

FTS-USDA OFFICE OF COMMUNICATION

**Moderator: RJ Cabrera
May 13, 2011
3:00 pm CT**

Michael Doerr: Thank you very much good afternoon and welcome to today's call of the Secretary Advisory Committee on Animal Health.

My name is Michael Doerr; I'm the (DFO) for the Committee. I'd like to start with a roll call and our facilitator Ms. Kim Ogle with APHIS will do the roll call.

Then we'll go over to our Chair Donald Hoenig. Kim will you take a roll call please.

Kim Ogle: We will. Good morning everyone just for the record today is the 13th. I'll begin with the Brief Committee Members Mr. Maximiliano Fernandez just recognize you're on the phone please.

Maximiliano Fernandez: Yes ma'am here we are.

Kim. Ogle: Dr. John Fischer?

Dr. John Fischer: Right here.

Kim Ogle: Thank you.

Dr. Andrew Goodwin?

Dr. Andrew Goodwin: Present.

Kim Ogle: Ms. Vicki Hebb?

Dr. Howard Hill?

Dr. Howard Hill: Here.

Kim Ogle: Dr. Donald Hoenig?

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes, I'm here.

Kim Ogle: Thank you.

Dr. John Kalmey?

Dr. John Kalmey: Here.

Kim Ogle: Dr. Charles Massengill?

Dr. David Meeker?

Dr. David Meeker: Here.

Kim Ogle: Ms. Judith McGeary?

Judith McGeary: Here.

Kim Ogle: Thank you.

Dr. Boyd Parr?

Dr. Boyd Parr: Here.

Kim Ogle: Ms. Genell Pridgen?

Genell Pridgen: Yes, here.

Kim Ogle: Dr. Willie Reed?

Dr. Philip Stayer?

Dr. Philip Stayer: Here.

Kim Ogle: Giles Stockton:

Giles Stockton: Here.

Kim Ogle: Mr. Brian Thomas?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Here.

Kim Ogle: Dr. Cindy Wolf?

Dr. Cindy Wolf: Here.

Kim Ogle: Thank you.

With those that are representing APHIS that are on the line please identify yourself please.

Charlie Rogers: Well this is Charlie Rogers I'm a Committee Member.

Kim Ogle: I'm sorry, did I overlook you? I apologize, thank you.

Chuck Massengill: And this is Chuck Massengill, I'm also a Committee Member.

Kim Ogle: I did call your name. Thank you.

Morris Johnson: This is Morris Johnson I'm a Committee Member.

Kim Ogle: Thank you. Oh I'm sorry Dr. Rogers you are - I apologize. Did I miss anyone else?

Morris Johnson: Did you get Morris Johnson?

Kim Ogle: Yes I did.

Morris Johnson: Okay.

Kim Ogle: Thank you.

Dr. Myers I heard you say your name at the beginning of the call. So I have T. J. Myers on the phone.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Yes I'm here Kim.

Kim Ogle: Yes is there any other APHIS participants on the telephone please?

Lee Ann Thomas: Yes this is Lee Ann Thomas.

Kim Ogle: Thank you Dr. Thomas.

In the room here in APHIS Theresa please introduce yourself.

Dr. Theresa Boyle: This is Dr. (Theresa Boyle) from International Services.

Kim Ogle: Thank you and welcome everyone I'd like to start off with doing a quick review of the agenda then I'll turn the meeting over to Dr. Hoenig.

I'm going to switch the agenda up a little bit and begin with him. But I'll briefly review the agenda with you. We're going to start off with Committee Administration and review the bylaws and meeting procedures. And Dr. Hoenig and Judith McGeary will be your presenters for that agenda item.

We will then turn the agenda over to Dr. Myers and he will give you some opening remarks. Provide brief updates on the tuberculosis branding and the proposed rule on traceability.

Then we're going to hear from Lee Ann Thomas and she is going to give you a report from the Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Working Group and the new framework.

And if you'd like to we're going to take a brief, brief, break and I'll check in with you to see if you'd like to do that.

Then we're going to hear from Theresa Boyle who is with us from International Services and she is going to give you a summary and the current status of FFMD Outbreak in South Korea.

You're going to hear from Darryl Styles from Veterinary Services and he's going to give you an update on emergency preparedness and response. And that will include a summary of stakeholder meetings, with a focus on FFMD Vaccination and a gap analysis on FFMD Preparedness.

Then we're going to close and hear from Carol Tuszynski from our Planning and Finance Strategy Staff with an Overview of the Veterinary Services Budget Issues.

Okay I'm now going to hand the meeting over to the Chair and Vice Chair Dr. Hoenig and Ms. McGeary.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes thanks very much Kim. Well welcome to everybody who is here from the committee and also all of the unknown people who are on from around the country. I hope there a few of you out there too.

Certainly my thoughts over the past couple of weeks have been with some of our colleagues down in the southern states who in Alabama who suffered from the tornadoes and a devastating loss down there and now the flooding. And I think you know, all of us have those people in our minds and the suffering that they're going through right now.

And so I just would mention that. And so after the last meeting I think one thing that became apparent to me was that I think we needed to just have some procedures written down so that everybody knew under what sort of guidelines we were operating.

So I asked Michael and RJ to come up with a basically guide as far how we're going to reach consensus, or how we're going to deal with issues.

Then also kind of a framework bylaws for how the meetings are held. And I don't think that we need to go into detailed discussion of them I think you've had them for a number of days to review. Judith and I had a conference call with RJ and Michael last week or two weeks ago - last week I guess. And we've been going back and forth by email with them.

And you know, I think we can take a few minutes to just if anybody has any comments on them or major concerns or issues you know, let's talk about them. But otherwise I just put them forward as how we're going to operate and I don't think we need to take a vote of them. I just you know, unless they are any major issues.

So I just open it up for a brief discussion of those two documents that we sent out earlier this week I believe.

Hearing no comments I think we can move forward. Everybody okay with that I assume?

Man: Yes sounds good Don.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thank you very much. Well that was easy, thanks for making it easy. The next item on the agenda is Dr. T. J. Myers, Associate Deputy Administrator

who is going to talk about the TB Rule - The Proposed Rule on Traceability and perhaps some comments on branding.

You know, many of us from the state veterinary ranks have really - have heard about this a couple times from Dr. (Clifford). But I thought it might be a good idea for the committee to be brought up to speed on what's going on along those lines.

So T. J. I'll turn it over to you. And thank you for being with us today.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Well thank you Don and Judith and to all the committee members for the opportunity to be here with you today. Dr. (Clifford) sends his regards he's out of the office today getting ready for a rather long meeting with the OIE next - over the next couple of weeks. So I'm filling in for him today.

And I also want to extend my appreciation to all the folks who are listening in across the country. We just really appreciate the opportunity to meet with the committee and to have this public access time.

There is just a couple of things that I wanted to mention to date. One that wasn't on the list that Don just mentioned is that this committee I understand is in the process or had talked in the past - excuse me, about an Agriculture Subcommittee and Michael is working to make sure that the list of members for that subcommittee is being developed. So hopefully that subcommittee once everyone is confirmed for that will be moving forward.

The two items that Don mentioned I'll launch into those now. The first is TB and Brucellosis Programs. We have been working for quite some time to take a hard look at these sets of regulations with an eye towards updating those

programs so that they meet the needs of the country with regards to responding to those two diseases.

So we're kind of in the middle of a fairly long process. We started back in I believe it was December of 2008 where we started to hold some public meetings about how we might revise and update these programs.

And then in the fall of 2009 we published some - a pair of white papers or concept papers proposing some ideas as to how the Bovine Tuberculosis and Brucellosis Programs might be revised and we took written public comment on those.

And then following the receipt of that set of comments we established a Federal State Tribal Working Group this past fall and they met for the first time in September. And that group has been working since then to help us develop a new framework for these programs.

And they've recently are wrapping up their work and the documents that was shared with you this week summarizes the elements that the working group and we believe need to be included in that new set of regulations.

And I'll talk a little bit about those elements but Dr. Lee Ann Thomas is going to be giving you a little bit more in depth overview of that here later this afternoon.

But those elements include the elements that one would expect would be in any animal disease control program. So they include state requirements, zoning, surveillance, affected herd management and (epidemiologic) investigations, indemnity, (unintelligible) controls, input requirements and approval procedures for laboratory test and laboratories.

And those are the (unintelligible) that Dr. Thomas is going to be discussing a little bit later.

The goal with developing this new framework is to establish a program that is less focused on state by state surveillance and state by state disease prevalence because for both of these diseases we've come a long, long way over the decades to getting close to reaching that goal of eliminating these diseases from the US.

And so we needed to rely to our regulations that to be more in tune with where we are with those two diseases. So the new regulations would be more flexible, more focused on performance standards rather than specific descriptive types of requirements.

So that's the document that Dr. Thomas is going to be sharing with you a little bit later. The next step in this process is to hold a set of public meetings we're using very much the model that we used for the traceability work that we have done over the last year or so.

So starting a little bit later this month we are going to be having four public meetings around the country to give folks an opportunity to discuss that framework in detail.

With us also online there is an opportunity for comments for folks that are not able to come to the public meetings. And we would certainly look for an encourage this committee to take a look at that framework and provide comments for us as well.

Once we go through that public meeting comment period that is the point where we would begin writing the regulation. So we have not written the rule yet, again we're working just off a framework document at this point.

But we would hope to write that rule later this summer and publish it as a proposed rule this fall. And then that would be another opportunity for public comment before a final rule would go in place sometime in 2012.

So that's essentially are timeline and our objective. And again Dr. Thomas will go into that in more detail here in a few minutes.

The final item that I wanted to share with you is a little bit of an update on the animal traceability - animal disease traceability rulemaking that we're working on. And I want to start off by thanking the committee for already taking a look at that issue and providing some comments to us and recommendations to the secretary.

I understand that you'd look at that and made some recommendations regarding making sure that it's not an unfunded mandate and that we have perhaps an extended comment period for that.

So that - those recommendations have been received and they are under review and under consideration at this point. The proposed rule is making good progress through the clearance process it is currently with the Office Of Management And Budget and we believe it is still on track for publication later this spring.

The department continues to look at this rule as one of it's highest rule making priorities. So I anticipate that it will continue to progress through the clearance process as rapid a pace as is possible.

One issue that has been discussed a bit recently and Don mentioned that is some questions that we've gotten regarding the issue of branding. And we have put some material out on our Web site and that was shared with you this week I believe.

And we have had some phone conferences with (unintelligible) and with branding officials in the states that have brand inspection programs.

So I wanted to just take a couple of minutes to clarify what would be coming out in the proposed rule here in a few weeks regarding the issue of branding. The department and the agency continues to value and recognize branding as a critical tool that is available to animal health officials that have branding programs in their state.

The rulemaking that we are anticipating will identify or will require that livestock with certain exceptions will be - need to be officially identified and accompanied with an Interstate Certificate of Veterinary Inspection when they move interstate. And that's again been the cornerstone of the rulemaking and that has been discussed with this committee in the past.

The draft proposed rule would define official identification for each species when it comes to Interstate movement. And that definition of official identification will provide clarity to livestock owners so they know what official identification options are except for the movement of their animals to any state or tribe.

And those things that are identified in the rule as official identification must be accepted by all states and tribes for the entry of livestock in to their jurisdiction.

However, the draft rule would also allow other means of identification such as brands, tattoos, breed registry certificates to be used as identification when agreed upon by both the shipping and receiving state or tribe.

So the proposed rule will clearly make provision for brands to be acceptable identification within the program.

So I think that will allow brands where they are used to continue to be used without any interruption in what's currently being done out in the state that do provide for brands. And it - so it provides that flexibility for that option to be used.

And again we have done quite a bit of outreach lately to help resolve any ongoing misunderstandings regarding that issue. So hopefully that issue when folks look at the proposed rule will be clear. And we certainly invite comments on that and any other part of the rules whenever the proposed rule come out.

So with that Don and Judith those are all the opening comments that I wanted to make. I'll be happy to take any questions from the committee at this point that they might have on those issues.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thanks T. J. we'll open it for questions for T. J.

Charlie Rogers: Yes this is Charlie Rogers the brand part of this has been getting a lot of discussion in brand states. New Mexico is a brand state.

The - there is some concern about delisting brands as official ID. And there is one - there is several questions - several interesting questions that have come up that haven't come up in the past.

One being Mexican cattle. Mexican cattle at this time have an M branded on them. If brands are not listed as official ID will we continue - we will continue to require Mexican cattle to be M branded. If we do not - if we do not continue that there will - there will only be an ear tag some other type of official ID.

Ear tags are easily lost, they come out, they can be taken out. If we've got - if we're not branding Mexican cattle with an M we may lose their identity.

And for states that have a lot of those type cattle if we have an animal that has a diseased event and they originated in Mexico and we have no way to trace that back to Mexico then that animal becomes the property of that state in which we'll create a diseased event for that state.

Also if...

Dr. T. J. Myers: If I can comment on that.

Charlie Rogers: If you would please. And let me go just a little further with that.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay.

Charlie Rogers: Even if we continue to have Mexico brand these cattle it's not official ID how much - how much - what will that carry, what will that - how much weight will that carry if it's not official ID?

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay. We have no intent to change the import requirements that would require that end brand to be used on Mexican cattle. So that will continue.

So again that would not result in any change to how we're - how we're requiring that those animals to come in.

As far as it being D listed as official identification again, the new rule would allow for branding to be used.

So you know, again I'm trying to stress that we're not really anticipating changes in those kinds of practices. So the fact that it's not listed as official ID does not lessen in any way I think the importance of that end brand on those cattle.

