woman: (Access) to the vaccine (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) vaccine is developed.

Woman: Yes.

Man: That's - yes, that's reasonable (like that) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (I think we're confusing here)...

Woman: (Unintelligible) (but I'm) (unintelligible) (for that) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) and prompt access.

Woman: Thank you (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You can get it in a couple years.

Man: What makes it so complicated is, (you know), then you've got the whole issue of swine, probably need two vaccines...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) to protect them.

Woman: Right.

Man: The ruminant needs one.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And, you know, then...

Man: (How that)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (That's captured there) like, because you're right, there are way to permeations for us to say...

Man: Absolutely.

Man: Yes.

Man: (In) industry but if we, again, I, if we limit it to government funding it's, we're going to make (the same) recommendation that (we made last time) (unintelligible).

Woman: Do we need to have the science based?

Woman: I'd take it out (that's too)...

Man: (I'd keep that, I think that's)...

Woman: I mean but...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (You know)...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Don)'s right there, you know, scientifically you can get by with one dose in cattle (and, yet you got your) pigs that are a little (bact), or a little virus factories that need two doses, and so if you protect, if you prevent the pigs from becoming virus factories, (you), are you protecting cattle and, you know, from (flues, the virus pigs) are going to choke out, you know, or so I don't know if you call it...

Woman: I think equitable covered it.

Woman: Equitable?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (I like equitable).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (If you feed at a minute ago)...

Woman: In comparison.

Woman: (What)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay.

Woman: You could also say equitable and...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Prompt)...

Man: But I think adding more (adjectives)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (To)...

Man: (Unintelligible) (makes it really sound) (unintelligible).

Woman: Appropriate plan on that, leave it like that.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think (that) science (based though)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: May I ask another question about...

Woman: Absolutely.

Man: The past feedback, and I'm sorry I hadn't, I had not read those documents but to what extent are these recommendations dead on arrival simply because they call for new funding.

And thinking in terms of where the nation is today running huge deficits that continue to grow, I mean I think the committee doesn't serve a (purse), a process well if we ignore some certain realities and I'm wondering if that's one of the realities here. I mean (that's) one of the problems I struggle with in academia, you know, you come up with these academic answers but they have no practical application.

Woman: I understand what you're saying but I think it's like (Judith) said this is actually asking for more from us than what they have before of trying to actually get help developed...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: What those plans are going to be.

Woman: (Right).

Man: Yes.

Woman: So...

Man: But do we, (if it's)...

Woman: It's slow but it is a little bit moving forward...

Man: Are we asking though for increased funding which I think that's what we're asking for right?

Woman: Funding for a vaccine bank, (yes).

Man: Yes.

Woman: I also think we're asking, we are asking for all powers that be up there to recognize that that (FAT) prep plan is dead in the water without vaccines.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: That unless we get extremely lucky and have a minute type one outbreak that's amendable to stamping out for the disease that in most cases in our country all of the modeling studies project will spread...

Man: Yes.

Woman: Because of the highly contagious nature and the density of our agriculture...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: And the movement of animals (unintelligible) that this FAD plan that they've asked us to prioritize and evaluate is dead in the water without accessible vaccines.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You know, I mean...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: That's the way I feel on trying to answer their questions.

Man: Yes.

Woman: I (if looked) to prioritize using (first), using that two and a half million doses of vaccines but if the outbreak starts in the middle of Kansas and feedlots (unintelligible) we aren't going to stop it. We'll use all the vaccine that we paid for with no effect whatsoever.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And (Annette Jones) won't be able to get a million doses to protect a million cows that are in the central valley of California because the vaccine will be gone and it will have been wasted. It won't stop a thing.

Man: (So) (unintelligible) (if) they scramble finding enough vaccine to try hold (the)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: South Korea together...

Woman: Right.

Man: (With) South Korea's livestock industry (is the size of) one of our states (which would be)...

Woman: So.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I would say I do think USDA finds these recommendations for additional funding of value in going to the President to try to give more money in the President's budget and then supporting the President's budget for any increased funding. So it's kind of a, you know, it is helpful in trying to justify what they'd like to put in their budgets or increase the funding...

Man: Right.

Woman: In their budget.

Man: And we are never talking about redistribution, reallocation of...

Woman: (We're)...

Man: Current funding.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: We are asking for new...

Woman: New funding.

Man: New funding.

Woman: We could say in item A under the plan call for information that this committee feels that waiting for a 2018 Farm Bill source of funding to move forward on this...

Man: Yes.

Woman: Is too late.

Man: That's (what)...

Woman: You could say (that)...

Woman: Yes, (I could say) (unintelligible) (yes) (unintelligible).

Man: That's actually...

Man: Yes.

Man: It's (it's), if we're waiting...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: On the Farm Bill...

Woman: In the intro actually before...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You know...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Because that's what we're saying.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: Waiting for the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: 2018 Farm Bill was too (long)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) appropriate (unintelligible).

Woman: We think...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So...

Man: (The)...

Woman: Why can't we capture what (Belinda) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: (Of all the number ones).

Man: Yes (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Did I)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) so I didn't...

Man: (Is it on the mic)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Look at the second (sessions they edit) does that capture what you said?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Doesn't even) (unintelligible).

Man: (And)...

Woman: The second (sentence is the work should be done) (unintelligible) (prep)

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: The secure (food) supplies are dependent...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: On an adequate vaccine bank.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Except in the luckiest and (the), hard to believe...

Woman (But)...

Woman: (Okay, type) one outbreak amendable...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Stamping out (that it) doesn't fit with the modeling.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Studies that (I think) (unintelligible) (to date).

Woman: Yes, (that this), how about...

Woman: (Unintelligible)...

Woman: (It's like an event)...

Woman: Unlikely...

Woman: In the unlucky...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Unlikely event.

Man: Yes.

Man: Highly unlikely (unintelligible).

Woman: (After this) (unintelligible).

Man: (Well)...

Woman: Yes, (I think we're all)...

Man: (Unintelligible) (yes).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Additional funding in the 20 - yes, in the 2018 Farm Bill (or) the next Farm Bill.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Do)...

Man: Don't put the year because (it, the) next as...

Woman: (Next because it might not be 2018).

Man: 2018, (makes), 2018 makes it clear to (them), well, (but) if you put, if we're looking at (it), if they're talking about the next Farm Bill, 2018 is two years away. The next farm Bill (it), it's more stark to put (it's), we're going to wait this long, this many years as opposed to the next...

Man: Maybe when the next is...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (But if you) just want to say waiting until 2018 is (too long, but what you say).

Man: That that's, that, when I read something, next, well, next thing, you know, next, this is not far away.

Woman: (Let's finish the sentence, take a five minute break...

Woman: (Okay).

Woman: We can work (unintelligible).

Man: (I don't) (unintelligible).

Man: (It's just)...

Woman: No, I'm with you I'm just saying let's try to...

Man: (But if you don't put) 2018 in there, you can also put in there that it's two years before the bank will have the money.

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (And we'll have the)...

Woman: Right.

Man: Vaccine (unintelligible) (because that)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (In 2018 and plus).

Woman: (Well)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay...

Man: (Unintelligible) (meant the old) (unintelligible).

Woman: Is that kind of addressed...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Woman: So...

Man: (That was yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: Five minute...

Woman: Yes, we (can) (unintelligible) and then we will take a quick break to...
(unintelligible) okay...

Man: (Great).

Woman: (Thanks) (Brenda Voucher). Take a break.

Man: I need to run to the airport.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Kind of grab a)...

Woman: (That's) a lot further away (than you might not get out there).

Man: I don't think I can make it back in five minutes.

Woman: No.

Man: But I just wanted to thank you all and great working with you again, and send me anything...

Woman: Awesome.

Man: That I can provide some input on and I'll be happy to.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: And I look forward to working with you all again the next time around (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Safe Travels.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Morning), (John).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Well, next year we'll) (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Thanks) (John).

Man: And my exit time's four o'clock...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: So I got 45 more minutes.

Woman: (Unintelligible) conference (unintelligible).

Man: Wow.

Woman: (Julie)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Julie)?

Man: (Unintelligible) (ADA meeting)?

Woman: (Verizon)?

Man: (Yes).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We're going to go on a...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Ten minute break.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: If you could put us on pre-conference.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Coordinator: (One moment).

Man: (What would you) (unintelligible).

Woman: I think (she) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Coordinator: All right and you are now live.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, so then...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So I think we've, have we focused enough on vaccine and are ready to go to (the matter of) preserving protein and animal genetics through response plans? (Have we, can't be forgetting that one).

Woman: I mean I think that's what the secure food supply plans are all about.

Woman: Yes. (They are)...

Woman: (Right).

Woman: Kind of got...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: But...

Woman: And, you know, we try to capture that in Point A saying that they need to utilize (constant played out) in secure food supplies realizing some are more mature than others and there may be concepts that address the smaller, non-traditional, some of those stakeholders.

We talk about potentially considering allowing of going to slaughter, you know, based on understanding, you know, what the risks are of that, either the risk of spread through meat. I think risk of spread through transport to the processor.

We talked about human health and environmental, you know, and this is kind of (state), like if we just come up with a (unintelligible) of recommendation is they need to work with state and private stakeholders to determine disposal options in each region. I've - is that covered in...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: Secured - (I), yes...

Man: Yes.

Woman: (It's where we said)...

Woman: (Yes, and) all the different methods of disposal are...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Addressed and the ones that are (of that mature) certainly...

Woman: Right.

Woman: But that's also regionally.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Are they...

Woman: Determined.

Man: Pre-identify locations where they're going to go because (it's going to) (unintelligible) pretty fast if you don't have somebody already laid out. So they've got a specific locations in mind.

Woman: (So the) ones that have those plans done have them.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: But...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Depends on the maturity...

Woman: (But that's just if they find)...

Man: Yes, that's certainly a state level...

Woman: (The) things that they thought were in place didn't come out that way when (it), they were trying to get rid of birds?

Woman: Yes, and I think that...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: That's kind of what we've heard.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So that's an answer to which one of their questions?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Oh, we're)...

Woman: We got to go back to their questions...

Woman: We aren't limited by their questions.

Woman: I know (but)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, but you know they really...

Woman: The questions they want us to answer.

Woman: (You know)...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: We really need to do...

Woman: (We can) answer the questions but you can expand and, you know, take...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Tangential, you know, (unintelligible).

Woman: We really do (want the questions) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Some way)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Yes, I'll pull) out the questions because I mean things like what products can move on day zero, I don't even know if (there's) any products (or) animals and, you know...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And we theoretically said you ought to stop everything until you figure out the scope of an outbreak but (does) everything include Kansas spam at a Hormel factory or is it, you know, fresh meat, live animals? Is it live...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Animals (or only) meat and milk can move? I mean that's a very specific question that requires scientific expertise that...

Woman: (Anything that's)...

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Woman: Going to spread disease.

Woman: But...

Woman: (Unintelligible) (do the recommendations)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: But the recognition is (that) things that are already in transit will likely continue and then the stop...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Movement has always been everything would stop.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: If your food supply plans have been to recognize how to move things...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (To determine which state) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (it's the full packet).

Man: (Okay).

Woman: So my understanding would be that on day (unintelligible).

Man: I think it's just one day...

Woman: Zero (would stop everything).

Woman: (Everything) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You know)...

Woman: (I've got it) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, here we go what answer to one.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (And now it says)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (prepare they're talking about).

Man: (Is there enough food)...

Woman: (Yes).

Man: (Before food's cold).

Man: (Yes).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (The five cold) points.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You know)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: (That's on my), yes.

Woman: (I)...

Man: That's...

Woman: My understanding was they have a Website ready to go live...

Man: (Website) (unintelligible).

Man: I don't think they're...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: For us to answer...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Especially the part of the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Right.

Man: (They're not) (unintelligible).

Man: (Especially) part of the.

Woman: (This is part of the)...

Woman: Right.

Woman: (Unintelligible)...

Woman: Right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Are we rewriting)...

Woman: Right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I mean (the)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (But) (unintelligible) (rewrite)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: But it doesn't...

Woman: I think (unintelligible).

Man: It (doesn't in) the last two questions...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Does (SOCCA) have any recommendations.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (On) the last two...

Man: Broadcast systems.

Woman: Broadcast systems.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Yes), for example...

Man: But you shouldn't be...

Woman: (See I'm) looking into (unintelligible) (with the) answers...

Man: (Unintelligible) (being available on) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Yes, we just did the math)...

Man: (That way if people need to) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (Ink).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And the same with priority (to that goal)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It depends on the...

Woman: (Exactly)...

Woman: Type of outbreak.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think one of my concerns is (it's)...

Woman: (Oh)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible) (and then) (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, (folks)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: You really need to...

Woman: (Yes, excuse me)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Have one person (speaking at one time).

Man: (What will)...

Man: To create a barrier around the state...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Hey, you all.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Really do), let's try the sort of engage...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Everybody in the conversation.

Woman: People are listening (and they're hearing) (unintelligible).

Man: (If this is, if) we look at that specific question, (they're like) I'm not sure we have all the expertise here to answer that so do we respond (and I've got some stuff on that one also) (Unintelligible) that basically (says) stop moving (in order) (Unintelligible).

(We) determine based on multiple factors including epidemiologic characteristics (what) they may be, geographic distribution, outbreak scale and risk assessment and (unintelligible) animal products (unintelligible).

Woman: You can go back with additional questions clarifying (including), you can go back and get that. We can do that.

Man: (Because) I mean (there are) just so many factors involved in (that) equation, (and) I think, (Belinda), you're right, I think the initial thing will be to (unintelligible) stop everything until we can really get a grasp, you know, but, you know, if you've got animals on a truck for 24 hours stopped, you know, (then it's) that's kind of an issue, you know?

Woman: So, I, like I said I think the recognition is (the) things that are in transit are going to...

Man: Yes, (unintelligible).

Woman: (They're either going) on to their destination or (they're) going back but things, animals and animal products are likely to complete their transit. You can't stop trucks...

Man: (That's true).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Everywhere in the United States on the road all at the same time, can't be done (realistically) and it would be disaster if you did. I mean (if this) (unintelligible) what would happen from an animal welfare standpoint, from an environmental standpoint, from a local (unintelligible) it would be a mess literally.

Woman: (I mean I don't think we want)...

Woman: (Annette) said, you know, the first thing you have to do is stop moving (bodies).

Woman: Do we want to (unintelligible) the question. I don't really think we're...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: We don't have any questions identified right now.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: So we're going to recommend that animals and products on the road continue to their final destination.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Or return home, I mean returning home may be a viable option.

Woman: Whichever's closest unless it's slaughter, there's no reason for them not to continue on...

Woman: Right.

Woman: They're not.

Man: (So on my way), so I'm on my way to the fair...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (I have to) turn around and go home.

Man: (That's)...

Woman: Yes, I mean probably don't want to be going to...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Yes).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (And there will be answers just)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Where an...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: An animal in transit may go (on its way to) feed yard from a ranch and that feed yard may say no.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: That's right.

Man: No. that's' true (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: So they will have to go back to their point of...

Woman: Right.

Man: Point of origin.

Man: Yes.

Woman: So then we need to, I think in some ways you've got to...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Movement until...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (outbreak).

Woman: New movement until the outbreak can be typed.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (You know)...

Woman: I think so, I, (Annette)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Said that first, you know, and I agree with her, that you have to stop moving the virus. And so...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And (the), all the secure food supply plans are based on how you determine when it is safe to move that (things).

Woman: Right.

Woman: And you can't do that at time zero.

Woman: And (Max) has a...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You know)...

(Max): Well also thinking (the Ebola) event (with) each state (how does that will work out), what is going to be (the) (unintelligible) (this group or the) state working with the USDA, who is going to lead the operation in the state?

Woman: That was the reason to recommend these exercises and making sure that everybody knows how they're going to work together.

Man: (Well)...

Woman: Yes.

(Max): Well, we need (to get that sorted out)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (I think) (unintelligible).

Woman: (I think we've got that down)...

Man: Yes.

Woman: Somewhere.

Woman: (Somewhere right there).

(Max): What about states (don't want the) (unintelligible)?

Man: And that's...

Woman: So certainly that's...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Certainly that's a part of some of the (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Of the) secure food supply plans...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So there are overarching plans and then there are regional plans, and like in New England the states have memorandums of understanding...

Man: (My state of Maryland).

Woman: Saying that if you'll let our milk in, we'll let you're milk in if we all follow these rules but if those aren't preexisting before the outbreak starts, right...

Man: (If)...

Woman: Because I'm not going to let your stuff in no matter...

(Max): (So I'm saying) that they really need to be...

Man: Right.

(Max): Sorted out.

Woman: (How) does, does this work...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: If you look the state is the person, the state's got the authority over quarantine and stop movement. So (it's usually) state plans and exercises should be standardized to address these, (I think), I don't know (I just think it's going to) (unintelligible).

Woman: (To develop).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (I don't know) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (We've got) standardized (unintelligible) but it's going to be different.

Woman: (Unintelligible) (to me implies)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) when you, when recommending that states' plans and exercises should be...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And then I'll.

Woman: Okay, go ahead.

Man: Well, I, the idea of standardizing state plans is not going to happen.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (We figured that out).

Man: (But, now, like that's) why (it) stopped (unintelligible) (because I was waiting) until you were done writing and then see where it was going next...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (But that's) it's a nice idea but it's, for a lot of (different because it's) not going to happen.

Woman: Yes.

Man: To the extent possible I think is reasonable, you know, if you add that little...

Woman: And I think shared and (mutual, can be) mutually considered.

Man: USDA could facilitate the...

Man: And they are.

Man: Coordination...

Woman: Yes.

Man: Of state authorities over...

Man: They are.

Man: (As) I'm sure they are.

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And, you know, perhaps provide some guidance...

Man: (If state planning)...

Man: Or expertise...

Woman: Emergency planning.

Woman: (Unintelligible) planning (the right) or is it...

Man: Planning...

Man: Of...

Woman: Emergency planning or what do you (mean)?

Woman: Okay.

Man: Planning is, I think planning is fine.

Woman: Just planning.

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Say that's) stakeholder emergency planning.

Man: Industry (unintelligible).

Woman: (Say it on) industry...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (I mean) if you look at that that kind of addresses both question one and question four because you talk, they talk about what...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: I mean...

Man: Yes.

Woman: They restated it as...

Woman: Right.

Woman: Do we specific recommendations or what should they do so.

Woman: Somewhere in the response to the questions about starting movement again, you know, in between if we stop everything on day one, and I still would like to address the issue that without appropriate premise ID and animal ID the goals of Phase one are difficult to accomplish.

Woman: Well this is (the our) (unintelligible), (you know, as long we've)...

Woman: (We've had) for years now which is it depends what you mean by...

Woman: Or may be difficult to accomplish.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Well, it all depends on what you mean by appropriate because, you know, if we go back to the (unintelligible) plan when FMD was used (as), allowed the justification for the (NAIS) plan, (well), the arguments we made is you actually don't need to know where that animal's been for the last three years, you know?