Charlie Rogers: Okay from a standpoint of Mexico if I were in Mexico and I had an animal in the United States and it had an M on it and it was involved in a disease event would I not make the argument that that animal that that M brand is not an official ID?

So why would I accept as Mexico why would I accept responsibility for that animal?

Dr. T. J. Myers: Well the M brand only denotes the country of origin of that animal. The animal coming across the border still has to have an official identification number.

So if it's still also required to have that ear tag. So...

Charlie Rogers: If that ear tag is not - if it's gone...

Dr. T. J. Myers: Understood.

Charlie Rogers: Yes, that's just an argument - that's an argument I believe Mexico could make at that point.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Well I don't - I'm not concerned about that. I don't think that that - again, that M denotes the origin - the country of origin that's all. It is still required to have that unique identifier when it comes across the border.

Charlie Rogers: Okay. I have a couple of other issues if you don't mind we can...

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay. Go ahead.

Charlie Rogers: In a brand law state stolen cattle that is pretty important that that you know, that that's a large part of finding those animals, prosecuting those people.

If brands are not listed as official identification an attorney at that point might take that and in a court of law may use that as a you know, well this is not registered in the CFR's official identification. So it should not be used in court.

Dr. T. J. Myers: But the issue of identifying stolen cattle is done under state law under a state brand inspection.

So I don't think that argument holds. I don't think anything we're putting in this rule would lesson the strength or the enforceability of state laws.

Charlie Rogers: Okay and I'm just throwing out examples. If I had stolen cattle in a state that's not brand law state they've been moved across the state line. Does that - how does that come into affect?

And I may be a little off base here but...

Dr. T. J. Myers: Well if it's - yes, you're getting into a point of state law that I'm not really familiar with. But I would imagine that you know, those two states would have to work that out through a law enforcement kind of an approach.

Vicki Hebb: This is Vicki Hebb if you've been since that situation and because I have the very same concerns as Charlie.

But if you took that same situation and transferred that to tribe who are not subservient to state and it wouldn't be in the federal registry I think that would lead tribes very exposed to somebody being able to just come in and steal them and get them to a non brand state. And they'd be good to go. We have been tribes down there on the Arizona border.

Dr. T. J. Myers: But again that - those issues of theft and identifying animals in that situation is not what this rule is focused on. This rule is focused on identifying animals in interstate movement for animal disease purposes.

And so there is nothing in this rule that would impact those state laws that address theft. I think it's important too to remember what the current regulations is.

Currently the regulations list a number of forms of identification as official. But there is nothing in the regulations currently that requires any state to recognize an official ID or what the regulation terms an official ID.

So...

Charlie Rogers: But I think as we move we must realize that there are consequences beyond just animal traceability that the ADT Program caused. And when you try to address those issues.

Like for instance the next administration if brands are not listed as official ID is it a possibility that the next administration might say well that's you know, it's not listed as official ID I don't see the need to continue with that.

Dr. T. J. Myers: I guess the question that I would ask you to consider what benefit does that listing of something as "Official" have. What is that you're trying to gain by having a particular type of identification listed as official.

Charlie Rogers: I'm just trying to avoid the consequences that may come in the future from that - from not listing it as official.

And this is a suggestion that I've heard from several different people. If we listed brands as an official ID with the qualifying statement only where mutually recognized by states and tribes.

If it were listed as official in that manner you have achieved the same result and you've probably satisfied a lot of people that are concerned about this. And you probably will minimize some of the opposition that may be mounting against the ADT program because of this particular issue.

And that qualifying statement only we're mutually recognized by states and tribes and go ahead and make it official still care - it still works in the same manner.

But you (broadly) minimize some oppositions with that statement. And this leaving it official.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Dr. T. J. Myers: If I can just address that before we move on to another speaker.

Vicki Hebb: Well let me - I would like to add to that.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay.

Vicki Hebb: This is Vicki Hebb. Even though a lot of the tribes are getting along well at this time under the state regulations for a lot of this and it's working well. Like Charlie said in the future if there is a problem tribes refer to the CFR for the rule between government to government. So it's almost essential that it be listed in the CFR for tribes.

Dr. T. J. Myers: I guess I'm - if it's - I guess I'm not understanding that comment if you could maybe clarify that or expand on that a little bit.

Vicki Hebb: Well tribes aren't subservient to states.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Right.

Vicki Hebb: So in your example of you know, individuals going to the state for you know, law enforcement of a stolen animal that doesn't have them in tribes it goes straight to a federal case.

So if there is nothing in the CFR stating that brands are official recognized in brand states then you know, where does it go from there?

Dr. T. J. Myers: Again I think we're mixing theft issues with this. And I'm...

Vicki Hebb: But it's a real issue for producers - real producers out here. We're they are concerned.

Dr. T. J. Myers: I understand, I understand and I certainly want to try to address that concern. What I would suggest is that you know, as you look at the language that comes out in the proposed rule I think that will help focus comments and we will certainly take those into considerations when they come.

The concern with what you had proposed Charlie as far as that change is that if you do list brands as official than we would need to revise or change or do something with the definition of official.

Because the definition of official ID is identifications that would need to be recognized by all states. And if we list brands as official it - we don't have brand systems in the majority of the states. So that really complicates the issue.

Charlie Rogers: Well yes but I'm talking about listing that with a qualifying statement that takes care of that. That it's only recognized - it has to be mutually recognized between states and tribes.

If you put a qualifying statement with that you put that qualifying statement with it I believe you've already cleared that up.

Dr. T. J. Myers: All right well we'll look for that as a written comment as the rule gets published. Because like I said it is in the clearance process right now. So I think during that comment period we'll have to look at those comments that

come in on that issue. I'm certain we'll get them. So I think we'll
(unintelligible).

Charlie Rogers: And for everybody out there that doesn't realize there are 14 states. There are
14 states that use brands.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Right.

Charlie Rogers: And I think that we're seeing kind of some mounting opposition to the
program just from those states. And this could possibly - just this statement
could possibly relief a lot of opposition.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Well and we did have the phone conference with the brand authorities all 14
of them. And talked to them about the provision that we're providing in the
proposed rule.

And I don't recall that we heard a huge amount of pushback from those brand
authorities. So I don't know that the opposition is as huge as maybe it has
been characterized to be by some folks. And I'm not talking about anyone on
this call.

But so I don't know that we know the level of concern yet and I think that's
you know, what the comment period process is all about. Is to gage more
accurately what the specific concerns are about specific published language.

Again we don't have language that you all have in front of you as a published
proposed rule yet to be commenting on either by this committee or the public
in general.

So I think it is important to move forward with that publication and to get it out there and to take a look at it and then receive comments. And then we'll need to address and deal with those comments at that time.

Gilles Stockton: This is Gilles Stockton you know, I want to reinforce the concern that Charlie and Vicki are expressing.

The antagonism against the ID program could get out of hand because people are already kind of touchy about the similarities to the NAIS program. And this sort of messing with our brands is kind of a growing concern in the countryside.

And I did really want to reinforce what you know, Charlie's idea there of listing brands and tattoos as official with a caveat. And one way to write that might be to call it supplementary - official supplementary identification.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: T. J. you know, I'm not sure how many other questions we have out there. I think this is...

Dr. T. J. Myers: Yes.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: ...a good discussion. But just before you know, one thing we have to realize is that there are four public meetings coming up. So there is going to be opportunity for comment once again well before the final rule comes out.

I know that this has been an area of discussion amongst state veterinarians and you know, in certain parts of the country it seems to be you know, a fairly high profile issue.

So but I'm not sure how much more can be said at this point. You know, we can keep going I think we have until as I calculated until 1:15 with T. J. So however we divided up that time is fine. I just don't want to have it monopolized by one topic.

But I guess I'll leave it at that now. So if there are other comments on that so be it.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Don't this is T. J. you mentioned four public meetings that's for the TB Brucellosis Rule.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Oh that's right. Sorry, never mind.

Dr. T. J. Myers: So we're very close to publishing this as a proposed rule.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: That's right.

Dr. T. J. Myers: And again I think that's why I would encourage us to take a look at the actual language, the actual regulatory text and give folks the opportunity to make some specific recommendations and specific comments on specific language rather than you know...

Maximiliano Fernandez: Hello this is Max Fernandez.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Yes.

Maximiliano Fernandez: Well I concur with Vicki and the other person that there were saying the necessity of the brand. Here in the Northwest you know, we really need it.

Not only that what we need to think about is that the 14 states that they use the brands today is off the largest cattle producers, you know. And it is so easy to identify (unintelligible) when they've got their (farm) brand.

Not only that a brand it will be there from almost born to death. You know, anything else that we put to the animals won't be lost from time to time.

In the state of Washington we recognize it now we're going to recognize it later. You know, this is what internally interstate we will keep using. But the people you know, the rancher here in the state of Washington.

Dr. T. J. Myers: And I want to reiterate to everyone that there is nothing in what will be in this proposed rule that would eliminate brands that would do anything to hinder their current use in the way that they are currently being used. There is nothing that stands in the way of the status quo as it related to brands.

Maximiliano Fernandez: Thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: And I misspoke but we still do have - everybody has an opportunity to comment once the rule comes out and for whatever the comment period is.

T. J. do you - I know that you know, the original intent was to have the rule out sometime in April and now we're into May and you said late Spring and I guess it's not late Spring yet. But do you have any timeframe from ONB?

Dr. T. J. Myers: No I don't OMB is you know, a critical review point and they will take the time they feel they need to take and there is no way to predict what that might be.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Somehow I knew you were going to say that.

Charlie Rogers: Can we - can this committee make a recommendation that the brands be listed as official ID with some type of qualifying statement? Can we make that recommendation and still possibly get it in the proposed rule?

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Charlie I think it's my understanding is we had that opportunity to put up any what we call deal breakers or red flags. And you know, the only two things we put forward with a extension of the comment period and unfunded mandate thing.

So I think - but, having said that I think that the next time the committee meets publicly we could and hopefully the rule is out by then because that will be the middle of the summer we could have that discussion again on the rule. And you know, make a comment at that point.

I - my impression is that it's out of the hands of veterinary services right now. There is no - the train is rolling down the tracks and there is no changing it is that correct T. J.?

Dr. T. J. Myers: Yes, that's correct it's very close to publication it's completely out of APHIS (hand) at the moment. So - and again, that I want to encourage everyone that or to remember that the best way to focus your comments is to actually have the regulatory text in front of you so that you can make specific comments.

And so I think having that opportunity to see a published rule and to make comments from this committee on that rule is your best course of action.

Chuck Massengill: Don this is Chuck Massengill and I've got a question I'd like to address maybe if I could get T. J. to answer so I can use that in my summary. Because

I'm going to be discussing this with our stakeholders after this call. And I'd like to know with this ADT rule as far as we can discuss it, is there any change in the way brands will be used compared to the way they are used now? Is there any change at all?

Dr. T. J. Myers: None whatsoever.

Chuck Massengill: Okay the Missouri - I mean from my personal interest Missouri is not a brand state however we do have a brand registry. And our state law recognizes brands as the only legal proof of ownership for livestock in Missouri. But those brands have to be registered with the Missouri Department of Agriculture to be legal proof of ownership.

And that's a unique state thing I'm not trying to get that into this conversation. But when I talked to other cattlemen I want to be able to tell them what we can expect to be different relative to brands. Because we do have a lot of cattle producers that rely on brands for their business.

And if I can say there is going to be no change, there is no change. Thank you very much.

Dr. T. J. Myers: You would be correct Chuck.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thanks Chuck. Anyone else with questions for T. J.?

Michael Doerrer: Don this is Michael I don't have a question obviously just administratively T. J. mentioned a couple of documents that the committee has and I just wanted to know for members of the public listening in that all documents that the committee has access to.

Also on our committee Web page that is right of the APHIS page does any members want to see what the committee has seen they have full access to them via our Web site.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thanks Michael. T. J. I had a question going back to the agriculture sub committee do you have - first of all how did you go about soliciting members for that committee.

And secondly what kind of timeline are you on with the respect to announcing the members?

Dr. T. J. Myers: I'll let Michael Doerr address that. I have not been involved in that process personally.

Michael Doerr: Hey Don at the moment we working with our partner agencies to identify the - were not - be the same process that we used to identify members from this committee that is a public domination. And then (unintelligible) subject matter expert.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Michael you're breaking up.

Michael Doerr: I'm sorry we're on a bad telephone in this room.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay.

Michael Doerr: I was saying that we're not gong to use the same process for the subcommittee in agriculture as we used for the full secretary's advisory committee that is a nomination process with review.

It's going to be more working with our partner agency - APHIS working with the partner's agencies to identify particular subject matter experts. And then USDA will do an internal you know, vetting of the subject matters experts and we'll announce those names.

So where we are in the process right now is that our internally our we're still in consultation with others. We're still hoping to be able to have the first meeting of the committee this summer. We don't have a particular date lined up at this point yet. And we'll continue to update the committee as we move forward.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thank you.

Charlie Rogers: So Don I hate to keep bringing this up but one other thing, you don't believe that at this time that we can make a recommendation of material on this brand issue? That this committee can make recommendation (unintelligible)?

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Well Charlie I - I think we can make a recommendation but I kind of tend to agree that with T. J. that until we see the language I'm not - I mean the exact language of the proposed rule I'm not totally sure what we're commenting on.

We commented on a framework before I don't know, T. J. do you have any thoughts on that? I don't want to say we can't but I - it might be a little premature I defer to you T. J. T. J. are you still there?

Dr. T. J. Myers: Yes I was on mute. I'm sorry, I was talking and...

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay.

Dr. T. J. Myers: ...had my mute button on. Michael can clarify from an administrative standpoint but as secretary advisory committee my understanding is that you can comment on anything you feel necessary to comment to the secretary about at any time you choose as a committee to do so.

So you know, I'm not saying don't make a comment. But again I think your best focused comment is going to be to comment on specific published language. That's just the way I think it needs to be approached. But again the committee is free to do as they chose.

Michael Doerrer: And T. J. is absolutely right from an administrative prospective this committee could provide the recommendation on any of these matters at any time you're welcomed to do that. And Don I'll leave it to you to you know, to figure out whether to do that or how.

But you know, I would also echo what T. J. was saying. It would probably be more effective to comment on the specific language. That's not to say - I'm not saying that we would ignore any recommendation, we would certainly pass it up through the lines. You know, with due diligence but I'm not sure that it's the most effective route at this point.

But...

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay well lets do this. We have some time at the end of the call and let's put it on - let's discuss it then. Is that okay Charlie?

Charlie Rogers: Sure, that's great.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay so then we'll just kind of put it on hold for a little bit until we get through the rest of the agenda. And then we can come back to it and see what folks want to do.

Charlie Rogers: Sounds good to me.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: All right.

Dr. T. J. Myers: And Don I've got a 1 o'clock meeting I need to run to. My original agenda said that I would done at 1:00 you said 1:15.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Am I cutting you short on anything else you want from me?

Dr. Donald Hoenig: I don't know we got two minutes anybody else have any items for T. J. while he is here?

Dr. Boyd Parr: T. J. this is Boyd Parr just real quickly the materials that the committee got doesn't really show. I've heard some concern from others state animal health officials and the TB Brucellosis discussion. And I'm sure there will be comments in these meetings on the indemnity phase and the right of appeal.

And I just wanted to raise those. While I understand the goal here to get it standardized and fair. I think everybody shares that.

I just wanted to pass along which I'm sure you probably heard but at least from one of my Don and my constituencies and state animal health officials 1) we're not sure the constitutionality of not having any appeals processed. And

2) we think it's just smoother for unique circumstances where people have the option to get a second opinion.

Just wanted to raise that issue of any comments you wanted to make.

Dr. T. J. Myers: Okay I appreciate that Boyd and I think I'll defer to Dr. Thomas. She is going give a bit more in-depth discussion of the TB Brucellosis framework. And so she'll be talking about the indemnity issues.

So that'll give you an opportunity to hear from her a little bit more specifics than what I gave. So that would be good.

But you are correct we have heard that concern. The concern about the appeal process. So we certainly take that into consideration.

And like I said I think you'll have an opportunity here in the next few minutes to have a little bit broader discussion with Dr. Thomas on that.

Dr. Boyd Parr: Thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay thanks a lot T. J.

Dr. T. J. Myers: All right, thank you all. I'm sorry I can't stay longer with you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay it looks like next up is Dr. Lee Ann Thomas.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Yes.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: TB and Brucellosis Working Group.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Yes and can everybody hear me okay?

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Okay. I'll go ahead and get started and I'm thankful for this opportunity to talk to you this afternoon. We have started our outreach efforts on the proposed framework. We've had a call with the state (desk). We've had one within the street so we're now looking forward to this opportunity to give you a very brief outline.

And I believe that you received a copy of the draft proposed framework. And T. J. provided a thorough introduction. But one of the things that I want to stress is that it is a draft proposed framework and we do have public meetings coming up. They will be May 19th, May 24th, June 1 and June 6th in the following respective locations; Lansing, Michigan, Atlanta, Georgia, Bozeman, Montana, and Amarillo.

And if you're not able to attend those public meetings in person we certainly encourage you to provide your written comments. And particularly and a gentlemen already expressed one concern about indemnity. But it really does help us to send your comments.

And not only if it's something you don't like, but if you will include what you would like to see that will be very helpful. We will use your comments to move forward with the development of a proposed rule.

What I'm going to do in the next few minutes is to give you a very brief overview and talk about each of the elements. And before I start with the first element just to provide you some background for what this regulation will

cover it will cover Brucellosis Bovis and mycobacterial bovis in cattle bison and (captive) (service).

So that's the framework or the baseline framework the baseline framework that we're going to start with this proposed regulation.

And the first program element is program are state requirements and there are four components to this element. And they consist of state status, general program requirements, reporting requirements and compliance and accountability.

What we're proposing in relation to state status is a three tier system that will be consistent, inconsistent and provisionally consistent. We are discussing and we very much want to get feedback on the use of an advisory committee that would help determine the status or provide recommendations on the status of the state.

We want to have the capability to move the state from consistent to inconsistent. Or a state could be moved to provisionally consistent from consistent if deficiencies were determined to be present. And we would expect that those deficiencies would be corrected in a specific amount of time.

The components that will be used to evaluate a state include it's legal authority in resources compliance with surveillance. It's case management activities and it's risk mitigation activities.

And I'd like to state because the question has come up in other discussions is the (unintelligible) pulling out of it's TB and Brucellosis Program, no we have no intent and we will continue to have a cooperative relationship. And insist

with for instance epidemiological investigation the depopulation of herds where appropriate.

So what I'm saying does not suggest that DS is pulling out of these programs. And I wanted to indicate that because that question has come up.

The second component and program requirements is that a state must have a infrastructure laws and regulations to enforce a TB or Brucellosis Program. That they must implement a reportable disease process for TB and Brucellosis. And they must develop an implement a comprehensive animal health plan that is approved and is main publicly available by veterinary services.

And transparency is going to be critical for the success of this regulation and therefore the program.

And so reporting is the third component of program requirements. And states and tribes will be required to report such sayings as the findings of an affected herd as well as updates or summaries of the subsequent investigations that take place.

One of our discussion points that we had and we did have tribal members that participated in the working group. And we had a lengthy discussion about how tribes - some tribes might chose to have their own animal health plan. Or some tribes might choose to work with the animal health official in the state where they are located to address some of these requirements.

The fourth component and program requirements is compliance and accountability. And we want to ensure that the regulations will require this and we're looking at the regulations allowing that states that our compliance

with the regulations or requirements wouldn't be necessarily subject to any interstate movement requirements.

The second element is zoning and it's been broken up into short term containment and long term containment. And short term containment is similar to what we see now with the investigation of an affected herd. Either TB or Brucellosis affected herd.

And it includes the quarantine of affected premises and the conducting of epidemiological investigation. And it also this activity needs to be described in the state or tribes animal health plan. The goal of short term containment is a eradication and it would end with the release of the quarantine.

A long term complaint containment plan will be required if the state or tribe cannot eradicate the disease within a one year period. And again, this long term containment plan is one area where we might look to the assistance of an advisory board to help provide recommendations to that plan.

A long term compliant ban would no longer be needed when the disease has been eradicated. And this has already implemented certain aspects of this zoning concept with the TB federal order and the Brucellosis and was published in December of 2010.

The third component is surveillance and it will incorporate national surveillance such as slaughter activities and will include targeting surveillance of at risk population as indicated in the state or tribes animal health plan. Or, and it will incorporate other surveillance that a state or tribe may conduct that supports any zoning activities that they may have in place.

We will continue to require unique and official ID for a specific program activities. One example would be vaccination. And we would also be - we would require the use of official ID for animals that are involved with epidemiological investigations i.e, the testing of animals we would ensure those animals were officially ID.

Any animal ID requirements will be consistent with traceability and where traceability the proposed rule may address a particular item.

We don't propose to be redundant or recreate the will we will rely on that regulation.

The fourth element is affected herd management and (unintelligible) investigation. And this is an area where we intend on using many of the existing policies that we have in place. The regulation would include a list of items that needed to be identified - excuse me, a list of items that would be need to be defined.

And it will also - will also develop standards and timelines for any investigations, reporting, notification of interstate traces. And this is an area again talking about I spoke earlier about compliance and accountability.

And we want to ensure that any investigations are conducted timely and that there is reporting of the results of those investigations. And that consequences are possible if standards and timelines are not followed.

This proposed Reg would also allow states or tribes to receive high risk or restricted animals. And one such example or one example would be the use of a quarantined feed lot. So the fifth element that we've already mentioned

today and we do recognize that there is a lot of concern. And we've already started to get feedback and that's the indemnity.

And this was one element that we could not - the working group could not reach consensus on. And so what I'm getting ready to say to you is this is a VS Position.

But what we wanted to do what we're trying to do with this position is to simplify the process to ensure that we have the ability to rapidly remove affected herds, or affected animals to prevent further spread of the disease.

We have done a rough calculations looking at the timeframe from removing animals or depopulating herds. And it's roughly about 90 days so there is a fairly long time frame that we look that we have the potential for further spread of the disease.

The - our proposal for indemnity does include the use of a calculator to determine the value of an animal. And the owners would be reimbursed this value minus any salvaged value that they might receive.

And the - as our existing Regs indicate we will all sale the new Regs would indicate that payments are contingent upon the availability of federal funding.

Next with the calculator is to develop it with input of others. And to take into consideration the age or type of animal the stage of milk production per dairy animals. Regional values and other criteria that may be used to develop a calculator.

And the calculator would be subject to review and modification to remain current. One question that has come up as well is would you have a calculator - a separate calculator for bison and yes we would.

We're looking at - we don't have the exact number defined but it's going to depend on the criteria. But certainly the beef versus dairy, versus (unintelligible) services, versus bison does that. We would develop specific calculators where there was a defined need based on the criteria that were developed.

It's that - and I mentioned that and T. J. as well that vision for a separate appraisal or appeal is that in trying we're not considering that in our current position and it's to be able to respond to these situations quickly. And to appropriately manage our limited federal funds.

And for those on you on the call roughly our current appropriated funding for indemnity is roughly about 500,000 for Brucellosis and roughly a million for TB.

The sixth element is interstate movement requirements. And the regulations will allow a state or tribe to institute interstate movement requirements where a risk of disease transmission has been recognized.

And I think I should probably clarify what we're talking about here is a state or zone has an at risk population. And it is deemed necessary that for those animals that are moving outside of that zone to be tested is that the rule will allow them that capability to institute on their own herd testing requirements on a risk.

The Reg regulation proposed regulations will define what types of animals and classifications of the animals and herds might be subject to movement control.

And we would make sure that the Reg allows the ability to implement movement restrictions for non compliance with program management investigations standards and risk mitigation activities.

And again in the context of our discussion we're talking about how an advisory board might assist with recommendations regarding non compliance.

Man: Oh okay.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: The fifth component is import requirements and we've broken it into three groups. Pre-import, import, post import.

Under pre-import we will continue to recognize a country or a zone according to non CFR 92 and that's - those are our regionalization regulations. We would continue to monitor approved countries or zones for conditions or activities that would trigger a review or a change in import requirements.

And our import requirements might be increased up to including halting imports if certain thresholds are reached and exceeded. And some of those thresholds would be number of slaughter cases found in imported animals, coddle fold, tuberculin response rates that are reported and possibly prevalent.

One we will not be focusing on prevalence here though. Certainly that will be taken under consideration but that would not be the single threshold that we would be looking regarding our import requirements.

At imports DS would continue to verify that all conditions have been met by examining the animals and import documentation. We would require that the first point of concentration be identified on import documents and records be maintained to facilitate the tracing of imported animals.

And we do want to institute false security requirements at locations that receive high risk cattle.

We want to ensure that high risk cattle are maintained separate and apart from our domestic breeding population particularly. And we're also proposing certain - will be proposing certain post entry requirements. And one example would be long term testing requirements for some classes of the animals such as rodeo or (adventing) cattle.

The last element is approval procedures related to official test in laboratories. And again we will be pulling much of the new regulatory text from the current regulatory text. We'll provide necessary definitions.

But the purpose of this particular element is to ensure that laboratories that are conducting testing for TB and Brucellosis are approved. And that we have a mechanism of recognizing and acknowledging what is a test that can be used for official program use.

What I clarify in this last element we will not be - we are not proposing any changes to the Centers For Veterinary Biologics Licensing Procedures. Those will remain the same. We're just talking about how in this element how we will approve official test and laboratories conducting those test.

So with that if there are any questions?

Gilles Stockton: Dr. Thomas this is Gilles Stockton. Am I right in assuming that this framework has no standing over the national park service or fish or wildlife?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: That's correct.

Gilles Stockton: Isn't that a huge hole in the control of Brucellosis?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Yes, however as you indicated we have no authority over those particular agencies. That we have to move forward to collaborate - work collaboratively with those agencies. But we have no direct regulatory authority.

Judith McGeary: Judith McGeary - I had a question on the indemnity calculator. Will one of the criteria include things such as the you know, rare breeds and heritage blood lines particularly for the - for the heritage blood lines particularly.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: I think it certainly could. I would encourage you to make comments to that affect regarding the calculator. Our discussions have been preliminary and we have not defined all the criteria that would be used.

Judith McGeary: Thanks.

Genell Pridgen: This is Genell Pridgen typically I would like to have further clarification on that. Because with this national safety program typically an indemnity would be for what the market value would be for that animal as far as on a commercial basis not - at least that's my understanding. Not typically the breeding stock value of that animal. Am I correct?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: On the - right off the top of my head I can't answer that question related to (scrappy). But I think the question is and the working group had extensive discussions regarding the fair market value. And I believe what's being

discussed here is really questions about the value market value. And the intent of the calculator would be to determine the fair market value.

Genell Pridgen: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Boyd Parr: Lee Ann this is Boyd Parr again back to the indemnity to the issue. And I appreciate you being very clear you know, there is a difference on the community and this DS recommendation.

My colleagues that have talked to me about this and they have convinced me that it sounds - I think are very much not opposed to a good calculator and they also share your goals of trying to be able to respond quickly.