That you're dealing with an animal ID system that's going to be creating far more data than could ever be possibly be useful in something like an FMD outbreak (where) what you're worried about is where has this animal been for the last ten days. And so...

Woman: (Right, so) I would like to (use)...

Woman: (Like AI is) an example, we didn't know where the chickens where in New York and then they had their outbreak and we said, in New York we said oh my God, we don't know where our chickens (unintelligible).

Woman: I mean...

Woman: I'm not...

Woman: (We knew where the few) Commercial (farms are)...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: And so, you know, we need to know where our animals are and that's what I mean with premise ID. I'm not talking about being able to trace the animal for three years but if we have an outbreak here, if I need to know what to do in 96 hours I need to know how many animals are in that zone, and if that's not even done they can't accomplish the goals of phase one.

Woman: But how often does the premises ID have to get updated, how often if it's a small holders (as), you know, at one point they had poultry and then they had sheep, or they - I'm talking about sort of the realistic.

But you - and again this one of our issues is sort of you can put this thing in paper, (I'm not) - let me back up. There is a role for animal ID, I'm not saying there (isn't) but to me the details of it are important both for the burden that's placed on (the) individual.

And whether it's useful because one of the things we kept pointing out was okay, so you get everyone to sign up their premises particularly if you're talking about needing to know where every backyard operator is, that changes

fast and people who started with poultry then add sheep and (no), they don't necessarily realize that they need to update that premises ID to add sheep.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Well, (if) they gave up on their sheep and they sell those sheep...

Woman: (Unintelligible) (yes).

Woman: Because they come in (unintelligible).

Woman: (So) you show up and there's no sheep there and you cross them off the list, you know. I mean...

Woman: But that's the case when you don't have premises ID too. I mean, that, you can put, get word out - I'm trying to remember, I don't remember what the outbreak was but I was talking with (what), you know, our, one of our vets who was involved in the outbreak - equine, sorry, not happening.

And the way they did it and the problem was like how do you identify every single backyard horse owner because, again, (it's moot), they got out word over the radio with (those feed), you know, feed stores and all of these venues we've talked about and every horse owner had a, you know, put up a flag at the front of their property and so they were easy to spot and find.

(That), we're going to have to, there's going to be difficulty finding people and I don't know that creating a massive database of premises that automatically becomes outdated pretty quickly is the answer.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Max): (It wasn't supposed to) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) there might be what we use it for on the Navajo nation, we have no fences.

Woman: Yes

Woman: We have to know where those animals are and it's wide open range. So what we use it for is a tool to help us with (unintelligible). So we're going to have a hot spot, warm, cold and where everybody's going to be.

(We'd) be able to say okay, this is where it is, this is the circle, we have an inventory of this many (families) plus or minus so many sheep, (that keep) (unintelligible) an idea of what you're going to be dealing with (unintelligible) and it's just a good idea to have some ID, and it's faster, it's quicker, (if you use a) lot of tools (than) trying to go backwards.

Woman: Well, one of the thing we, I mean we have, I think it was two or three sessions ago, probably three by now, you know, for an analysis of whether prem ID (is) - I get the theory, okay, I get the theory.

My argument is I don't know that it plays out that well in practice and our concern, one of the concerns from our folks has been putting resource and reliance on a system that doesn't play out well and that, you know, in practice (that we asked) - I think three committee meetings ago - for USDA to do a study and look at how - because the swine industry has prem ID...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Pretty solidly, you know, what (would role that plays) in the CED outbreak.
How does this really play out...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You know, (and)...

Woman: (Annette) (has got a)...

Woman: (Unintelligible)...

Man: (Unintelligible) In Washington state (about) ten years (unintelligible) took
more than two weeks (and a half, that was in north) (unintelligible)
Washington (unintelligible) where the chickens were.

Man: Yes,

Man: And (really regardless what should) be a really good thing to know where, (or)
try to know where the chickens are. Not only that (just) looking for the
chickens you might find other animals (that) you wanted to, you know, to
catalog more future breakouts

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: That will (hurt) anything to (unintelligible).

Woman: (Dan), you had your...

(Dan): No, I was just going to again, point back to the Michigan experience with TB
and it's a whole lot different than FMD, don't get me wrong, but we have

individual animal ID and that's more important primarily in a chronic disease where disease can spread...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Because that's in our area).

(Dan): But certainly the premise ID has been really important in maintaining the infection of TB in northeast Michigan because when an infected farm is found immediately folks can get to all the farms that are susceptible to TB and do follow-ups. So similar to what (Belinda) said, I mean to me it's critical and especially critical in a fast moving disease like foot and mouth disease. (What's) critical with TB because it's slow moving...

Woman: You have time to find to them.

(Dan): Yes, you got time - (but), well, you know, it's funny...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Dan): When we first had TB in Michigan it took more than six months to find all the farms.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Dan): Now, you know, they weren't out there running the roads, you know, but they were out there looking for the farms, it took them a long time to find all the farms, and with foot and mouth disease you might as well, you know, you might...

Man: (Yes).

Man: (Well)...

(Dan): Cash it in.

Woman: (And I just)...

Man: Well, I'm just wondering if at what point too we're talking about ID, I mean, you know, you can have urbanites with a backyard flock of, you know, four animals, is that going to be a premises because I'll go back to the exotic Newcastle outbreak in California...

Man: Yes.

Man: They had a tremendous difficulty in getting that under control...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Because of the illegal cock fighting operations that weren't reported and weren't going to be reported. It took them quite a while to get into those yards, find where those birds were and get them...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Euthanized because they may have known where they were but they didn't have a way to actually get on the property to do anything about it because they couldn't prove that they were there.

Man: (Sure) (unintelligible).

Man: So you're never going to have...

Man: You're not going to get 100% compliance...

Man: But...

Man: Especially in these small...

Man: Sure.

Man: You know, like if I've got three or four animals...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I'm not going to think about it.

Man: (Unintelligible) illegal (unintelligible), illegal (unintelligible) (are use the) same...

Man: But even if the, but even in a backyard situation, you know, if I'm living in town, I've got three or four chickens in my backyard because I like to get the eggs and I just like to watch them run around (unintelligible) (and I) come across my desk I'm never going to hear about this.

Woman: (Charles).

(Charles): (Unintelligible) this premise ID thing is (probably), premise ID thing may be a good (program) but I think that may be a state by state decision. In New Mexico...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Charles): (We don't have) premise ID...

Man: (Unintelligible) right now.

(Charles): But every brand inspection is done has a GPS coordinates attached to it.

Woman: (That is a)...

(Charles): Now not every...

Woman: Premise ID.

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (That is a) premise...

Man: Yes.

(Charles): But not every rancher knows that (because)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Well, his)...

Woman: (He knows that the ranch inspection)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Charles): (Unintelligible) brand coordinates attached to every brand inspection...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Charles): So you know where to go back to if there's a problem in New Mexico.

Woman: (Yes).

(Charles): So...

(Annette): (But this isn't)...

Woman: Go ahead (Annette).

(Annette): Sorry I was, I had a technical difficulty there for a little bit but I was listening. I agree. So you absolutely, having gone through four different (avian is one the) outbreak, the exotic Newcastle outbreak and TB, you cannot respond quickly and you cannot remove, move product without accurate prem IDs especially in today's world of barcoding lab samples.

But on the other hand I agree with the other comments that, you know, bad data is worse than having no data. So outdated backyard flock data, we don't even use our exotic Newcastle data, it's a waste of time and effort of all those backyards. So, but, an intelligent premises ID program that is able to maintain as much as possible current data I think would be very reasonable to support.

Woman: Define intelligent.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Well, I) (unintelligible).

Man: (No).

Woman: That's what, and, (Annette), I appreciate your comments on both, you know, on the full set of comments you just made and it somewhat goes back again to where I started with (Belinda)'s comment which was what appropriate. What I worry about is making a recommendation that we should do appropriate premises ID or an (intel) because the devil is in the details on this.

It is what does this really mean and doing it badly is, A, not going to be that useful in an outbreak and B, going to get you a hell of lot of lack of cooperation and active opposition from a lot of small holders. And I'm not, don't get (unintelligible) on, yes, you like, no, you don't. (I), it's what's going to happen. We saw it (and) we know it.

So, you know, if there is, if people wanted to get into at a time where we had a lot more time to really talk about (it) what does it, you know, (Charlie)'s comments about a state-level program and variations about what can work at the state level and what has worked well at the state level, I don't feel good about making a recommendation about appropriate or (intel), you know, it's too wide, it's too open to (interp) (unintelligible).

Woman: So is there a way to have an outcome-based recommendation, you know, that doesn't say every premise should be identified but the, in an effective, you

know, these are the, some of the pieces of an effective program, and it would be the ability to find where animals are, you know, and that's outcome based, it doesn't say the only way to find animals is...

Man: Through premises...

Woman: Through Premises ID.

Man: So what's the direction...

Woman: (Go ahead)...

Man: Sorry (I thought) (unintelligible).

Woman: (No), go ahead.

Man: The direction that we are moving (in) I think there is to get your - we realize that premises ID will make us quicker in getting to places, we also realize it's never going to be 100% so we're always going to have to go door to door.

We are working toward tying premises ID towards the movement (unintelligible), (and) if you want to be considered to move milk, to move cattle, to move eggs, you better give me a premises ID before the disaster starts because once it starts I don't have the time to get to (you).

Woman: Right.

Man: And so you, (and) so that's how we're moving forward. We started with our dairy industry...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And they did it. (No), if you want to be able to move milk as quickly as possible, you better have a premises ID. If not, that's okay, it's your option, we're still going to come door to door and find you eventually but you won't be able to move milk because we can't get (unintelligible).

Woman: (Or) (unintelligible).

Man: (And) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Broilers that are)...

Man: And so we're, that's, where we're moving that direction because (I guess) there is a, that's one, there are probably 50 other ways because there are a bunch of other states...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: But there are ways to get premises ID done.

(Annette): (Unintelligible) so maybe we should use the (word)...

Man: (But listen), it's never going to be 100% but...

(Annette): Maybe...

Man: Go ahead, (Annette), sorry.

(Annette): Maybe we should use the word voluntary because that's what we're doing also, you know, if you want to move any product you need a prem ID.

Woman: Yes, (and you see our) folk's response is that doesn't sound voluntary. I hear what you're saying, I'm not disagreeing with you.

Man: (Okay) (unintelligible).

Woman: (But the)...

Woman: (It's a) (unintelligible).

Woman: (You'll have to get them angrier) by using voluntary in that context.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It's like...

Woman: (Is the) farmers market is going to be shut down?

Woman: (Quite possibly), so...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So what I'm saying is this, but you brought up a variation, (Charlie) brought up a variation (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: My point is there are ways to discuss how to find animals (but) simply saying we should have premises ID, I like where (Liz) was going (I'd go, I'd say) not maybe (types) because part of it is going to be communication, part of it is do we create better communication outlets where people have open concept communications with smallholder network where they'd be easier and quicker to find?

Woman: (Yes).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: You know, there is lots of pieces that go into being able to find animals quickly.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: So the ability to (quick), you know...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I'm trying to think of how to phrase it...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: But I like the outcome.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Max): (Unintelligible) (all these) (unintelligible) (you have numbers in) every square mile that you have a farm or a ranch what is the reason that all the

(unintelligible) farmers (will) because they (unintelligible) (the numbers are) right there, you know? It's a big difference in the (duplication on the) large farms.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: To the little (unintelligible) (that real for) chicken but (it) clearly must be a way to (figure that all out).

Man: Well not everybody uses FSA and some don't do it on very specific I don't trust the government at all and I don't want them having a number...

(Max): Right, I know that but...

Man: (On me)...

(Max): (You don't raise the pigs)...

Man: And...

(Max): They will come (unintelligible) (yes).

Man: And, you know, kind of getting back to this point that we talked about where this is more of a state-level issue when we start talking about premise ID, we've got this already basically on the books, you know, state, if you want to move anything in interstate commerce you have to be identifiable.

Man: Yes.

Man: I've got to be able to trace back. And so it's, the basic nuts and bolts are there and they're coming into place and I think that really that's going to be something that's going to be left at the state level because that's where it currently is.

And whether it's a brand which is useable or whether it's the Scrapie program which is what the sheep and goat people are going to be using or some other method, those kinds of things are sort of in place and growing in (unintelligible) as we speak and, you know...

Woman: (Right).

Man: Kind of getting back to the question about...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: How long do you have to keep that data, you know, that (three), we're really focusing on FMD here right now but having that...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Long term data allows for going back to look at a TSE, should there be a TSE outbreak. So there is a reason to have that long-term data on hand. It's not, we're not just addressing FMD.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So, yes, I know you know but I just wanted to get that...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: I'm just saying that after the incidence in (Annette) (gave) that's not when you want to build your rolodex.

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (No).

Woman: Because (this said), and if you look at this list what's got to be accomplished in Phase one, I mean this is our federal plan, this is how they're going to be listed. Phase one, they're going to transition to phase two (with a) goal of less than four days, (that's) 96 hours.

And they're supposed to (balance the control zone), they're supposed to know how many animals (they have), they're supposed to enforce all the biosecurity protocols (that are there), they're supposed to activate the veterinary stock pile which requires knowing the numbers of animals, and whatever we can do to have that rolodex built before the outbreak (is that's) all I'm saying that this is...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Whatever way we can (file down), whatever ways we can get everybody to trust that that's what this information is for and that we need to find the animals, we need to be able to (count them).

Woman: So is what we've got up there realizing that it's a very controversial topic, can we all agree on the statements that the effectiveness of response is tied to the ability to quickly find animals?

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (actually).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And count them, not (just) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, I'm just keeping it as (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Woman: (They don't get) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) I'm (doing) my minutes...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (So to) make everybody (happy too).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And you're doing it well (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You) got 100, (you get one) (unintelligible) (how much you talking)
(unintelligible) (yes).

Woman: Okay, so one of the things...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: That question is you want to get into (pissyness)...

Woman: (Yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: (And ask is)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Once) secure food supply is a priority to implement and I really think, I'm going...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (To express this strongly) in here that it just depends on the, where the outbreak is...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: And what the susceptible populations are.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: That's not a proper question.

Woman: (It is), yes.

Woman: (No).

Woman: Is it in a major area with pork? Is it a major area...

Man: (That's not an)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (It's not an appropriate question).

Woman: I think you implement them all, that's what their purpose is and each has its own guidelines for how they're implemented and they really aren't prioritized.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (No, if they're going to be)...

Woman: (Before we put) (unintelligible).

Man: (Maybe them are) (unintelligible) (or actually we get), you know, people.

Woman: (Unintelligible) people are (going to do that) (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: The sheep and goat people are going to borrow the beef plan and (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (to say produce and) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And that's the question (it's a word together)...

Man: (Unintelligible) you're going to have to (move it)...

Woman: (That people have been doing)...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Simultaneously (unintelligible).

Woman: Simultaneously...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Well)...

Woman: (Well, make more cheese).

Woman: (Unintelligible) yes.

Woman: Now I (think) (unintelligible) (tired).

Man: (Parts,) is that part of their plan?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: You know...

Woman: (They were animal)...

Man: (For us) a lot of ours are...

Woman: (Like) (unintelligible).

Man: Very small because they want to stay...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: For fear that (they're breaking or)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (well)...

Man: (On a greater)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (If there are regulations)...

Woman: Okay, question three...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Priority (for) vaccine use...

Man: (And they don't want to)...

Woman: (Those) guys are going to say beef.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: You know, (depend, but), yes, this falls under the, you know, I think we've said this already, maybe we just say it explicitly which is, you know, it depends, you know, if a suppressive vaccination strategy is likely to succeed in stopping the spread then that probably should be the priority. If it's not then the priority (perhaps is) protecting, you know, breeding stock and important, you know, key herds and genetic resources, we don't know.

Woman: I think that goes back to the (you called, captured) that statement that (it's) the decision of the (industry)...

Woman: (The command)...

Woman: (Command).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: To minimize the expansion of the type of the outbreak and the impact on...

Man: Genetics and protein.

Woman: Everything...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: (Has) impact on all the producer groups (then).

Woman: Do we want to reiterate how long (it's going to) take to get the (vaccine)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (But if I) think the question...

Woman: (It could be developed)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think the question (that)...

Woman: (What you asking us this)...

Man: Should have asked was...

Woman: When you don't have vaccine.

Man: How are we going to get the money for the vaccine (unintelligible).

Woman: I mean...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (That's) cutting to the chase.

Man: (Yes).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Why are you asking us this)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Nothing is getting done).

Man: How are we going to get funding to have an adequate vaccine (unintelligible).

Woman: (You're not), well actually it's not, we could do it somewhat (subtly) in that question which is part of the answer would depend on the amount of vaccine available.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And the availability of (vaccine)...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible) (works for the vaccine).

Woman: So number four we already answered for...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Number five, do we have any recommendations regarding the classification of phases and types and I felt like (John Zack) was asking us to discuss whether it needed to be more granular, and I don't know if, you know, I don't know if he wants to say that...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Type two is when it's less than X number of herds (rather) than a small (you know), or regional or, you know...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So I guess...

Man: (But he's going to be) rewriting (it) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Given)...

Man: (That) (unintelligible), (right)?

Woman: Well, I can't remember (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, (he did) something around the (index), that was (the 13) documents.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (Given) your...

Woman: I think it's...

Woman: Given your response to the comments about what if they haven't gotten to animals until they're recovering...

Woman: (Yes) (Unintelligible).

Woman: I would, my one comment about the granularity of the plan might be that that scenario hasn't really been incorporated in the plan and needs to be incorporated in the plan that if you have animals that were infected and may be recovering what do you with them?

Woman: How does that play into deciding also...

Woman: Can they...

Woman: What type of outbreak is it.

Woman: Can they be vaccinated? Do they have to be tested? Do they have to be stamped out? What do you do with animals that might actually be...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Recovering)...

Woman: Recovering.

Woman: (And no one's)...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Prior to disposal or vaccination.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Now), when you're saying that (you, are you presuming that) the index case is already recovering because it...

Woman: No.

Woman: No.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I guess what I'm, and the reason I ask is if I'm thinking that if we get to the point...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Other than the simple focal (this)...

Man (Unintelligible).

Man: Vaccine is your first option.

Man: (Unintelligible) (type of)...

Man: So we're not probably looking at stamping out as a first option if the outbreak is big enough that hey, I can't really get in there until they're already recovered.

Woman: (Right, but)...

Man: But if it's your index case that (just) may be (the) unique thing that nobody can talk about (but if it is)...

Woman: Well, what's it's not the index case but two weeks in you got a 10,000 cow dairy or you got thirty 10,000 cow dairies in New Mexico...

Man: (No), not in New Mexico.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Take) New York.

Woman: (Unintelligible) Hawaii.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And (manpower) or otherwise (you) never got to them...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Do you vaccinate them then? (They've been infected, they), that the, (maybe they're) clear of virus...

Man: (That's a)...

Woman: (And maybe their) antibodies (unintelligible).

Man: That's a question for the immunologist I think.

Woman: Yes, that (but)...

Man: (I mean, you know don't).

Woman: It's not in the (plan)...

Woman: But it's...