I think there fault is that there is a spelled out process for an appeal of a unique situation that in fact you may end up being able to come to an agreement sooner as opposed to being tied up in court without giving an appeal. That there is an internal process for a second appraisal, you know, something like that.

So just to get that out you know, everyone shares the goal of being able to respond best more quickly. I think some of my state colleagues had experience in this area think that the actual result may be longer with no appeal at all.

The better job you do on the calculator the less often it'll happen. And the fact that someone has that option may make them more confident in your calculator and less likely to appeal.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Thank you and one thing I'd like to clarify the question has come up in my presentation I talked about indemnity and I was speaking about indemnity

particularly in regards to those situations where a decision was made that I heard did need to be depopulated as opposed to a test and removal procedure.

So I don't want to imply that we are going to depopulate all TB and Brucellosis affected herds. We have actually in both programs we have used testing removal.

So I don't want to suggest and I don't want anybody to go away from this meeting thinking that we are suddenly going to start taking the taking of herds under the scenario. We still be using test and remove procedures where it is appropriate.

Chuck Massengill: Lee Ann this is Chuck Massengill. Good morning.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Hi.

Chuck Massengill: I have a question about the short term - long term containment. We said long term would occur when the state or tribe could not eliminate the infection within a year. And that would mean to say that the state or tribe is going to define the conditions for quarantine release. I can't imagine getting a herd off of TB quarantine within a year. Nor can I really expect a Brucellosis affected herd to be able to certify free of disease in a year.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Yes and Chuck the working groups intent there would be I think that one year period is - in that one year period if you continue to have new incidents or new cases of disease that pop up.

Because you make a good point you could have a herd particularly with TB that would be under a quarantine for a period of over a year.

Chuck Massengill: Okay thank you. Thank you very much that helps me understand that. Now if I can on the detail go back to Page 5, Item Number 4. The programs should be flexible enough to include additional agent species when producer or industry initiatives support certification or accreditation.

And then the next sentence seems to address host species. And then the last sentence address (Asian) species again. Is that the way it was intended to be?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: And Chuck I don't haft that document in front of me.

Chuck Massengill: Okay.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: So...

Chuck Massengill: You messed up you gave it to us.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Well no I think what the intent was there during the working group we had discussions for instance as to whether or not we were going to broaden the regulatory framework to include for instance Brucella melitensis as well as for that particular disease agent.

But then the question came up as - and similarly are we going to have a Brucellosis program in sheep and goats.

Chuck Massengill: Yes.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: So the question is are we going to extend it to B Melitensis. And currently this regulation will not do that. Nor do we plan on initiating routine surveillance in sheep and goats that would support a Brucellosis Program in sheep and goats simply for funding reasons.

So the comment about industry and ultimately congress is if we were to get funding to do so we would certainly consider that.

Chuck Massengill: Okay well I can see that's good and then it does - it is intended so that we do have flexibility on both host species and agent species so I appreciate that.

And the next question I have is on our imported animals we specifically address fate heifers imported for feeding. And I wonder why because I know we have in the past imported sexually intact heifers for feeding restricted for feeding or intended for feeding.

And I wonder if that state heifer reference was necessary in there if it should just be heifers?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Is that...

Chuck Massengill: The importation I realize you don't have that but...

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Yes I have it I just don't have it in front of me. And I'm thinking of the context of how state heifers were used. And I simply recall that state heifers were used is it is a mechanism to mitigate the risk of Brucellosis in imported animals where the country has not been recognized just being free of Brucellosis.

Chuck Massengill: Yes.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: So it's - I think of...

Chuck Massengill: Here is something that might not be appropriate. So maybe somebody else on the committee can help me - or maybe I'm just being distracted by something that is not even significant.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Okay ask me if the question - is the question would we continue to consider fang of heifers. And I think it may be helpful to use the context of Mexico. But where we do have a state heifer program.

Chuck Massengill: Now the question was on importation it addresses steers and state heifers for feeding. And my question was why we limited to that state heifers?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Probably because we were focusing on Mexico.

Chuck Massengill: Okay because we were importing intact heifers from Canada but they were going directly to feed if I remember - right?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Correct. And the - and thank you Chuck for pointing that out because it would probably - that is a reference that is specific to situation in Mexico. And certainly would not be applied necessarily to all countries around the world.

And that points out the import Regs are intended to address the import of cattle, bison, captive service, around the world not necessarily specific countries.

Chuck Massengill: Those are just the details that caught my eye reading through it that when I read them I had to read back over them to make sure that I was reading it right. Thank you very much.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Perhaps for the group Chuck if I can go back to one of your questions about what is this program going to cover.

I think it's important to note because the working group discussed this is that if we have a situation where we have a TB affected herd where that if you will premise is going to be depopulated and there are other species on that premises that are known to be affected with TB that we would depopulate those animals as well.

So we're going to use really the existing flexibility we want to make sure we maintain that in the new regulation. So when you're dealing with a specific situation where you have cattle bison service that are found to be affected that we're able to remove other species as well.

Chuck Massengill: I think our group would be very comfortable with that. Thank you.

Gilles Stockton: Dr. Thomas this is Gilles Stockton again. In terms of bison there is wild bison and then there is many more domestic bison. Is it a legal distinction between the two clear?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Are you getting to when we referred - well, I'm not sure. Not being a lawyer but bison when I say bison I'm talking about those animals that are considered to be managed and maintained under a captive behind situation.

Gilles Stockton: Yes what I'm wondering about is that certain bison from Yellowstone Park have been tested and Brucellosis free. And then the State of Montana sells them.

I think sometimes their - they go to different private ownerships or some tribe and enter into a herd there. Well then are they captive domestic bison then or are they wild bison?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: I would have to know certain circumstances those animals are basically being released into parks. Certain circumstances where they have little to know management and under those scenarios I would call them wild.

However, if they are going into somebody that has a - that is in the business of selling those animals if it's a production then I think they're subject to these regulations.

For other programs if they are behind the fence and they are being managed they are subject to the regulations. And I recognize that the key there is what's the definition of managed.

But you bring out a good point is that the regulations need to be clear as to what were covering.

Gilles Stockton: Yes I certainly hope that in the future in this committee we could have a more in depth conversation about this issue.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Any other questions for Lee Ann?

Lee Ann I just had a clarification on something Genell asked about the indemnity issue and I heard you say fair market value. I assume the calculator make a distinction between a grade hosting cow and a registered hosting cow?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Okay thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Other questions?

Charlie Rogers: Lee Ann this is Charlie Rogers in your indemnity funds if they are depleted and you have another herd that needs to be depopulated do we have any idea how we'd handle that this time?

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Yes we've had discussions on that. And part of those discussions have included what we've done in the past. Well we'll go back and CC monies the credit commodity corporation funding. And we have done that in the past. Most recently for TB.

However, the current administration does not look favorably for request for CC funding. Unfortunately for instance with TB we've been doing it a while with the promise that we would irradiate TB.

So CC request are unlikely to be - are not likely to be favorably received or approved.

So we're left with the option of test and remove where we're in a situation where we really to depopulate a herd. Or, alternatively if it's at the end of the fiscal year you hold that hold and then you depopulate when funds are available.

Because funds are limited your question and what my response is ultimately we may run out of money and although it is no ones preference that the herd be handled under a test and remove.

Unless the industry or the state were to provide funding for that depopulation.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Other questions?

Michael Doerrer: Don't do this again. But I would encourage the committee to publicize the upcoming public meetings on the TB framework to your constituents. Let them know what is happening and where there is a federal register notice out about them.

So we welcome public comments at those venues in addition to written comments.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes. Michael can we have the dates and places again. Okay.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: I'd be happy to give those. May 19th will be in Lansing, Michigan. May 24th we'll be in Atlanta, Georgia. June 1 we'll be in Bozeman, Montana. And June 6th we'll be in Amarillo, Texas.

Michael Doerrer: And additional details including agendas are on our Web site. Off the APHIS home page.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay thank you very much Lee Ann.

Dr. Lee Ann Thomas: Oh thank you. And if I may if I can just ask of the committee is that we really want to see your comments. And would really like to encourage you to submit. If there is something you'd like but also if there is something you don't like tell us what you would like to see instead.

So thank you for the opportunity it
S greatly appreciate it.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thank you again.

Hey and if we have our next speaker I guess that would also be a key question. Is Theresa Boyle on?

Dr. Theresa Boyle: Yes I'm here.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Oh great. So thank you for joining us Theresa I think you're going to give us a status update from South Korea which I think would be very interesting and useful.

Dr. Theresa Boyle: Okay just so everybody knows who I am I'm Theresa Boyle I work with APHIS International Services. I'm a Foreign Service Officer and I served in numerous locations overseas including Costa Rica with the (unintelligible) Eradication Program. Mexico city with trade issues and the Exotic Animal Disease Commission. Uruguay as the Plant and Animal Health Trade Attaché and then most recently in China covering animal and plant health issues. And now I'm on domestic rotation here in Riverdale.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: So a full passport - huh?

Dr. Theresa Boyle: Yes, definitely. I'm going to go into some of the foot and mouth disease outbreak information from South Korea. But just processing that this is not to imply that South Korea is the only country that is having problems with foot and mouth disease.

There have been other outbreaks happening in the past such as mainland China as well as Taiwan or Chinese Taipei, South Africa, Bulgaria, Libya, North Korea as well, Mongolia, Angola, Mosambiek, Zambia, (unintelligible), Russia and Japan.

So it's not isolated just in Korea but today I was asked to discuss specifically in Korea. So that's the direction I'm going to (unintelligible).

The outbreak - the most recent outbreak in Korea was notified to the OIE in November - the end of November specifically the 29th. That they were having a reoccurrence of foot and mouth diseases Serotype O in the east central portion of the country and their swine.

This serotype was similar to that in circulation and other countries in South East Asia.

Previous outbreaks in South Korea were in January of 2010 which was Serotype A and then again in April 2010 which was Serotype O. That was reported to be under control as June 7, 2010 - okay.

They don't know the exact reason that they got it yet they are speculation on how they got the disease. But it did move fairly quickly before good movement controls were put into place.

Possible reasons are very typical of other outbreaks that we've seen around the world. Meetings that were being attended by different farmers, pregnancy checking, artificial insemination, people coming on the farms, the use of transport vehicles both for feed and animals without disinfection. They definitely had a lack of good bio security on the farms.

So it's very typical of what we hear in other countries that are having outbreaks that are not controlled very quickly. Early on they had problems due to the cold weather of how they deal with having the disinfections, etc., happen with sub freezing temperatures.

It went across the gamut of different species. It was in swine, dairy cattle, beef cattle and goats. They did put control measures in place as soon as the outbreak was identified. They slaughtered affected animals. They put premises under quarantine. They put movement controls into place.

They had screening of animals, zoning, they did enforce disinfection of affected premises, livestock markets were closed. But in all when they were right in the midst of the outbreak there was close to 175,000 personnel that were mobilized.

And they had about 1500 checkpoints that were established to help try to control the spread of foot-and-mouth disease. By the end of December Korea pretty much decided that they weren't going to get this under control and they needed to vaccinate.

So they decided at the end of December to vaccinate nationwide about 13 million swine and cattle. That - it took until about the end of January for the first round of vaccinations to be completed.

On about January 14th South Korea did request assistance from the United States in the form of vaccinations.

And the foot-and-mouth disease vaccine bank at the North American foot-and-mouth vaccine bank which includes Canada, Mexico and the United States, got together because that's where our vaccines are held are the vaccines bank.

And it was decided that we would comply with their request and we supplied them with about 2.5 million vaccines. Putting that in perspective it's not even 10% of the vaccines they needed but it was useful for them.

As of May 13th, as of today, the total number of cases now stands at 153 cases of foot-and-mouth disease there. The last case was in swine on April 23rd. And prior to that was April 20th. And prior to that it had been about a month.

Numbers that we've received as the countries culled more than 3.47 million cattle, pigs and other animals. And it's cost them in losses of about 2.78 billion US dollars or in their money, 3 trillion one.

They did face a number of challenges during the outbreak situation, some things that hopefully could have been avoided but will be in the future. But there was a lot of reports of animal cruelty, reports of animals being buried alive and there were videos of that as well.

They had to address that fairly quickly because of the public outcry. And either it wasn't getting reported a lot after that point or they got it under control.

There have been public statements being made recently indicating that they believe mistakes may have been made in the vaccination cycling which is why the last two cases were found possibly with the timing of the dosages or the amount given or defective syringes.

But different possible scenarios of why that may have failed in some of the instances. They are taking some future actions. Three of them that I know of is that they are planning to continue to vaccinate animals for the foreseeable future. There's no plan at this point to start weaning cattle off the vaccination.

They are also considering developing their own vaccine bank and a reference laboratory. But these plans have not taken effect at all yet. It's just in conversation.

Another future action that they plan to put in place starting next year is introducing a permit system so that they can regulate their local agricultural sector a little bit better and know where people are producing livestock.

This is going to place a greater responsibility on the individual farmers so that they can help prevent outbreaks but also have some type of a system in place to penalize those failing to follow the animal protection regulations and requirements.

In 2012 large corporate farms are going to be getting their permits. That makes up about 4.4% of livestock growers or about 8600 farms.

It's also, in 2012, going to include animal breeding in chick hatching farms because it's not just going to be those farms that are susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease but all livestock agricultural sector.

By 2015 they expect to have it have expanded to all small scale farms including cattle, pigs, chickens and ducks which is about 81,000 farms. They do plan to have penalties for noncompliance. Violators could use their permits. They could pay fines or they could even face jail terms.

What they would like us to do is to have farmers be required to take responsibility for their farms.

There have been many - there's been a lot of talk through the ministries and through the public that the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and also the

Avian Influenza outbreak that happened is blaming it on farmers not doing their part to decontaminate themselves, their animals or employees.

So they really want that responsibility to go to them and not just be laid on the government. This permitting system will also mandate how animal waste is disposed of. So any unauthorized disposal of waste could result in immediate revoking of their permits.

So in the future they'd like both the farmers and the local governments to play more of a role in handling disease outbreaks. They're stating that local governments are going to be required to pay about 20% of the compensation for animals culled and the rest would come from the central government.

So they're trying to bring more of that to a shared responsibility. That's pretty much the update for South Korea.

Just a little bit of what's going on in North Korea although I don't have the most recent update because it is not something that we have information sharing of readily as I'm sure you can all well imagine.

On February 7, 2011 North Korea notified the OIE and FAO that they had FMD detections in their country as well. At that time there was already 135 affected premises including cattle, goat and swine.

Their total animal population is estimated to be about 400,000 cattle, 2 million swine, 2 million goats and about 100,000 sheep. With North Korea they had no contingency plan in place to deal with the foot-and-mouth disease outbreak. They had no standard operating procedures.

They had no containment strategy. And their information management was very difficult to manage due to domestic communication channels. And in addition, they also had no FMD vaccine available. Their foot-and-mouth outbreak spread very rapidly.

Their response was extremely unfocused and incomplete - isolation of infected farms. There was talk between officials that North Korea felt that they got it from South Korea but there is no recorded date of when North Korea really had their first outbreak. So that's not confirmed.

FMD in North Korea was threatening to worsen an already very fragile food supply system. And the response from the officials there were to request North Korean citizens to consume less food.

When this outbreak occurred obviously folks know that North Korea doesn't have a lot of cooperation with other countries. But they did request FAO to come in to review the situation. And that's where we got a lot of our information from.

The North Koreans were requesting that FAO provide vaccine for emergency use, provide assistance for vaccination production in North Korea. And also provide assistance to enable domestic production of diagnostic reagents.

All of the things that were being requested were going to necessitate an emergency plan that would cause - that money was not available readily. North Korea was told by FAO that they really do need to establish and protect foot-and-mouth disease and have a response plan in effect.

They don't have a strategic vaccine campaign and they do need capacity building in both epidemiology and basic bio security. So the situation there is

not as transparent as it was in South Korea. So we don't know the exact situation that's going on there. And that is being headed by FAO.

Okay. And if anybody has any questions I'd be happy to answer any if I can. If I can't then I will try to get the answer for you and get back to you.

Dr. (Howard Hill): This is (Howard Hill). Does South Korea export any pork products?

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): Not fresh. If there is any product that comes in it would have to be treated to other countries. But if it was to come here it would have to be treated in accordance with all the requirements. But I don't know of any that's coming in.

Dr. (Howard Hill): No, I wasn't asking whether it comes into the United States. I was asking whether they export to any other Asian countries.

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): Oh, okay. Yes. But I don't have that information in front of me of exactly what product and where they go to.

Man: What was the response of China to the North Korean outbreak?

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): When it was brought up to them during a meeting it was basically noncommittal. So if they are doing something with the North Koreans they did not express that to our authorities.

Man: And again, do you have a feeling of how capable they are to control FMD outbreak?

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): The Chinese?

Man: Yes.

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): That's a loaded question. I lived in China for about three years. I do know in the past before I was there, they denied having any foot-and-mouth disease.

And they called a disease Q which was very similar to foot-and-mouth disease and I believe it was back in about 2004, 2005 when they came out and said that they do have foot-and-mouth disease in the country. They have outbreaks periodically in different areas.

The response that I have always received from China was that an outbreak occurred. It occurred on this farm with this many animals. The animals were destroyed and the outbreak is under control. It probably begs more questions but that's not something that we get additional information on.

So we consider China as a country affected by foot-and-mouth disease, the capacities that they have to deal with it they probably have a lot of the knowledge of how to do it. I don't know if they always have the resources and I don't know what they would share with North Korea.

The transparency that we have with China is not the best as everybody knows. I'm not telling you anything you don't already know there.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: (Teresa) this is Don. I was wondering about South Korea and their vaccination program. I get the impression that they're into maybe a long term vaccination program. And is it confined to just one region of the country or is it a long term vaccination program, do you know?

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): I don't know how long term it is but in the foreseeable future they have not announced when they might be stopping again. The outbreak hit them

pretty hard. It's devastated a lot of their industry in that respect. They don't want to chance that happening again.

I think - my impression is that they're going to be making a lot of changes and getting a lot of things in order before they risk having something like that happen again. But they have not indicated how long. But for the foreseeable future they will be continuing to vaccinate.

One of their main concerns is that they really do not have definite information of how it got there. They have theories but there's no definite. So because they don't know how they got it they don't know how they can prevent it for sure.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Well it also seems likely that they may not be at the end of this outbreak either if they just had a couple of cases less than a month ago. So probably still.

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): And what they're attributing that is in - is the management of the vaccine program.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay, thanks.

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): And we...

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Any other questions for Dr. (Boyle)?

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): I do want to just add one thing that within international services we do have an office in Seoul. We have (Scott Zaks) who is our foreign service officer there as well as a couple of foreign service nationals that work in that office. So we are located there.

They do cover North Korea as well but with very limited any - information whatsoever.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: And they never requested any help from us other than the vaccine from the vaccine bag correct?

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): Correct. They asked for some information that was shared with them on some of our programs but nothing monetary or anything more than just some documents to help them out.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes.

Dr. (Teresa Boyle): Yes. And I do want to make a note that the vaccine was not donated to them. It was given to them with the understanding that they would then pay back the bank with feed stock. So it was not a donation.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay. Well thank you very much. So I guess we're onto our next item on the agenda which is a report from Dr. Darrell Styles on continuing along the FMD vain. He's going to talk about stakeholder meeting and gap analysis. Dr. Styles are you there?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Yes. I am thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Sure.

Dr. Darrell Styles: I'm with Veterinary Services Emergency Management. The first item is the summary of the stakeholder meeting which was held May 2nd here in Riverdale.

This was an assemblage of APHIS animal stakeholders both from the production sector as well as the processing industries, wholesale sectors and retail sector.

Because we're trying to bridge a lot of the gaps in our preparedness through the entire food chain and not just from the producer perspective because once disease occurs we know that the entire food chain is going to be impacted by them.

The topic of this particular meeting was foot-and-mouth disease vaccination. And APHIS has never really focused on that alone. We've always had that discussion in the context with other meetings where it was a subject.

But here Dr. John Clif Boyd, our CVO, made it clear that vaccine was a clear - was a viable option and a tool that we may use in the event of a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak to control the spread of the disease.

The problem that we have as regulators and our stakeholders is that each industry sector will probably have to use vaccine differently. It will have a profound impact on our export markets overnight. Those will be closed.

And it takes some degree of negotiation to reopen those markets depending on the time that we are involved in mitigating the outbreak and the degree of spread and what sector it may be found in. So each production sector of course would have a different model of using the vaccine.

And let me just give you an example and this is just an example of how perhaps there are some differences between the production sectors.

In the dairy sector they may elect to vaccinate for long term or life simply because it's so difficult to replace the dairy animals, to put them back into production quickly.

Whereas in the swine factor and production units there if we're talking feeder pigs, they may elect not to vaccinate but elect to depopulate or they may elect to vaccinate certain sectors of the swine industry such as the genetic stock and fowl operations.

We - what we've done is we're turning to our stakeholders to help us formulate a rational strategy for each sector and region to employ vaccine if it has to be used in an outbreak setting.

So that was the purpose of this meeting and there was a brief docket of speakers that addressed points such as general response to foreign animal disease specifically FMD. That was Dr. ClifBoyd.

There was a primer on basic vaccine and vaccine function and that was Dr. Pam Hollinger of UC Davis. Then two people from our National Center for Import and Export.

Dr. Michael David and Dr. Julie Punderson provided discussions on the economic impact of food-and-mouth disease and how that would impact trade both domestically and foreign.

Clearly I think everyone agrees that foot-and-mouth disease while being a terrible, infectious disease it's a much more profound economic disease and we need to look at it in that regard. The remainder of the meeting then was discussions divided by table.

So each table had about six to eight participants and they had a list of questions each pertaining to vaccine use and their feelings about it. And which we collated those results after the meeting. And those will be provided in a digest form probably in the next week or so.

The important part (sequelia) of this meeting is that a working group is being formed. That working group is being chaired by Dr. Jane Rooney and Dr. Pam Hollinger.

And this vaccine working group will work directly with the stakeholders to help form a rational vaccine strategy that APHIS can employ in the event of an emergency. And that working group is just now getting started.

Dr. Rooney is now taking names of interested parties from our stakeholders who want to be involved in that planning process. And I imagine that that working group will be ongoing for sometime because this is a very complicated subject.

I think what we learned at APHIS from this stakeholder meeting, is that our industries are much more receptive to the thought of vaccine use given the experiences in Korea and Japan recently and seeing the devastation that occurred economically in the UK where they elected not to use vaccines to contain the outbreak.

So it's - as regulators we will consider it a tool. The decision to use the vaccine will probably have to come very early in the outbreak. But we need to only - we need to reach that decision in context of our stakeholders and the impact that it may have on them.

And that concludes my remarks about the meeting. Are there any questions about it? I guess we can move onto the gaps that you asked me to prepare from the last call. And I've listed a series of challenges that we have here at APHIS.

And let me preface these remarks by saying that we are ready to mount a response to a foreign animal disease.

But we do have some challenges and some resource challenges that we would like to enlist your help on in trying to bring focus to these issues which would be very important to our efforts to combat an infectious disease, particularly FMD.

And I believe you have those (blip) points in front of you. Is that correct?

Woman: RJ, did you have a chance to get those out to the committee or did you not get them in time?

RJ Cabrera: I believe the committee has them. If they don't we can...

Woman: I may have mentioned this in the email but I don't remember seeing that one.

Woman: We'll get them to the committee members after the meeting along with (Teresa Boyle)'s talking points as well.

Dr. Darrell Styles: I apologize for that oversight but I'll go through them slowly. The first challenge that we have is that there is insufficient vaccine and antigen stores within our foot-and-mouth disease vaccine bank to address an FMD outbreak adequately.

How the vaccine is kept at this time is in a concentrated form. It is not in a usable vaccine form but it must be processed into that. That can take several days in order to make that available to us as regulators. At the inception of any outbreak certainly we would begin that conversion process.

But several things must take place - the type of virus must be determined so that we can reconstitute the - vaccine matching that particular strain - that order.

One of the things that we would like to do in the foot-and-mouth disease vaccine bank is actually have physical vaccine available, not only antigen. The reason we have antigen is that it has a very long shelf life in the freezer and can be kept in a concentrated form.

The vaccine itself is guaranteed for about a year once it's manufactured and is immediately off the shelf, available for use.

And in the past we've elected not to maintain those stores but the policy change within the foot-and-mouth disease bank be for us to maintain that we are going to approach our partners, Mexico and Canada - thought they would be interested in expanding the use of the - of vaccine.

And if not we would still move forward with that plan so that it would be available to the US because you can well imagine in the early days of an outbreak we do need some vaccine to get started in containing an outbreak.

So that will cost more money to have that kind of off the shelf vaccine available. And this is one challenge that we have in this resource strapped environment, is trying to have adequate stores within our foot-and-mouth bank and having readily available vaccine to use.

Should we address each point separately or just - questions or keep going?

Woman: I think it's up to you. How do you think it will best be received?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Were there any questions about that particular challenge?

Man: Yes. I've got a question. You said that once the vaccine is made the shelf life is how long?

Dr. Darrell Styles: About one year.

Man: You know, I don't know how many million doses you're planning to have in stock but, you know, that's going to really, really add to the cost of the program.

You know, and not being able to anticipate when an outbreak would occur I don't know how you'd put a cost - I don't know how you ever associate a cost with that. We haven't had an outbreak since 1929 or 1927 or something like that.

You know, and if it's another 70 years which I know our risk is higher now, but we're going to incur a lot of costs over whatever period of time that is.

Dr. Darrell Styles: I agree that it would be a costly measure. However, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And (unintelligible) the amount of (prey) that we would lose over time, very rapidly rather than costing in the millions it would cost well into the billions.

So we feel that this kind of preparation would help certainly the strain that we would have as off the shelf would be those common strains to North America and South and Central America first. And those would be the (O-SIRO) types.

Man: And if it's a different (SIRO) type the breaking out antigen and making vaccine?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Correct. We can only be as prepared as we can based on a risk analysis. The next point is one that I think is on everyone's mind is that we do have insufficient numbers of specialized and trained personnel ready to be immediately deployed in an FMB outbreak.

Certainly, you know, in the UK they solicited the help from other countries. Veterinarians from all over the world went over to help them in their effort in 2001. Here we would be in a similar situation.

Many of our contractors that are associated with the National Veterinary stockpile have requested training for specialized tasks such as depopulation and in some cases specialized disposal. Unfortunately, APHIS doesn't have that kind of funding or resources to mount that sort of training.

To give you an idea of how valuable this is in the recent tornadic activities in Alabama there were a number of collapsed poultry houses. I believe there were over 400 of them.

Through our cooperators at the North Carolina Department of Agriculture we dispatched a team of engineers to Alabama to help them with their foaming units which had to be modified on site in order to produce the type of foam that would be able to depopulate the poultry in the houses that had collapsed that were unsafe for human entry.

So had we had this kind of training available ahead of time we could have prepared those industries for the type of training needed to modify their units to produce the type of foam for this particular response activity.