Man: What's going to happen...

Man: (Try not to think)...

Woman: Because the assumption has always been all infected animals would get stamped out and the vaccine would be used either to (sustain) it or to protect the rest.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And nobody has said well, what to do with animals that...

Man: Are on the road to recovery.

Woman: On the road to recovery that are, that were infected.

Woman: Which goes, (wait), which is a pretty important thing also on like (when we've) got limited vaccine supply, you know, are we going to mess with these guys and, or kill them completely unnecessarily.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Well, the other thing is is I think that in that situation not only do we need immunologists to consider but what are the welfare implications because if you have recovering animals that still can't eat because their tongues are (shuffling) or they're crawling on their...

Woman: (Or) lost a hoof or...

Woman: On their knees to the feeders and I don't care if (they're spewing) virus or not they need to be humanely...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: (Euthanized).

Woman: And they should (deserve) indemnity.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Even if they're no longer viremic, there's that issue as well.

Woman: (Right), the indemnity associated with killing them once they're no longer infectious.

Woman: I think we've just written a whole new book for them.

Woman: Well, they wanted input.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: The upside to that is it that, you know, the initial plans are usually just kind of (etch a sketch can) and then as you have time to think about it over several years it becomes better (flushed) out and you're going to cover...

Man: (More)...

Man: Of the basics.

Woman: (Unintelligible) (yes).

Man: Yes.

Man: And I don't think that's a problem.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Okay)...

Woman: I was (going to) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Granular.

Man: Granular.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (I don't) know because I (feel one grain), we can stamp this one out and (grain two), we have to vaccinate everything and we can't do it so.

Woman: (Unintelligible)...

Woman: Yes.

Man: You go straight from one to five.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Or one to throw up your hands.

Woman: (And)...

Man: Well, (and then) (unintelligible).

Woman: (We don't have to expect) (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Woman: But that's (not)...

Man: (You're right).

Woman: (As we're) giving them (unintelligible) of things to keep in mind if we're in that situation (unintelligible) on how to minimize...

Man: Reduce the...

Man: (Belinda), just back to your (idea), and something was firing in my brain about carrier animals of FMD and we do know, and I just went and checked actually the Iowa state (guidance), we know that the virus can show up in animals that are recovering for as long as six months...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And maybe even longer it just depends on the species (there)...

Woman: They can shed?

Woman: Depending on the species, right?

Man: No, not necessarily shedding but they can detect it and nobody knows how important they are actually in the potential...

Woman: Right.

Man: Transmission but...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: The question is do you want to take that chance...

Woman: Right.

Man: Of a recovering animal...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Being a source of reinfection, (and)...

Woman: Wow.

Woman: (Well, that's and) does the vaccine eliminate that or not...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: I don't know if we know that.

Woman: Actually, someone tell me if I'm wrong but I don't think they even touch on the issue of wildlife carriers and what that means to the type of outbreak. Like, you know, if this outbreak happened in an area where there's a (plum) of feral

hogs, even if it's a focal, out, you know, just a couple of premises, it may already be out of control pretty quickly.

And that (leaves), I'm not saying, you know, there needs to be something that they need to have that as part of their epidemiology and assessment of their phases unless someone's (unintelligible) I missed.

Woman: There, some of the plans are relying on the fact that wildlife have not...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Proven to be a...

Man: A source of (transmission).

Woman: A main means of transmission...

Woman: Right.

Woman: In outbreaks that have happened in other countries, and so they hope against hope (if) that will be true in the United States as well.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (But) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) I always, you know, I have this thing for feral hogs because like...

Woman: Yes, (in) Africa they sustain it.

Man: (Unintelligible) (I was going to say) because if hogs are such great, you know, virus factories I'd be surprised if feral hogs...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Seen it).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: No, (well, and one)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: The hopes is that they (were get those pigs)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (That they can)...

Woman: (Because they will)...

Man: (Unintelligible) (feral there)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (And to say feral)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: In Africa...

Man: You know, (in) Africa (is nice).

Man: (Well there's)...

Man: There's plenty of...

Man: (Lots of) feral hog (unintelligible).

Man: Wild hog...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (together)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: An endemic issues already and so...

Woman: I don't think we (got all the) answers to that.

Man: (Unintelligible) (got a reserve) as well.

Woman: So is that...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Did we capture that (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (wilds hogs), or the wild hogs were carrying (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: I think that we also have to recognize that if we get into a type three or greater that even if we have vaccine, do we have the other resources, human resources...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (The equipment) to deal with that?

Woman: I think (we've got)...

Man: (I think) (unintelligible).

Woman: (That all set up)...

Man: In the vaccination section...

Woman: (Okay, well)...

Man: That they need (unintelligible) (an assessment) of what it would take.

Man: (What will it take)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Well that's a)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (I actually think a) lot of that...

Woman: Yes.

Man: Ten years ago.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Man: So if some of that's been done maybe revisiting it at the industry...

Woman: (What)? I couldn't hear you, say it again.

Man: (Kim Hollinger) did exactly that for the entire U.S.

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible), maybe (not) a decade ago, maybe it's time to revisit some of it - I know she's gone from where she was but...

Woman: I didn't know, she's not at (Davis) anymore?

Man: (She was at) (unintelligible) yes, I think she's moved from...

Woman: Okay,

Man: From what position she was in but it, point being that maybe it's time to revisit that and have demographic and the industries (unintelligible) that those numbers have changes the human resource calculation (unintelligible) out there.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (See if I can find her).

Man: (Unintelligible) California (there, is it) moved in that time period?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) anymore.

Man: I don't know how...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And North Dakota.

Man: St. Louis (Unintelligible).

Man: (And)...

Woman: Well, I think you've crossed off A.

Woman: I didn't.

Man: (Yes, you did).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) did you do.

Woman: (Unintelligible) do.

Man: (I don't think) (unintelligible).

Woman: I know (I don't) need to figure out how to reject it...

Woman: (Go to) (unintelligible).

Man: Because...

Woman: (Unintelligible) yes.

Man: (You really backwards from where you last have changed).

Woman: No, I just to need (to do the)...

Woman: Right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Format it) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (change) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And then reject.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: There we go.

Woman: Now...

Woman: Okay.

Man: You know, (Patrick), do we want to make that statement 23 strains and, you know, 40 million doses? So I think what, who was our industry expert the other day was talking more about (unintelligible) (filter) types and like 25 million doses.

Woman: That wasn't the industry expert, that was (T.J.)'s

Man: (USDA) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: That that's what they were thinking of...

Man: But I, yes.

Woman: Dr. (Rock)'s paper and what (was) testified at House Ag Committee is the 23
(zero types) and surge capacity up to 40 million doses.

Man: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (And may want to do is)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Appropriate but it could be less)...

Man: Yes.

Woman: (I know).

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Does that) (unintelligible) (you know, we had a side) conversation and indicated that, you know, (each take) \$150 million and run with it right now...

Woman: (No, I'm) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (managing) so it could but less costly.

Woman: Right.

Woman: (What we're) trying to get out (maybe we need to spell it out better) but the discussion around what led to point A was let's at least get that information like...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) should get that (unintelligible) and then maybe (it's only) a ten strain bank so maybe, you know...

Woman: (Yes).

Man: And having a hard numbers to present to...

Man: Right.

Man: Somebody and say this what we really have to have...

Woman: Yes.

Man: To do what we really need to do.

Woman: And that will give us that...

Man: (And then anything) we scale back on is going to...

Man: (It's better)...

Man: Yes.

Man: (Good).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Agreed.

Man: (Cool).

Woman: Okay, (so, yes, there's the, and) Human resources, does that cover what (Pam) was doing?

Man: (Right)...

Man: (Well) (unintelligible).

Woman: So under point...

Woman: (All under)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Stock pile)?

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: And it's not just to admit (it so the vaccine is) do everything around...

Woman: Yes.

Man: Manage (unintelligible).

Woman: Control on the...

Man: Deliver...

Woman: Outbreak...

Woman: (It's) testing, evaluating animals, (mutating every)...

Man: (Disposal)...

Woman: (Disposal).

Man: I guess the question (do these respond to generic and)...

Woman: (Can I), just so, I mean part of this was (though) specific to vaccine, like this was our section...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: On vaccination.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So we're emphasizing.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You might want to add it under two...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Like make sure you have...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Human resources, et cetera, et cetera.

Woman: Yes, you're right.

Woman: (Right), we want to (keep them on vaccine)...

Woman: (Just like) (unintelligible).

Man: Well I think maybe even before that because they're not going to be able to go to Congress and say hey, we need, you know, (an) extra 7000 people to go out and do this but certainly if they can determine, they can get an estimate of the number of people they would need and then start looking at contingencies for where they would find those people in the event of such an emergency.

Man: Yes.

Man: And, you know, whether that would involve...

Woman: (It's not) (unintelligible).

Man: Drafting every private veterinary in the country to come out...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And do this or having the...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: National Guard show up or whatever it happens to be...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: They need to, they can do the determination but they're not going to be able to go get and...

Woman: (Yes).

Man: And have these people just...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: All sitting there and in offices waiting on standby for the FMD outbreak.

Man: (I bet they're)...

Man: And (we're coming in there) because it's important. They're doing some of that (with the) national veterinary stockpile and having trained third party...

Woman: (And) (unintelligible).

Man: Contractors that they can bring in to...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Depopulation...

Woman: (These are not get along)...

Man: (The) vaccine delivery and other stuff. So (that), they're working on that...

Man: Yes.

Man: It's not going to be employees or...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (No, it could) (unintelligible).