And this is something that we had wanted to do and we've had some minimal training built into some of our cooperative agreements. But this is a challenge that we have is that training is an issue.

On the third point, one that I have repeated before and it is kind of one of my mantras - this is - we have insufficient options for depopulation and disposal and particularly the disposal when it comes to an animal health emergency. There are diseases out there other than foot-and-mouth.

And there are even conditions out there other than foot-and-mouth that we may have to mount a depopulation disposal effort.

Unfortunately there is no surge capacity built into our disposal system and that remains to be an almost insurmountable challenge in some ways for destroying large numbers of animals quickly. We can do it with poultry because of the way we can manage those carcasses.

When we're talking about hoof stock it's a tremendous burden on the agency as well as the states in order to try to mitigate those carcasses safely.

So that's why at least with FMD we are looking at vaccine as an option to either synchronize our ability to depop and dispose over time so that we do not overwhelm our current disposal system.

Or if we did have to do a mass disposal we would have to look at some other options none of which are very favorable. So that's going to take some more work. APHIS certainly has invested in technologies for disposal and depopulation.

But as you can imagine, we're only making down payments in that area that much more work needs to be done in determining the appropriate - especially in the disposal technology area. Any questions on that one?

Under the next one we - one of the things that we - I have a lot of confidence in is our laboratory network.

Our National Veterinary Services Lab, our Foreign Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory and our National Animal Health Laboratory Networks and our state labs will do an outstanding job in handling surge capacity in the face of an outbreak. They're going to be well prepared.

One of the problems though will be the chain that is feeding those laboratory networks.

Having people in the field that know how to properly collect the specimens, proper handling of those specimens to insure that we don't have contamination and then transport of those specimens to the laboratory for diagnostics.

We need to have a better infrastructure and more coordinated planning when it comes to our activities in terms of getting the appropriate samples and sample chains to our laboratory networks. And again, that comes back to a training issue.

Another point that we had that is really of great concern to us is that there is a lack of planning and Memorandums of Understanding or Agreement to address safe commodity as both live animal and product movement and control and continuity of business issues during an outbreak.

We have some outstanding work going on right now with a secure milk supply plan which I think is great. The secure egg supply plan which is now complete and being adopted by some states. And APHIS is hoping fund the secure pork supply plan.

We'd also like to have - move forward if we did have the funding available, on a secure beef supply plan. The issue is, is that while we do have these very good plans and some wonderful regional activity going on it's not moving forward fast enough on a coordinated basis.

So in other words, if we were in an outbreak we're not sure how well states would cooperate with each other in agreement over allowing these commodities to move so that business can occur unimpeded.

And we'd like to certainly reach out to our state partners and our industry stakeholders to help us move forward on that kind of a coordinated planning effort because it sits heavily in our minds.

I think (Teresa) mentioned it and something that has been repetitively mentioned to me by regulators from Korea and Japan is the most valuable thing that they did in the outbreak was control animal and commodity movement.

Without that no amount of vaccination, depopulation or disposal will stop the outbreak. You have to be able to monitor and control the animal and

commodity movements and do so safely while not interfering unduly with commerce.

Otherwise we will not be able to hold to control the disease adequately. But this is something that's much bigger than APHIS. It's going to take a lot of planning on the state level, perhaps bringing in DHS partners to do this because this is a very large issue, because we're dealing with economics here.

One thing that (Teresa) mentioned and another point that we're concerned about is the lack of adequate bio security plans for farms, ranches, carriers and processors all to be implemented before and during an FMD or Foreign Animal Disease outbreak.

Many industries do have bio security plans but these are not well - they're not practiced and they're not well disseminated amongst their producer stakeholders.

And that's one of the issues that we've had is to try to ensure that farms have a - if you would consider this a peace time and a war time type of strategy for bio security and control with of course the war time strategy being much more stringent measures when we were in the middle of an outbreak.

But clearly I think you can see in some of our less - our non foreign animal disease issues such as (pers) who widely it spread amongst our swine industry. And if - with a sufficient amount of bio security that that disease itself can be controlled with the proper measures.

But we would like to have some more integrated planning and bio security plans from our stakeholders as well as our other industries. Another point that we have is lack of ISO.

ISO is International Standards Organization - cleaning and disinfection standards for restoring our packers and renderers to normal operation after processing FMD contaminated material. In the UK this was done but the UK is not a net exporter of product. They consume what product they use.

So whether - how they clean their packing plants and their rendering plants only affected them internally. It was not an external export decision. However, in the United States our plants themselves do export. And it weighs heavily on the mind of both our renderers and our processors.

Should contaminated material go through the plant, how can they reassure our foreign trading partners that they have adequately cleaned those plants and now can reopen those markets for export? Unfortunately we have no money for ISO standards research.

But we are doing some of that with a little bit of APHIS money on the side with DHS help and looking at fugitive emissions within our rendering facilities.

In other words, what we're using is an innocuous bacteria or tracer, following that through the rendering process and seeing where it can - where it may escape the process and then how that can be mitigated after - afterwards.

So that project is ongoing but much more work needs to be done on development of these ISO standards so should we have an outbreak of any sort our industries can be reassured that they can reopen and provide some quality assurance for our trading partners that they are clean.

The next to the last point is animal trafficking data. We have animal trafficking data because we could actually focus APHIS resources and the response resources on particular areas where we know animals are moving if we've identified a risk in that sector.

Certainly with our integrated industries we have much more availability of that data in the swine and poultry sectors but less so in the others.

And it would be - it would be very important to us to generate models of animal movement and disease spread so that we can optimize our resources, focus our attentions on those areas which may be of highest risk and then move forward with mitigating a threat that would be in that area if we had that data.

And lastly is one I think that everyone knows about which is going to be challenges with animal traceability within select production sectors leading to issues with monitoring and regionalization of trade. I'm not going to go into that one. I think everyone understands the challenges there.

But suffice it to say that if - in order for us to zone which is the same as regionalization, under the OIE rules, there has to be some form of traceability otherwise we cannot export from that sector. And with that I'll conclude.

Man: Thank you Dr. Styles.

(Jannelle Fridgen): I have a question. This is (Jannelle Fridgen). Would it be possible that his talking points could be sent to us so that we could sit there and read them, you know, when we have more time to kind of go through that - the different concerns that he had?

RJ Cabrera: Yes. We'll get these to you immediately after the call.

(Jannelle Fridgen): Okay, thank you.

(Willy Reed): Yes. I have a question I'd like to ask. This is (Willy Reed).

When you were talking about getting samples to the network laboratories and the fact that the collectors may not be adequately trained to collect those samples, is there any just thought or plan on training people to adequately collect samples and get them to the laboratories?

Because it makes little sense to have all those capabilities in our labs and we get poor quality samples or inappropriate samples to them.

Dr. Darrell Styles: I think certainly our non animal - our National Animal Health Laboratory Networks would be delighted if training funding were made available so that we could do this on a state outreach basis. But unfortunately in this budgetary environment that type of training is not available.

And we do have foreign animal disease diagnosticians that are sent to areas to do the investigation. But unfortunately we just don't have enough of them that could do sufficient surveillance in an outbreak situation. In peace time we barely have enough to meet our needs as is.

Charlie Rogers: Darrell, this is Charlie Rogers. Back to having vaccine available - is there any type of probability study on a foot-and-mouth outbreak in the US in the next five to ten years or anything like that? Is there any type of study like that?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Yes. There have been studies out there but as you can well imagine, this is based on statistical data. And when statistics become involved people start

arguing the validity of the models that generate those types of disease spread models and issues.

So we don't have one that we feel at this point is completely reliable. (SIA) is certainly trying to move forward into - with their modeling teams to perfect better and more accurate models.

But this is a moving target because we lack a lot of sufficient data especially when it comes to animal movement, to provide the basis for those modeling so that we can do accurate disease spread analysis.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Following up on that, this is Don, has there been any thought given to purchasing off the shelf vaccine from perhaps South American countries that may already be involved in full scale vaccination programs like Argentina and perhaps others?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Yes. Our National Veterinary stockpile is engaged with them. And so agreements would be in place for that potential.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Good. Thanks Darrell.

(Cyril Stockton): This is (Cyril Stockton). Dr. Styles, you mentioned the need for traceability for resumption of exports. Could you comment on the usefulness of traceability in - during an outbreak?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Well it would be great if we were - if we could trace back and index case and all of its subsequent contacts so that we could assure that that particular chain had been followed up thoroughly and that we were able to contain that particular spread or line of spread.

And so traceability would certainly help us in that situation. And it's something that - in terms of a - as an APHIS regulator and a virologist that's what we look at traceability for, is specifically for disease control.

Having traceability available is certainly part of the OIE guidelines in terms of its economic function, to assure that you're only trading out of free zones or clear zones.

But in terms of disease control traceability would be invaluable for us in terms of trying to track a disease and ensure that we have eliminated all possible contacts.

(Cyril Stockton): To kind of follow up on that though what is foot-and-mouth disease with an 11 or 12 day incubation period. Would this particular traceability program that we're looking at be able to provide the data in time to be useful?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Well some data is better than no data. And so we understand the challenges in trying to secure a mutually agreeable traceability system. But just having any system in place would be helpful for us despite the fact that we are looking at somewhat of a lag time. And we do realize that that would be a factor.

(Cyril Stockton): Thank you.

Dr. (Howard Hill): Dr. Styles this is Dr. (Hill). I would like to go back to your comments about the (NOM)'s capability. I would agree with you, the labs are very well prepared.

But my understanding - a recent meeting I was at there was a lot of concern about the ability of the laboratories to communicate the results and the data

back to a centralized clearinghouse at the - at a federal level where we'd have to maintain those records and know what's going on.

What's being done to help with the communication with those laboratories?

Dr. Darrell Styles: Dr. (Lautner)'s on the phone. She can probably address that better than I could. She's not - well I do know that they are working on a uniform method and standardized method of communicating between the laboratories. I cannot remember the acronym. I apologize for that.

Several long laboratories that I have worked with are in the process of converting to this form of records communication.

And they're in the testing or beta testing phase or have now moved into the phase of using that system so that the records format is seamless across the system and in a way that the data can be received into appropriate central clearinghouse, provide the government with what it needs to do, its function but not necessarily provide an undo data burden or expose data that a particular stakeholder wouldn't want us to have.

But our laboratory network is looking at a standardized records format. That particular function is being tested at this time is my understanding. But I apologize, I can't provide you with more information than that.

Dr. (Howard Hill): Okay.

(Willy Reed): This is (Willy Reed) and I'm, you know, quite active with AVLD and with the (NOM). And I can tell you we have been trying for about five or six years to accomplish that goal. And it's still not there. And I don't have any idea of when we're going to get it done.

But it - a lot of it boils down to the funding for these laboratories because many of them don't have the IT capability inhouse that they need to accomplish this.

Dr. Darrell Styles: Yes, we understand that and we were very disheartened to learn about (NIFA)'s loss of funding to our (NOM) laboratories. Again, this is - we seem to be cutting off our noses to spite our face in the country when it comes to terms of agriculture.

We just - it's one of the areas that seems to get constantly cut. And we struggle to continue with our mission. And I agree that we definitely need more funding in that area.

(Willy Reed): Yes. I agree too. That's the problem that we face.

(Judith Migeri): This is (Judith Migeri). I unfortunately haven't had a chance to read the full article yet, just the abstract.

But there was some interesting research that appeared in Science last week, about, you know, incubation periods, transmissibility and the implications for decisions on when and how broadly to cull animals during an outbreak.

Is the agency planning to do an - a review of its decision making policies in light of this new research?

Dr. Darrell Styles: We would always base our decisions on the most sound science. And that article I think really was targeting ruminants. Unfortunately, when swine are factored into the equation it complicates the whole issue.

And certainly with ruminants and if it occurred in cattle I think that we would have a much better opportunity of controlling and mitigating the threat.

But when swine are in the equation and especially in those states where both swine and cattle occur in close proximity to each other, we have a much greater issue.

(Judith Migeri): That's - okay, and I was unaware of the differences there in terms of the level of transmissibility and contagion which for me down in Texas, particularly raises issues. I mean because we have feral hogs everywhere.

They're ubiquitous and actually very, you know, the spread of the feral hogs is no longer just a Texas or even a Southeast problem. It's incredibly wide ranging.

Can we get some information perhaps on, you know, some background on that - on those specifics on the differences and the specific issues faced when we're dealing with FMD in the context of swine?

Dr. Darrell Styles: There are certainly some research articles that I could refer to the committee or provide a digest of those. Unfortunately, FMD despite being a profound worldwide disease is one of the least funded study diseases.

And so one of the things that we are lacking in this is disease spread and disease spread models in (SICHU).

So in other words, if we went to an endemic country and were able to do disease spread studies within a herd, whether that's cattle or swine or mixing those two, we would have much more accurate data but that data doesn't simply exist.

Unfortunately what we've had to do is extrapolate anecdotally from observations in countries where they've had outbreaks such as Korea and Japan.

(Judith Migeri): Yes. I mean I don't want to put you to a significant extra amount of work simply summarizing studies. But certainly a list of references or, you know, connection, you know, a link to those would be helpful.

Dr. Darrell Styles: Sure.

(Judith Migeri): Thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Well thank you very much Dr. Styles. I appreciate your presentations and we'll look forward to getting that information from you. And I'm sure we'll be talking to you again at some point.

Dr. Darrell Styles: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: So long. Why don't we move into the next item on the agenda which is a discussion of the budget? I asked that this be put on because it's always of concern.

And I was down in Raleigh a couple of weeks ago at a state veterinarian federal USDA eastern region meeting and there was some new information on the budget. So I asked that somebody from APHIS Veterinary Services be available to give us an update on that.