Man: (No) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Can I ask a question particularly of the stakeholders at the table, and I'm sorry (that) (John LeBueter)'s (not) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (So I asked a) question when we were asked for topics for this meeting and (I talked) a little, little about it where are the stakeholder groups on the topic of having some kind of a farm animal disease disaster insurance program kind of like crop insurance but for like (something, like is) that being discussed, I...

Woman: (Where)...

Woman: (Or did) the avian industry discussing it (for) like what we do if we had to respond to this again, we lost \$3 billion...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Is that on (this) table with the various stakeholder groups?

Man: (Maybe)...

Woman: (For)...

Man: Privately, some people (maybe they)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I don't think you can get it privately.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I don't think it's available.

Woman: Yes, for pork (we'd) asked in the last Farm Bill to initiate a study for, that would assess you, (you know), what it would cost and what it would like for USDA to develop a (unintelligible) what we're calling catastrophic livestock insurance similar to what crop insurance is.

And they did listening sessions throughout the United States last summer. I haven't seen a final report, you know, we were told that actually getting it in a (unintelligible) a new insurance program in the last Farm Bill would have been...

Woman: Impossible.

Woman: Impossible, but we, they at least did the study and then you can build on it. So I think there's interest, you know...

Woman: Is there any interest from private insurances to offer anything like that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Absolutely not.

Woman: It's kind of like trying...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: To get lightening insurance on a herd, we can't afford it.

Man: Yes, (when)...

Woman: Because the, it's too expensive, you can lose 10 or 12 head...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Before you even think of trying to pay anything. I mean it's just...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: It's just astronomical.

Man: And you see the same thing with the current disaster program, you know, for, it's drought really. If you have X number of days of drought you can apply for, but the cost of purchasing the insurance and then the indemnity that you receive once you actually activate that it's absolutely not worth doing. No, we can't get anyone to sign up and we've been asked over and over again by USDA please go out and, you know, talk to producers, have them sign up.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: It's just not worth it, and so this would be even more money, more catastrophic and it would not be economically feasible.

Woman: Unless the insurance were highly subsidized like crop insurance is.

Woman: (They)...

Woman: (Could be)...

Woman: Almost never used.

Woman: Yes, they're almost never used.

Man: Well, that's what the...

Woman: (But, and that's the)...

Man: Recurrent livestock program is. If you've got grazing livestock it's a federal program but...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Yes).

Man: You still have to pay in and the amount you'd have to pay in is so high that, you know, if you do use, even if you do use it what you get back is just not, it's not worth doing.

Woman: Unless they've changed, you know, crop insurance to the, what we pay now is (just)...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Well), the other thing, the current livestock insurance, you know, you can sign up for 12 hours a month and you can't have a heard of more than, I don't know, 3000 animals. So, you know, for the larger scale pig industry it's not accessible to them at all.

Woman: (No).

Woman: Okay, you guys...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Like feel like you've been whipped because I'm wondering if we should...

Woman: We've got 45 more minutes.

Woman: Well, (this, I'm) wondering if do we want to go...

Man: Yes

Woman: All 45...

Woman: (Get it over with)...

Man: (Unintelligible) (we've been whipped).

Woman: Over there aren't they.

Man: (Yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (I'm not going to say) so (seriously) I don't think it's realistic for us to think that we're going to (get) a different set of recommendations in 45 minutes.

Woman: No.

Woman: So I mean we do still need to do some housekeeping on like so how do we go from here.

Woman: Right.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: So are folks good with FMD (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: (Unintelligible). (Okay).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Housekeeping. So (Judith) and I can take FMD, try to put it in a reasonable order, add some verbiage around...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You know, what I think the concepts are that we captured and e-mail it out as a hardcore report from this committee meeting for further wordsmithing. You know, last time we tried to do subgroups and track changes and I think that was so confusing because people would track changes on top of somebody else's track changes and you lost track changes...

Woman: And we're further along than we were.

Woman: Yes, and we are further along...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: And so I think what...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We'd like to do, what I, my view is unless somebody really objects that we send out a (quote) to, you know, a pretty complete report and you suggest back edits, you know, and if we get widely disparate edits, you know, that are, you know, polar opposites then we'll have to, you know, we'll have to figure out to deal with it either on a phone call or through e-mails.

Woman: When you say suggest back edits what format would you like that in?

Woman: (Yes), (Milly), can I just (unintelligible) I would (just) suggest that you'll find the same problem if you've got 20 members kind of, you know, editing one document and I (would) really suggest (when I'm doing the) subgroups (but) we can set up a series of calls and potentially do this.

I mean where you see the document and (we) just go through it just like we (unintelligible) and we do it in less time, you know, and if there needs to further conversation we can do it on the call, and one person can (committed) but and it just (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, so can we...

Woman: (And plan that you and then)...

Woman: I was going to say can we put it together and see how many, how much comment we get back.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Sure you can do that) (unintelligible).

Woman: You know, and then we can decide if we a need a call...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Phone call.

Woman: You know...

Man: (Yes).

Man: (That's fine, right)...

Woman: I think that, you know, we when we had tried to have calls on some of those subgroups before you wouldn't get anybody who'd get on the call...

Woman: Actually no, the subgroups that we did get participation but...

Woman: (Did you really? I know mine didn't).

Woman: It's so tedious...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It's a tedious process and, you know, some people (miss it then they don't)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Come back (request)...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (And they comment, they just, let's just) get everybody on same time, get it done...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And then you can (slow down) (unintelligible) (step)

Woman: (Right), well...

Woman: (And me) - oh, I'm sorry.

Woman: And I do have a (unintelligible), I did propose a, (was a) back up schedule.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: Schedule.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Okay, and I do want to (say), you know, to be inclusive for the new members of the committee (we sort of have) gotten through this multiple times in the previous slide. When we walk out of here today there's an, there is an agreement on the substance of these FMD things.

We can wordsmith, we can make sure that someone (does), like I don't (know), think that's clear where this is coming from, we can do all of that but if we're going to change the substance, or for these recommendations where we haven't gone through this sort of in depth we're going to have to do public meetings.

Woman: (Right).

Woman: Which is either out meeting in September or a publically-noticed meeting on the phone. We can do a phone call (but it), we're going to have to (a) lead time of publically noticing it so...

Woman: Right.

Woman: We just had to go through that a (lot).

Woman: So, yes, and so what I, what I did hear, (okay), so we've got our next big (phase)...

Woman: (And we) (unintelligible).

Woman: The next one's possible public teleconference, and we can make the call on that sometime in April. I need a six week lead time to lock down the call and do what needs to be done for notice but (we), so that's the thing, (if) we want, if we need to do another call, if we want to put new recommendations, add new language...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: To what we already have...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We need a six week lead time to plan that call.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And that's the short time. I mean really...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I need two months. So we can make the call on whether we need a public teleconference (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Woman: You know, maybe some time in next month. I think we will.

Man: (All right), yes.

Woman: So we can just plan it...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We've got lots of stuff to talk about in a call. I mean, you know, we can just plan it and (but you guys), what did you get through today...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: FMD?

Woman: Well, you know...

Woman: (Which) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: AMR.

Woman: No, (we) (unintelligible).

Woman: (But we haven't hit AMR).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: No,

Woman: (Yes), we did FMD.

Woman: We did. (We did the CWD).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (And we) got scrapie done.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (Scrapie done).

Woman: We've, well...

Woman: Okay.

Woman: Scrapie (means was one of the things)...

Woman: Okay.

Woman: But scrapie, you know, we made sure we had...

Woman: (Oh) (unintelligible).

Woman: All the concepts...

Woman: We probably could...

Woman: We also made sure...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We all the concepts...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: Under emerging diseases.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So that really, the big one...

Woman: Is going to be...

Woman: Is the traditional, non-traditional stakeholders which I don't know that we (even) have any new concepts, we went through those yesterday.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: I think we had quite a bit around that though.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Yes, we have quite a bit but I mean we can write the report without bringing new...

Man: Concepts.

Woman: Concepts in, and so I think the one that's probably going to take a significant amount of discussion time is probably going to AMR. And so I propose here...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Mid-March, first call.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: But are we going to be allowed to discuss AMR (substantively) on that call?

Woman: You will be able to expand on all, what you've already put down (unintelligible).

Woman: We have a lot (there).

Woman: Okay.

Woman: That's the easiest way to (do) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Okay).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: This is not a request...

Woman: Actually requested for the diseases. I mean they actually...

Woman: Right.

Woman: Have a list of diseases from a, which we did not...

Woman: Yes, we really...

Woman: And we got nailed on that one (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (But is that our role)?

Woman: Well, I don't know. It, you may just want to look at the list (and propose the draft list and see if things are okay).

Man: Is there something we're missing?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Woman: Because it's pretty (common) (unintelligible) (it's irrelevant to) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) yes.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: Which I didn't look at until after we had (unintelligible).

Man: (So I mean) still we're having...

Woman: Conversation.

Woman: But maybe that's something, (R.J.), could you provide the committee that (list), the - because I don't...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (NLRAD).

Woman: (NLRAD)?

Woman: Yes, (NLRAD), and that would be something that would have to be, if we do a call would have to be expanded on that call because we don't have some of those...

Woman: (Yes, we could)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (That we didn't discuss).

Woman: Do you have (that) you're going to (take care of it, to question the studies that)...

Woman: (The question is we need to look at NLRAD) and see...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: If there's stuff we think is missing.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I think then we (unintelligible).

Woman: (So definitely plan on the) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Let's just plan a May call.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, so in the meantime...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Do we want to have a call to further...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: To kind of touch on or just save if for the public call?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We don't want to do a lot on the (public call).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Why don't we do this, why don't...