So I believe - is Carol Tuszynski on the line?

Carol Tuszynski: Yes, I'm here.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Hi.

Carol Tuszynski: Hi.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thank you for being with us. And I'll open up the - you can go ahead.

Carol Tuszynski: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon everybody. I'm Carol Tuszynski. I head Veterinary Services Planning Finance and Strategy Staff.

And I did send a chart that had some specific information that folks asked for but I wanted to start first and just get you up to speed on where the 2011 budget is and what we have and what we don't have on that.

Congress passed the budget a couple of weeks ago so we have an official appropriation for 2011. But the bill that they passed is not kind of the typical bill that we would normally get in a normal appropriation year.

What they provided us was an overall number for APHIS for fiscal year '11 and some specific language about a few programs gotten passed in Avian Influenza and some language about earmarks that had previously been funded in the 2010 budget.

But no line item breakdown beyond those specific line items that they mentioned in the bill. So what we don't have yet for 2011 is a line by line appropriation. There's still work being done with the Department and with OMB and with the agency.

And eventually that will all move to Congress to get them to agree to the breakdown that we're proposing. So we do not have line item by line item so there's on way at this point to really be able to share any sort of comparison program by program between 2010 and 2011.

We - the Avian Influenza reduction which is specifically spelled out in the bill is \$20 million reduction to APHIS overall. VS won't take all of that reduction. But to APHIS overall there was \$20 million less in the 2011 bill than was in the 2010 bill.

And they also rescinded some carryover dollars that we had been carrying over from Avian Influenza. That fund is - while it's appropriated dollars it's considered no year appropriation. So you can keep the money until it's expended.

That's different than most of our other line items are one year funding. And if the money's not spent by the end of the year it goes back to the Treasury.

We believe - our best guess right now is that of all the reductions VS will have approximately \$20 million less - a little more than \$20 million less in our availability and appropriated dollars this year than we had last year.

That's the combination of littler - smaller amounts of new money and not having as much of that carryover money coming forward into '11 as we had in '10. Part of that is related to Avian Influenza but part of that is just because we have spent through some balances from other years.

So for traceability for example, we had carried over for a number of years, a balance because we - for a few years back we had gotten some pretty

significant appropriations and were not able to spend those in a year. So we had carried those forward.

But coming into this year we did not carry forward as much this year as we had last year because we spent it last year. So we have a diminishing pot of money for traceability and not - we don't expect to get added anything more this year in traceability than we had coming into the year in '10.

So probably Avian Influenza and traceability are the two biggest impacted line items. But again we don't have that final line item by line item breakdown for 2011. And then I didn't bring with me the 2012 information.

I think, you know, we did have some conference calls when that President's 2012 bill came out. In 2012 there is some additional significant reductions proposed for APHIS. And for Vet Services in particular the biggest one of those is in the chronic wasting disease program.

And like I said, I didn't bring that with me so I don't have the numbers off the top of my head but those are - the CWD, another significant reduction for (YONI)s and another one for the VHS funding. Those are the big ones that are being proposed in 2012.

So, you know, as Dr. Styles was saying, we're in kind of a different environment. I think the next couple of years are going to be much more a tightening situation than we had maybe been in the last five years or so. So I had sent I believe you got it this morning, a chart.

Folks had asked me for some specific information for the regions, what the allocations were for each region in 2010 and '11 and what the spending was

for cooperative agreements and what the spending had been for earmark. So the figures I've provided for 2010 are actual obligations.

This is what we actually spent because that year has past. The numbers that are there for 2011 are our current intentions for allocations in the eastern region and the western region and our current plans for cooperative agreements overall.

And that - I know that that information on the specific cooperative agreement amounts has gone out at a line item level and at a state level already from both of the regional offices. So this is just the total number.

And even though we don't have those final line item numbers we are still moving forward with our plans and with our - with getting that information out.

And hopefully going ahead and obligating all of those cooperative agreements shortly so that we get them all done and renewed, the ones that had expired or we, you know, were off cycle a little bit and so we're trying to get those all finished.

I just - I guess I would open it up for questions. Do people have questions on the numbers that were provided or any other budget (unintelligible)?

(Phil Sterr): Yes. This is (Phil Sterr). I'd like to see, on Avian Influenza, obviously I have a vested interest in that, but some detail on that.

Carol Tuszynski: Okay. And again - in what way? What kind of detail are you looking for?

(Phil Sterr): I guess I don't know what the overall funding was. You say it's \$20 million less for this year?

Carol Tuszynski: Yes.

(Phil Sterr): Okay. And then what was the original funding amount?

Carol Tuszynski: Oh and I have like - I have the VS - the potential VS number. It was - wait a minute - I believe we have \$40 million this year in new funding for Avian Influenza so it was \$60 million before.

(Phil Sterr): It was \$60 million?

Carol Tuszynski: Pardon me?

(Phil Sterr): I say it was \$60 million and it's gone to \$40 million.

Carol Tuszynski: It's gone to \$40 million. That's close. I'm just trying to remember off the top of my head. And then we had - we lost \$8 million of the carryover that was also available to us for Avian Influenza in addition to that \$20 million.

(Phil Sterr): And that \$8 million was carried over from 2009?

Carol Tuszynski: From 2010 into 2011. We - because that's a know your fund and if you remember back when the concern about the high path AI became an issue a few years ago we got a really large appropriation for a year or two. And that's been going down slowly over the last couple of years.

But when we got those really high amounts we didn't spend it all those years and we were able to bring some of that money forward.

So we have always kept the money available for indemnity purposes and have carried some of that but have also carried some other money over that we have used for operations over the years. And that pot of - that whole pot of money has been slowly going down but this is a really abrupt reduction.

And it hasn't been something that Congress has done all that often. It'd be something that they're looking at right now as really scrutinizing any balances that agencies are holding in some of these know your funds. So we expect to see more of that kind of thing happen.

It wasn't just AI that they did that to this year. In APHIS they also hit some of the plant pest carryover balances as well and rescinded those.

(Phil Sterr): In terms of what the money was earmarked for or was specified for I'm assuming it's doing the routine surveillance as well as you say indemnity as well?

Carol Tuszynski: Yes. Well our overall Avian Influenza program in APHIS that - all of that money funds operations in a number of places. So it funds our domestic surveillance activities in the live bird markets and other, you know, poultry surveillance.

It also funds our preparedness activities, some of the stuff that Dr. Styles mentioned. There has been some continuity business work done for poultry, some modeling done for poultry for high pat - for AI in particular.

It also funds activities that we have done overseas with other countries with the idea of trying to help other countries build their capacity and take care of Avian Influenza issues there so we don't face as much risk.

That's been work that's been ongoing for a number of years as - in addition wild bird surveillance has also been something that's been funded out of that Avian Influenza fund.

So there's, you know, there's a number of activities that have been funded in the President's - when we had proposed the President's '11 budget had proposed a reduction for Avian Influenza. Congress just went way beyond that in what they actually cut from that program.

But some of those reductions would have been to some of the international activities. We would have scaled back some of the wild bird surveillance.

So we will be, you know, looking now that it's gone a little deeper there is, you know, we're having those conversations about exactly where we would have to scale back to make up for the difference.

But there are also a number of areas and I think, you know, some of the things that we were planning to not do this year were things that we had completed, one time investments, those sorts of things.

And so there was, you know, we didn't need as much money coming into this year we didn't think, to be effective anyway. It just was a bit of a surprise that Congress had gone even further in their reduction.

(Phil Sterr): And I would say from the US consumer, which I represent the poultry industry, the domestic surveillance is top priority and the assistance has been much beneficial particularly for the live bird markets where we don't have any authority to go into but then also commercial surveillance.

And I would say that would be a priority if you're listening to constituents.

Carol Tuszynski: Absolutely.

(Phil Sterr): I think the overseas - I hate to say it but it's almost as lost. It seems to be endemic in Indonesia and I don't know if they'll ever get rid of it with their current situation.

Man: I think what's of further concern there to me is some information that was presented to us in Raleigh that indicated wildlife services has been drastically cut too. Is that correct?

Carol Tuszynski: Yes, well they - earmarks mean different things to different parts of APHIS. And for veterinary services by and large the earmark money is money that comes to us but then goes out to some other entity. But wildlife services earmarks operate just the reverse.

It's really an earmark of their dollars for their people. And when all the earmarked money was removed that meant that the funding for personnel onboard in APHIS went away. So they're facing a bit of a - more of a crisis because they had - it's not money that passes through.

It's money that was paying for people who were onboard. So - and had been onboard since October the 1st. You know, the other complication here is that the budget didn't pass until April. So we were operating with that, you know, uncertainty all the way through April.

And now we're having to deal with the fact that there really wasn't the money for people who had been paid for six months. So that's - and that has hit

wildlife services much harder because they're the ones who operate. The earmarks just mean a different thing for them.

Man: And some of those people I know in our state, they had people - they've had people over the past several years who have been doing wild bird surveillance for Avian Influenza as well as other things. But - so that, you know, follows along with what Dr. (Thayer) was saying about AI.

Carol Tuszynski: Right. It's kind of a - they've kind of in some ways took two different potential losses, the earmark money plus the Avian Influenza reductions.

Man: Yes.

(Boyd Parr): Carol this is (Boyd Parr). I appreciate you presenting this information and what you sent out earlier. And I believe you said but I didn't catch it. What was the overall Veterinary Services part reduction or maybe that's not available yet from...

Carol Tuszynski: Well I'm thinking it's going to be a little over \$20 million total in...

(Boyd Parr): Yes.

Carol Tuszynski: ...appropriated dollars. But that's without...

(Boyd Parr): But that's not going to carryover right?

Carol Tuszynski: Right.

(Boyd Parr): That's without carryover. I mean appropriated.

Carol Tuszynski: Oh. Appropriated probably over ten, about half and half. Half of it would be the new money.

(Boyd Parr): So about \$10 million in Veterinary Services and - okay, and cooperative agreements to states who sometimes use a combination of the carryover and the current year.

Carol Tuszynski: Yes. Yes. Especially I think in the case of traceability in particular we've been able to fund higher levels because we had that carryover money available from, you know, a number of years ago. And that we just do not have as much of that anymore.

(Boyd Parr): Yes. Well and I appreciate - and I appreciate you sending out the information this morning. I just wanted to be sure just so we kind of get an idea of where it's heading if I'm interpreting this correctly.

And you gave us the stuff that's not at headquarters level but your allocations to the eastern region and western region. And if my math is correct there is - overall there's about a \$9.8 million reduction.

Of that reduction \$7.5 million came from cooperative agreements, \$2.8 million of that was earmarked and I'm assuming that's not including any of the wildlife. That's earmarks to states like primarily in the east, (YONI)'s money to Wisconsin and stuff like that.

Carol Tuszynski: Absolutely. Yes.

(Boyd Parr): And so once you take that out it's a \$4.7 million reduction in money that went to states and had a \$2.3 million reduction to money that stayed in the eastern

and western regions. So basically 76% from cooperative agreement 48 cents out of every dollar reduction was done at the state level.

And 23-1/2 at the federal level and the other 28 was earmarked reduction is the numbers from what you sent out. And we understand making priorities. But the point we've discussed when we were doing traceability and the assurance that there won't be unfunded mandates, this is an alarming trend.

You know, if APHIS Veterinary Services is going to do less hopefully no one's under the illusion that states who've had real cuts of significant percentages higher than this can do - not only can't do more, can't do the same even from their state funding.

So as these cooperative agreements with their some expectation for states to take on even more of the in the field work it's just a double whammy. So it's, you know, that - obviously the east region and western regions the cuts primarily were made at the expense of the state funding.

So I thank you of providing that. And I know everyone's got challenges and I appreciate you getting us that information.

Carol Tuszynski: Okay. I don't think it's - these are decisions that we make lately. You know, I hope people appreciate that. It's not - these are not decisions that we make lightly and we're very sensitive on the traceability side that it's not intended to be an unfunded mandate.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Any other questions for Carol?

(Cindy Wolf): Carol this is (Cindy Wolf) and I'm representing the sheep industry. We find it curious that APHIS has put the sheep, goat, horse and (servid) group all in one

category because we don't feel like other than sheep and goats we don't feel like there's shared diseases.

And it's - in our mind it may threaten some funding especially (Scrapee) funding where we're really far down the road and made wonderful progress toward eradication.

And now actually would be looking to have a few more dollars to increase some surveillance and activity and then be able to ramp it back down because we think we will be able to eradicate it in the next decade, let me say it like that.

So I'm just wondering what kind of feedback you could give us there as to maybe why that happened or if we could look to have that - those small room that species unlumped from that miscellaneous category.

Carol Tuszynski: Yes. And I think it happened just in a concern about we have some commodities, some species where there isn't a lot of funding and trying to create a line item for every single species just became a little bit untenable. Or the thought was when that was first put together that it might be.

The way, you know, it's in Congress' hands at this point. And how or if they choose to adopt it is entirely up to them. They can modify it. They could do whatever they want with the proposal.

At this point because it's gone forward and gone out there already as part of the President's 2012 request there's not really much that APHIS - it's not appropriate for APHIS to do much more where you don't really change it once it's gone out as the President's budget.

But it's in Congress' hands to decide how to - so they're the people I think where it makes the most sense to have conversations of if you've got a better idea of how to put that together.

(Cindy Wolf): It is kind of curious because in talking to the sheep and goat industries there wasn't a heads up that APHIS was considering this until it was - as you say had gone out the door.

Carol Tuszynski: Yes. And that's just, you know, there's just - it's just the way it is. That's not going to sound like a really good answer. But as these budgets are being talked about it's - there are so many people who are involved before it's finalized.