Man: (It's at eight in the morning).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Why don't the chair and vice chair work on a, putting words around some of the concepts we have and a draft report that we could send out, and it may not (hap), I don't know how quickly it's going to happen (we), I think we can send FMD out fairly...

Man: Yes, we prioritize FMD as the first.

Woman: (You know), but the others may take a little longer and then we can decide do we need, do we have the substance we want in there and we just need to do some (re-editing) or do we actually have to wordsmith on a phone call and, you know...

Man: (And I expect plans will be made), there'll be some we don't and some we do...

Woman: Yes, exactly.

Woman: So let's plan the public call.

Woman: Right, exactly.

Woman: Actually, that's a very practical way to do it (to find a) team (unintelligible) team and share it, but when we you start getting a lot of (editing)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: That's when it gets a little...

Woman: Right, well, what I don't want to do that really screwed up at least (my) subgroups in the past is that if you start passing around versions...

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: You lose like (Michael) makes changes and (Charlie) comes around and changes (Michael)'s changes...

Man: Yes.

Woman: And you lose...

Woman: (You do that)...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: And we...

Woman: Yes, that messed up a couple...

Woman: We messed up a lot of (that) so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) farm...

Woman: (It was all) (Charlie)'s (fault).

Woman: (Poor) (Charlie).

Woman: So we agree that you guys will be (the) (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (I) (unintelligible).

Woman: (And that's what) (unintelligible) before.

Woman: Well, I'll send out this schedule in case you do want to, you know, have another...

Woman: (Well, see so)...

Woman: Well, have this available (unintelligible).

Woman: You said it's going to take six weeks so we're looking...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Into April before we'd be able to have one, right?

Woman: So I put (first), in the end of, possible (telephone) conference end of May.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (What)...

Woman: End of May.

Woman: End of May (sucks).

Woman: (With a question).

Woman: Okay. So...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (We) want the beginning of May.

Woman: I'd like the beginning of May...

Woman: So that's...

Woman: How does everyone feel?

Woman: Two months (that we)...

Woman: How about the first...

Woman: Are you guys good with that (or)...

Woman: One of the first two weeks of May, how does everyone feel about...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Conference call, okay. You're...

Woman: One afternoon call.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Yes, maybe)...

Woman: Yes, like a couple hours...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's right around commencement, final exams, that kind of thing.

Woman: AI season, cattle to grass...

Man: Yes.

Woman: How about even April 25, is that any better?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (It'd be) better in April than May.

Woman: Week of April 25?

Man: I can live with it. For me, but...

Woman: Either end of April or end of May.

Man: (Gee)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Well, actually I'll be giving my final exam that day so (unintelligible).

Man: Great

Man: From nine to ten I'll be giving a final.

Man: April.

Woman: (Could April) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (the Monday).

Man: (College) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You're out of the country.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Would Tuesday work (unintelligible).

Man: (Oh, there's) definitely (be) out of the country.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thursday, (the fourth)?

Woman: I don't think they (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Well), they think (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (I can think they are).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (A couple of us will be gone) May (or) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) they've got artificial insemination and other season but, and then, you know, later in May I'm out of the country from the 9th until the 30th.

Man: (Unintelligible) (you).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So the 9th of May until the 30th of May I'm out of the country.

Woman: First week of May I could do (but)...

Woman: How is the week of April 25?

Man: (Unintelligible) (you know)...

Woman: Like through that whole week, (the) 25 (unintelligible).

Woman: What's your...

Man: (A) logistical question...

Woman: Monday won't work (because it's)...

Man: Are we talking a full day, half a day...

Woman: No...

Woman: Two or three hours...

Woman: (Two or) three hours.

Woman: Couple hours.

Woman: (Yes), we've done full day call, (no more).

Woman: No.

Woman: No.

Woman: No.

Woman: (And no).

Woman: Four hour calls don't work...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Two hours is a max.

Woman: Two hour goal...

Man: During the day?

Woman: Three hours if we're really being (stupid).

Man: At night?

Woman: We'll (allow)...

Woman: Three hours.

Woman: (We'll)...

Woman: Same time.

Woman: You know.

Man: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible) discussion.

Man: I can't (unintelligible).

Woman: Are you gone that whole week?

Man: Yes.

Woman: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: The week of April 25?

Woman: The week of April (25)?

Woman: So we know we don't always get...

Man: You're never going to get everybody...

Woman: Get 100%.

Woman: Sure.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Attendance. So, you know...

Woman: So the very first week of May?

Woman: (Shoot for the best unless we have a) (unintelligible).

Woman: (The) week of May 2nd is open for me up until, well, up until that first, second, third, fourth and maybe even the morning on the fifth would probably work for me.

Woman: I can make that work.

Woman: Week of May 2?

Man: Yes.

Man: (May 2 would) (unintelligible).

Woman: May 2?

Man: What day of the week is that?

Woman: We haven't set on it yet.

Woman: Second is a Monday.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Second is the Monday.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Second is a Monday

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So we're looking Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Of that first week of May.

Man: (No) Wednesday.

Woman: No Wednesday? Monday or Tuesday, first week of May.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Sounds good.

Man: Going, going...

Man: Hang on let me pull up my academic calendar because I want to make sure, well...

Woman: I'll slow down.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, I'll...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (I'm just going to pull up the) calendar

Man: The second (is) better (than the first)...

Man: See...

Man: But I can make either one work.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: What dates I really have...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: To be available in May.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Max) will be there whenever you schedule.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So...

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: Let's see May third through sixth is (finally) (unintelligible), (final) will be done, spring commencement is May 7.

Woman: (Unintelligible) Thursday...

Woman: So I'll (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So May 2 or 3rd?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: So it does...

Woman: (The) second works better...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: May second?

Man: Either one is fine (unintelligible).

Woman: (We're saying votes) for May 2nd?

Man: (Second)

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: May 2 will work.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Max): May 2 (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Okay).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: May 2nd.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Just for now please block the whole day...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It will not be a whole day call but let's just.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And (unintelligible) (know)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (What, how) (unintelligible).

Woman: Want to discuss on that day and (then) (unintelligible) (to a)...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (A) subject matter folks we want to bring (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Slowly)...

Man: (Well).

Man: (All right).

Woman: That was less painful (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Yes).

Man: (Okay).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Now)...

Man: (But)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Much easier doing it with everyone in the same room.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It is.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: It's a whole different dynamic (unintelligible).

Woman: Sitting here (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (It's really)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, I know this works much, much (better).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Well).

Woman: Okay, so we're set on the next...

Man: (This brings back) (unintelligible).

Woman: Two dates.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Two dates, oh.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (The May first and) on the week of September 5th.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We've got a half hour (still).

Man: (Yes, I) (Unintelligible)...

Man: Well, we were supposed to have...

Woman: Did you want to tackle the charter or?

Man: Public comment (unintelligible).

Woman: (People) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: But I'm just (mentioning)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Publically one comment)?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I mean public comment (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (R.J.)?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Public comment, are we not supposed to take any last minute public...

Woman: Well...

Man: (Comments during this session).

Woman: There are no...

Man: Nobody on the call?

Woman: No one can be on the phone (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: That's fine, (just checking).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Well, we have the one very, 25-page comment that came in and I would share that electronically.

Man: Yes, please.

Woman: (It's long)...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Don't read it to us.

Man: (Can we hear this) (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And read it...

Man: (Effective) summary, whatever.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (phone call).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, I mean so maybe mention...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Remind people for the (chart), to read the charter and we can discuss it...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, we could (Unintelligible) the charter on...

Woman: (On them, and I'll get started)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Oh, that's better because I think that's better).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, it might be a rant.

Man: (Yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: And if it is, (if they're complaining)...

Woman: Somebody named (R.J. Cabrera's)...

Man: (They don't mind) (unintelligible) (well thought out).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's always welcomed (there).

Man: Oh, I would like...

Woman: (R.J. Cabrera's).

Man: But, you know...

Woman: (You know, e-mailing me)...

Man: (So that was) (unintelligible).

Man: (If it's an RCAP random) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (No, actually)...

Man: I can say it out loud (unintelligible).

Woman: (Looked at my) e-mail and see all these e-mails showing up...

Man: (In public) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Oh, (I didn't, I sent some)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: In the transcript...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Well, thought out, great.

Man: (Yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Sure).

Man: (Right) (unintelligible).

Man: If you're just going to rant at me...

Woman: (It's not focused).

Man: (It was all) (unintelligible).

Woman: Nothing wrong with (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (And if you've got some suggestions that have helped)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, (just want) (unintelligible).

Woman: (You just don't want to gripe)...

Man: (Yes) (unintelligible).

Woman: Talk to (yourself).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Okay).

Man: She'll hang out (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (During that)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay, I'm sending you the document...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (And) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (That was what we)...

Man: (I mean I)...

Woman: (I think the only one)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (That could get us there) (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Okay...

Woman: (Small and modest) (unintelligible).

Woman: (What is, what), tell what I need to do the (rest of)...

Woman: Okay, so do we have any last minute comments, we're going to wrap this up...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You did good).

Woman: (Do we) want to go around...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Everybody maybe give your ideas, your impressions of this meeting perhaps and...

Woman: No.

Woman: No.

Woman: Parting comments?

Man: May I ask a question?

Woman: (Unintelligible) yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) okay, and I'll, but I wanted to start with a question of how are the topics determined for this committee to take up?

Woman: Okay. So the agency always drives these...

Man: Okay.

Woman: We determine what goes on but our leadership...

Man: (Right).

Woman: (Has always wanted) to engage the committee and their stakeholders on what they (think) are important topics.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We take your suggestion and (we then), it goes to a review and a determination is made based on (what's top) important (and)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Well, I want to say that I, again, appreciate the opportunity to be part of this committee and very impressed with everyone and (the fine) leadership in running things, both you, (R.J.) and (Liz), for chairing the meeting.

I'm also encouraged that this process involves a constituency that I represent, and as much of a problem they may present for some of you, that is those involved with animal protection (we're), we really need to have a process where our government is seeking input from across section of interest. And it doesn't mean that it's always followed or taken but to be in the room, to be at the table (is) an important message that gets sent back out.

Some of you had a chance to interact with me personally and I think at least (is) my impression that you come, came to realize that I'm more alike most of you in this room than and the folks that you might have (been) encountered along the way and through time I hope that I will be able to add a positively to this process and thank you for letting me part of it. (I'm not running)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Max).

Man: Now, (Max), I'll talk to you later.

Man: And I'll say one more comment (of what, and) I feel the same. I'm honored to be part of this committee and there are so many people here that have such good input and if we all keep, we're all here for the same reason.

Man: Yes.

Man: And if we all keep an open mind you learn so much by the conversations that we have here and it's just a matter of keeping an open mind and we'll, we have come up with good decision and good recommendations.

Woman: Yes, I would second that. I'm honored and flattered to be chosen to be a part of the committee and this is hard work and it's, some of these things are really even difficult to imagine.

We don't want (unintelligible), we'd rather not have to think (about) (unintelligible) and in some cases we're planning for things that we don't ever want to see happen, and yet (it's) clear that we are all here for the same reason that people are willing to, you know, consider stakeholders that they represent, (then) also those that they don't represent (unintelligible).

I'm confident that we can remain lucky and keep the (unintelligible) some of these scenarios out of the United States until better prepared (but) maybe we'll have a positive impact with the work we're doing.

(Max): I'm happy to be here and I'm happy to get to know each other a little bit better and I'm glad that we are planning for the future.

Man: That's a very good point, planning for the future and I've really enjoyed the opportunity and really appreciate (the) diversity in this group representing a lot of different (planets) of agriculture which (Michael) is very important that we get everybody at the table talking, and it was really...

Man: It was really kind of enjoyable.

Man: A lot of candid discussion, I think it was very respectful. You know, certainly contentious at times but I don't think it was dysfunctional. It's always good to have a little bit of conflict that you manage through and can take (you to the edge and) have everybody look at things with different set of eyes. So really appreciate everybody's input and look forward to future events.

Man: So I'd echo the comments and just add that, you know, sunshine and 70 degrees is probably better than (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: But I did have a question for the folks that have been on the committee, I think, (R.J.), you mentioned earlier last year's meeting was facilitated, (did you have) a facilitator or...

Woman: We had a - no, (it's the) meeting before.

Man: Oh, okay.

Woman: Last year we, we sometimes bring in a facilitator but when they're not, it's, we've just been really...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Fortunate to have folks who...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Know...

Man: (Yes).

Woman: And really...

Man: So...

Woman: It's with the chair to move the conversation.

Man: So I, so we had great facilitation this year but I was just curious if outside facilitators improved or made it worse. I mean just (or)...

Woman: (Well, they're) never utilized very much and so...

Man: Oh, fair enough. Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: So that...

Woman: (I have a half a mind to half)...

Man: Answers the question.

Woman: But we just, again, have been fortunate...

Man: (Okay).

Woman: To have folks who, you know, kind of follow on along and leadership...

Man: Sure

Woman: (Unintelligible) (keep things moving).

Man: Okay, (I), it was just a curious question.

Woman: No.

Man: So thanks, appreciate that.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It is 9:50, that everybody is on the same page and I actually enjoy hearing the different aspects that you don't think about normally at home when you get into your tunnel vision because that does help to remember that it's not just your own program, it's for everyone so that's a good thing.

And I appreciate the patience that a lot of you have with those of us who don't have all the numbers after our name or the letters. So as a producer on here sometimes I wonder what I can actually contribute but at the same time we're

the ones that are going to have to carry everything out and so being able to understand how these things are developed and handed down to us is very important and (I) appreciate that.

Man: I think what you just said (there), there's a practicality and a pragmatism that comes without some of the added education and initials that I think is really valuable to have in a group like this.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (I think) that's, that is probably the best thing that comes from having a group like this together is ideas about how things should get done and ideas about how they actually will get done come together in a place like this and that's a good thing. This was a much more entertaining three days than I expected.

Man: (And what)...

Man: (It)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I wasn't sure what to expect but I didn't expect to giggle and to (laugh), and I didn't expect (unintelligible), it was, I enjoyed (it) a lot. Thanks, it was good.

Man: (Right).

Man: You know, I'm just sorry to find out that I'm even more ignorant than I thought I was walking in the room. I have learned an awful lot here and it's been a great experience to learn this, and there's a lot more I'm going to have to go back and learn as well now.

And certainly there are a lot of things that my constituents don't know and that (tend), anytime I mention anything even related to this I tend to get the deer in the headlights stare, and so, yes, there's a lot at (stake) (unintelligible) and I really appreciate that. (And) it has been a really good week, you know, that's (the), it's been a lot more than I expected.

Woman: (Unintelligible) thanks for, I guess I'm a newbie. I appreciate being here, it was really a lot of fun. It was very, very informative, I appreciate (R.J.) and (Liz) and (Susan) for all your guidance, it was really good. And I think the diversity (that here) is excellent selection of all of the members here I think we all work and that we'd be able to move forward and have some good ideas or (report) comments. Thank you, it was nice.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Having (sort of) gone through a lot of these meetings now, (first of all) I'm glad that, I'm grateful to still be on this committee, I'm grateful to have been part of it and still be part of it.

I think this is one of the best meetings we've had in terms of, partly the dynamics between everybody and really getting to know each other more than we have in previous meeting, and really grappling with some (of these) issues in depth. And yes...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I learned a ton, you know, I think we all come in, we know our piece and then we learn a lot from each other and I'm really glad for the level of depth that

we were able to get into these topics and the scope of the conversation, and yes, I really enjoyed it so thank you, all.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: Thank you, thank you for being kind to me, it was my first day as chair...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: First meeting as chair and I'm privileged to be chair and be on the committee again, and I think we, that all of us at certain times fought our individual biases but I think overall we came up with a holistic set of recommendations and ideas and listened to each other and learned a lot from each other and I think we've (delved in), like (Judith) said, into depth more on some of these topics than we had on any of the previous meetings I've been to.

I think we were pretty well prepared most of us when we came. We had done some background work (as what do our) stakeholders think, you know, tried to look at some of these documents and bring not just our own personal opinions but the opinions but the opinions of the groups we represent and I'm really pleased with that.

And so we will keep trying to move the ball forward on working through these recommendations and looking forward to working with you all for the next two years.

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: And thank you, (R.J.), for your work on this.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: This is always, I would call it a labor of love, you know, (and we, and you prefer to) continue (unintelligible) (with the one) (unintelligible) I guess it's been about six years...

Woman: (It's) six years.

Woman: And it's always interesting to me to see what the dynamic will be, how it will evolve. And this was, I have to agree (unintelligible) (who) described it as an entertaining (hour).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (takeaway)...

Woman: Too.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (You got to remember)...

Woman: (Unintelligible) a lot more (unintelligible)

Man: (He's from) New Hampshire, (you know)?

Woman: You know, you guys really did more than other groups (get) together (really) (unintelligible) (meaning) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (you guys) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Diane), (who) also worked with me (and)...

Man: (You got to have fun)...

Woman: (This meeting to go) (unintelligible).

Woman: (We didn't have any) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Whereas like)...

Man: (That's not good)...

Woman: (I think) (Unintelligible) too many (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) this is my first one...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And I found it very collegial, everybody participated (fiercely). I think it's a great group of, (for the work, the beautiful work you're done), and then in the (back who) you may be wondering who's (been there the whole) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Cindy Bragan). She is (a), my deputy.

Man: Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And she may be working with you guys as well over the next, you know, as we move forward, and so, again, it's been a pleasure working with everybody and look forward to what work you're going to be doing. I think (though) we're going to get great things out of you guys. I just sent you two massive e-mails...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: With links to some of the archive material and you also got the 25-pager comment (unintelligible).

Man: (Is somebody) on the phone? Is (Annette) still on the phone?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I think (it said that's she is hanging up).

Man: (Oh).

Woman: (Annette) said May date works for her and I'm hanging up.

Man: Oh.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: I have one more question, does anybody know Bill Gates? Could they write up a grant proposal for (funding) (unintelligible)?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: It's such a massive amount of money.

Woman: (Yes).

Woman: And I know, (Michael)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You asked why (unintelligible) (or for why are) we moving forward?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (One answer for faith) (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: We, I think it's, it'd be fair to say that the people in emergency preparedness and all of the other people involved with FMD vaccine, they know (what) (Unintelligible). This is not something (unintelligible) and money (answers all things).

So we keep it on the radar, and you guys help keep it on the radar and it's all right to keep coming back and coming back. I like this list that you guys came up with because it's very (pointed) and (factual) oriented (whereas) in the past it might have been more narrative...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (And everyone says topical) so I'm looking forward to (it)...

Man: (Excuse me)...

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Do we need) (unintelligible) (things up here).

Woman: You can...

Woman: Yes.

Woman: (You know) what I want you guys to take your (name plaque) (unintelligible).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: We're required to bring them to the next meeting, right?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: That would be good.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (meaning this) (Stuart)...

Man: (Yes) (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (at the point where I) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (That's write).

Man: (Or I could)...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Okay, with that, can we adjourn?

Woman: (Oh, please) (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: We are adjourned.

Woman: We are adjourned.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Wow).

Woman: (Unintelligible) (not you).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you, all.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Julie)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (It will really have)...

END