So we might discuss an idea here internally in APHIS and then it has to go up into the Department. And they're weighing our proposals against all of the other agencies in the Department. And they don't want information to get out until they've kind of done all of their talking.

And then the same thing happens as it moves up to OMB across all the agencies. So we're just really difficult for us to share too much information before everybody really has finalized their thinking.

And unfortunately by the time that happens it's coming out the door as part of the official President's proposal. So I do think, you know it's just - and I don't know how to get around or change that dynamic.

It's just we have to give the folks within the department their chance to weigh in and evaluate our proposal, whether they want to even put that forward this year or whether they had other things they wanted to focus on across the whole department.

And like I said, we just really are not - it's not at our discretion to do some of that, to get it out there ahead of the Department and then ahead of the Executive - the whole Executive Branch.

But, you know, it's - I'll take your concern and we can see if there's maybe something we could be more sensitive about in the future.

(Cindy Wolf): Okay, thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Other questions? I guess you're off the hook.

Carol Tuszynski: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Thank you very much. So long. Okay. I think that we're at the point where we can go back to one of the topics that we discussed a couple of hours ago which was (Charlie)'s question as to whether we would - whether we could put branding on the table for discussion.

So unless Michael, do we have anything else? Do we have any other speakers on or can we move into that discussion?

Michael Doerrer: Nope. We can move into that discussion.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: All right. So why don't we do that? (Charlie) do you want to - are you still there?

Charlie Rogers: Sure. Yes. Don I'll tell you what - you know the intent for brands in ADT program. I understand that. The intent is, you know, we're not - nothing's

official unless everybody can accept it. And that's fine. I understand the intent for the ADT program.

It's the unintended consequences that might come from that that concern me. And I still believe we can have the same thing but with - and brands can be listed as official and we still have the same thing if we use a qualifying statement with it. Hello?

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes.

Charlie Rogers: Okay.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: I understand. I...

Charlie Rogers: I thought I was alone for a minute.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Well maybe it's just you and I. I don't think so. Yes, I'd ask for other input here. I don't - I have some thoughts of my own but I...

(Boyd Parr): This is (Boyd). I, you know, I understand what you're saying (Charlie) and I also agree. I'm just kind of, of the opinion timing wise that we're not going to gain anything by doing it now versus during the comment period as I understand it at this time.

You are right, you know, in hindsight if you're starting over those semantics make a bigger difference than people think, of having it there. Now back to your earlier discussion, you know, the (M) Brand is not official identification now. That's a designation of Mexico but it doesn't identify an animal.

And I think people are getting a lot of emotion wrapped up in it. But you understand that.

Charlie Rogers: I'm sure that's correct. Yes.

(Boyd Parr): And (TJ) was correct in ownership. The misconception a lot of people have is of the 14 brand states several, maybe even a majority as I understand it now, they recognize brands within their states but they don't recognize brands from other states now.

Just because it's a brand state doesn't mean they're taking brands from other states. And, you know, we've tried educating and people are still upset. So I sympathize.

I have no objection to what you're talking about and I don't know the lawyerese or the legalities of why you couldn't word something like you say.

But having said that, I'm not sure what we had accomplished today versus July which you would do in a comment period or if we have a rule by July, you know, until OMB decides to move we don't know.

Charlie Rogers: Well I definitely would rather - I definitely would rather address this issue when it would do the most good.

Woman: I have a question on timing. You know, perhaps RJ or Michael could respond. You know, the - my thing is, you know, the proposed rules over at OMB are earlier through recommendations have been, you know, are going up through the channels in USDA.

Does that mean that when the proposed rule comes back from OMB that there's still some room for USDA to make changes before the actual publication or will our earlier recommendations also simply get rolled into more of the comment period?

Man: You know, it's very difficult and very unusual to make changes aside from, you know, typographical changes after all...

Woman: And extending the comment period I realize it's not substantive therefore it's - that's an easy change to make but...

Man: (Unintelligible) in the comment period at any time. That's not a big deal.

Woman: Yes, but the other one where we suggested the language about an unfunded mandate...

Man: Yes.

Woman: Is that already something that just because it's already there would be that we could presume that that's also just sort of going to get rolled over for the next phase?

Man: Yes. If you're talking about changing regulatory - the text of the regulation it's very, very difficult and unusual and you'll always risk having to re-clear. That's very unlikely. So the recommendations have gone up the line and they are being considered.

And yes, they would be considered - any changes were to be made to the proposed rule or after the proposed rule comes out before a final rule would be issued.

Woman: Okay.

Man: So yes, it would be in the same boat.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: I guess my preference would be to comment on something concrete. And I think that if the rule is published when they say it's going to be which is always open to question but I assume we'll have a rule by a July. And we have a - I think we have a conference call scheduled for the middle of July.

You know, we might revisit this at this point and it might have more of an impact as opposed to now which I'm not really sure that it's going to have any impact at all right now on the outcome of the proposed rule.

Whereas if we comment on the proposed rule or at least have a discussion on whether to comment on a proposed rule we might be able to come to some sort of a conclusion there on making some constructive comments. So I just think that might be - well that would be my preference anyway.

(Chuck Massengill): Don, this is (Chuck Massengill) and I agree with you. I think the likelihood of getting good consideration and a valuable response to our comment is going to come if we comment in response to the published proposed rule.

I think that's where we can get the most bang out of it. Sending it now I think would disjoint the action we want. We want people to consider that in the context of the proposed rule. And once it comes out I think that would be more valuable.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes. Is there anyone else - (Charlie) are you...

Charlie Rogers: No. I'm good with it Don. Whatever this committee thinks and what - if we need to revisit this after the - after we have something concrete that's fine. I mean if...

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes.

Charlie Rogers: ...that's the opinion of the committee that's fine with me. And we're - and wherever it would do the most good absolutely.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes.

(Vicky Hubb): This is (Vicky Hubb) and I agree...

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay.

(Vicky Hubb): ...in the percent as well. If we need to wait to have a better impact on this issue then let's wait.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes. And I, you know, I assume we'll have something to really comment on. But concrete to comment on it by then.

Charlie Rogers: Makes sense.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Okay. Well good. Then what I was hoping we could do maybe in the final few minutes of the call and I mean we don't have just a few minutes, we have more time. But I'd like to get a little bit of discussion if I'm - I think I'm allowed to do this, on future topics of discussion for the committee.

I don't think we'll ever be at a loss to discuss issues of animal health. But I'd like to start to put some more seeds of ideas into the, you know, kind of into the pipeline so that we can get some more discussion and perhaps recommendations going.

So, you know, I'd just open it up for discussion for the good of the committee I guess and look for some suggestions.

(Liz Wegstrom): Don, this is (Liz Wegstrom). I think that Dr. Styles brought up a little bit on his gaps analysis of FMD that I'd like to maybe consider opening up and looking at what is the research going on at (Plum) Island for foot-and-mouth disease and what kind of recommendations might this committee have for prioritizing that.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes. I think that's a great idea. You know, maybe get somebody on from (Plum) to tell us, you know, what they're working on, give everybody - bring everybody up to speed on that. I think that's a great idea (Liz).

(Cyril Stockton): This is (Cyril Stockton): I'd like to be able in the future to sort of delve a little bit more into details about (unintelligible), tuberculosis and how we're controlling them. What's the extent of the problem? And then also to look at the diseases that we're importing including tuberculosis but BSC.

And what we're doing to mitigate importing further diseases.

Man: In particular - so I heard concern about import and what we're doing to mitigate the risk of disease through import. Are there are other particular issues related to TB and (unintelligible)?

For example, do you want to hear more about the DUIA or do you want to hear more about the rules or the proposed framework?

(Cyril Stockton): No. I am - and I should through in (Scrapees) too. No, just exactly where we are?

What is the status of for instance the - I think I've got it fairly clear in my mind about (unintelligible) but I don't know much about tuberculosis and just exactly the extent of the problem and whether we're gaining on it or we're not gaining on it or...

Man: Okay.

(Cyril Stockton): And I understand that there's a report on the status of (Scrapees) due some time this year.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Have you got that Michael?

(Willy Reed): This is (Willy Reed) speaking and it seems like to me we ought to have an update on the (NOM), you know, laboratory system.

We certainly heard some concerns today about any people collecting samples and, you know, this new - what the IT communications system that has been in development for a number of years apparently is not complete.

So I'd like to really know, you know, what's lacking and what would it take to get to where we need to be.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: All right.

(John Fisher): Don, this is (John Fisher). And I brought this up previously and figured it's something we'll work on a little bit later after we've worked through the traceability issue which is certainly the 900 pound gorilla in the room these days.

And that is wildlife - surveillance for diseases in the wildlife and particularly with reference to diseases that are transmissible between wild animals and domestic animals and also between wild animals and humans.

And we've heard today about drastic cuts and Avian Influenza virus, funding particularly for wild birds, chronic wasting disease funding and a portion of that was going out in cooperative agreements to state wildlife management agencies.

I think we were building a pretty good model there for surveillance - funding for surveillance in - for significant diseases and free ranging wildlife. And now we're starting to take some giant steps backwards there.

But I think that would be something that would be good for our committee to take a closer look at in the future.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: I would agree with you (John), especially on the CWD front. You know, I understand that agencies are kind of reluctant to continue on with a full scale eradication program. But at the same time we're going to pull the funding we need to figure out what's the next step.

And I mean we - some of us have gone into full scale mandatory surveillance programs, mandatory testing programs and that was with the idea that there was a limited amount of indemnity available. And now it looks like that's going to be not available anymore.

And certainly we've been doing a high level of good surveillance and - at least in some of our states in white-tailed deer populations and I think that's probably going to go away too. So I agree on that.

(John Fisher): Yes. And we've spoken in the past also about the role of wildlife in foreign animal disease response. That's something I think we could look at a little more closely.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes.

(Liz Wegstrom): Don, this may be a tangent on that. This is (Liz Wegstrom) again. But I know we heard today about (Judith)'s concerns over feral pigs in FMD. I think an update on what we're doing with wildlife services for any control of feral pigs as far as - and also as well as testing for zoonotic diseases.

I know they have done some (unintelligible) and then also animal health diseases like (sidarabies). But I think some kind of an update on any feral pig program would be also of interest to the group.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: I agree.

Man: And related to that, just FYI, I don't know if folks saw the federal register notice but wildlife services will be standing up its own Secretary's Advisory Committee pretty soon. So you're going to have some competition.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Oh.

Man: For the best advisory committee in USDA.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: That's right. Other ideas? Well all right then.

Man: Don, one other thing real quick. On the cost of - it'd be interesting to know kind of what it would cost to have available vaccine for foot-and-mouth disease on a yearly basis.

Man: And actually related to that in hearing some of the questions I wondered if it might be useful to get a more in depth understanding of the National Veterinary stockpile and how that works and what it does.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Yes. Good idea. And yes, and going back to the vaccine I think that, you know, perhaps - there's a lot of good work going on that has been going on at (Plum) as (Liz) pointed out.

And I think they could give us an idea of, you know, when some of these new vaccines are going to be commercially available - how soon, how quickly they can be produced. And as (Charlie) said, how many doses do we need and how much is it going to cost.

So, you know, we're just - we're heading down the road as we've heard today. And over time if we get FMD in particular we're going to have most likely vaccinate. So those would be good things to hear about. Anything else? Good discussion.

Michael, Kim do we have anything else that we need to...

Kim Ogle: Yes. I have a couple of things to help wrap you up. I want to...

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Sure.

Kim Ogle: I want to circle back to the call to - the roll call. And just recognize that (Willy Reed) did join us once we began. And I'd like to see if (Bryan Thomas) joined us as well. (Bryan)? Okay. So everyone joined us today with the exception of Mr. (Thomas).

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Great.

Kim Ogle: Very good. So just to wrap up a little bit today, we heard that APHIS is expecting the proposed rule on traceability to be published most likely prior to our next meeting, how's that, which is July 22nd.

Hopefully before then so you'll have a chance to read that document and then perhaps write down your branding comments and you can have a healthy discussion at your next call.

I believe there's an expectation of all the committee members to continue to reach out to members of your community and your stakeholders for an - that is one of your roles here that outreach role.

So continue to do that, especially since you are going to spend some time putting comments on that proposed rule. And I believe we promised you a couple of documents so we are going to email you Darrell Styles document that he spoke from.

RJ Cabrera: And those have actually already gone out so you should have those waiting for you in your mailbox.

Kim Ogle: Excellent. Excellent. It's already in your inbox. It's the document he spoke from. He called it a gap analysis. But it will give you a chance as committee

members to see where you can weigh in and perhaps provide advice to the emergency management staff on the FMD program and preparedness.

And then also (Teresa Boyle)'s talking points have been emailed to you as well on her FMB outbreak in South Korea and North Korea.

RJ Cabrera: Not yet emailed but they will be.

((Crosstalk))

Kim Ogle: Okay. Very good. And then also I will follow up with Darrell Styles to make sure that he sends out information to help you understand what's going on in the feral hog world.

And it'll give you a chance to get acclimated to that and swine as well so that you'll be more prepared for the next conversation you have on that. Other than that I want to thank you all for being with us today. I know we look forward to the next call.

And I want to reiterate that it is July 22nd. And as always we thank the committee for all your work. And I'd like to thank anyone who was on the call today from the public for listening. We look forward to having you on the next call. And I'll turn it over to Michael.

Michael Doerrer: So Don I think we're good to adjourn if you're good.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: All right. We're all set. Thank you all. Have a good weekend. All right.

Michael Doerrer: Great.

Dr. Donald Hoenig: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you for calling.

END