

FTS-USDA OFFICE OF COMMUNICATION

**Moderator: RJ Cabrera
September 23, 2011
1:41 pm CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the conference coordinator. I'd like to remind all participants that the conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections, please disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Michael Doerrer: I'm on. Okay, good afternoon everybody. This is Michael Doerrer, Riverdale. I'm here with RJ Cabrera. It is noon so we can begin our conference call. Why don't we start by taking a quick roll just to see which committee members are on the line. I realize that some of us will be joining a bit late. But just do a quick roll. RJ, do you want to call the roll?

RJ Cabrera: Sure. Dr. or I'm sorry Mr. Max Fernandez. Dr. John Fischer.

Dr. John Fischer: Right here.

RJ Cabrera: Dr. Andrew Goodwin.

Dr. Andrew Goodwin: Present.

RJ Cabrera: Ms. Vicki Hebb will not be joining us today. Dr. Howard Hill.

Dr. Howard Hill: Present.

RJ Cabrera: I'm sorry, Dr. Hill, you're present. Dr. Hoenig is present.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Correct.

RJ Cabrera: Mr. Morris Johnson.

Morris Johnson: Present.

RJ Cabrera: Mr. John Kalmey.

John Kalmey: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Dr. (Chuck) Massingill

Dr. Charles Massingill: Good Afternoon.

RJ Cabrera: Ms. (Judith McGarry).

(Judith McGarry): I'm here.

RJ Cabrera: Dr. David Meeker.

Dr. David Meeker: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Dr. Boyd Parr.

Dr. Boyd Parr: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Ms. (Janel Bridgen)

Max Fernandez: This is Max Fernandez.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you, Mr. Fernandez. Ms. (Janel Bridgen). Dr. Willie Reed.

Dr. Willie Reed: Present.

RJ Cabrera: Mr. Charles Rogers.

Charles Rogers: I'm here.

RJ Cabrera: Dr. Philip Stayer.

Dr. Philip Stayer: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Mr. (Gill Stockton).

(Gerald Stockton):Here.

RJ Cabrera: Mr. Brian Thomas. Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom.

Man: She's going to be late.

RJ Cabrera: Dr. Cindy Wolfe. And we have a quorum.

Michael Doerrer: Thanks everybody. Good showing and I think a few more of us will be joining as we go on. Don and (Judith), why don't we go over to you to start the meeting off? And then we can hear from Dr. Clifford.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay, thanks Michael. And thank you all for being on the call this afternoon. It sounds like we have a very good attendance of the committee which is great. When we've had a couple of conference calls along with RJ and Michael in preparation for this call to setup the agenda, thank you to both of them or all 3 of them for helping out.

I would just ask people to try and put their phones on mute because we do have about 20 open lines here. So if you can put your phones on mute when you're not talking, that would be a big help. There's a lot of background noise right now. And I'll try to do the same. I'm going to have to temporarily go off the call at 1:30 so I've asked (Judith) to chair the call until I come back on. I'll probably have to go off for about an hour. But I should be back. And perhaps we'll be done by then.

So with that, welcome everybody. I'll like to turn the meeting over to my good friend, Dr. John Clifford. He's going to talk a little bit about whatever he wants to talk about as well the aquatic animal health subcommittee. Go for it, John.

Dr. John Clifford: Alright thanks, Don. I appreciate everybody being on the call today. And I know this is quite a bit of time commitment. I'm just going to be with you all for a very short period of time here. So, I'm also going to have to rely a little bit on Michael Doerr with this. Basically, you know, we had had some discussions about the development of aquatic animal health subcommittee to be able to help address and eventually be able to move forward on the National Aquatic Health Plan.

And that health plan has been developed over a number of years with a lot of input from the private sector, the Aqua Culture Industry to Departments of

Commerce, Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture and our state departments from the animal health officials to the local DNR offices at the states have provided a lot of input over time with that plan. And part of that is to develop a subcommittee on aqua culture and I think that we're prepared to standup that subcommittee at this time.

Is that correct, Michael?

Michael Doerrer: Yes, John. The committee is in place. All the names have been named. Those names are available on our animal health committee webpage as well.

Dr. John Clifford: So, Michael, with regards to that, I'm not sure what additional steps need to be done or anything.

Michael Doerrer: Currently, we're just trying to finalize the date for the first meeting. We're looking at some time in mid-November and I believe that'll be in Washington area. So right now it's just logistical planning. And as soon as we have all those plans set, we'll be making public announcements and giving everybody notice. And we'll use our webpage as a vehicle for - for getting information out.

Dr. John Clifford: So, I guess if there's any questions of the group?

Dr. Don Hoenig: John, this is Don Hoenig, I was wondering if either you or Michael could clarify. I had a question on this from a state veterinarian. So I was just wondering if you could just clarify why the Department choose to go the route of a subcommittee of the secretary's advisory committee on animal health as opposed to an actual advisory committee.

So would either you or Michael address the issue?

Dr. John Clifford: Let me address first and if Michael wants to add anything, he can. Basically, I think it's important to note that we have an advisory committee on animal health. And - and that would be this committee. So rather than standing up another separate committee and then you have all requirements that go along with those committees as well as looking at costs that have to be looked at with regard to those committees and so forth.

It's - we felt it would be a much cleaner approach, easier approach, to use this committee as the umbrella of all animal health issues both terrestrial and aquatic. And then to develop a subcommittee and then through that subcommittee, that subcommittee's reports would come back through the full committee in a public form for discussions and acceptance or not with regard to any recommendations.

So, we felt that this process was basically appropriate and adequate to do that. So, Michael do you want to add anything?

Dr. Don Hoenig: Can you also tell us whether you have appointed a chair and a vice chair of that committee or how that - how you plan to do that?

Dr. John Clifford: I'll let Michael or RJ talk to that.

Michael Doerrer: We'll select a chair and vice chair during or after the first meeting as part of our administrative setup of the subcommittee.

RJ Cabrera: Yes, we thought it would be better for the - the members to get to know each other, you know, have some familiarity. So that will take place during the meeting or sometime thereafter the first meeting.

Dr. Andrew Goodwin: This is (Andy) Goodwin. I was wondering how the - the agenda will be set for that committee? How will the choices be made on what work they should do.

RJ Cabrera: There will probably be a planning call much like the planning calls we have for SACAH in terms of setting the agenda. I know that there are some email communications being prepared with logistics and setting up time for a planning meeting.

Michael Doerr: And we can also gather input from you all, from the full committee. And Dr. Goodwin and Dr. Hoenig are our representatives from the parent committee on the aqua cultural subcommittee. So we can also work through you to - to try to administratively see if there are agenda items that the full committee would like to have addressed by the subcommittee.

Dr. Andrew Goodwin: Okay.

Man: And I'd also add (Andy) one maybe good place to start is actually the review of the - the committee's review of the National Aquatic Animal Health plan and any recommendations that are in that plan.

Dr. Andrew Goodwin: Okay.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. Any other questions about the Aquatic Animal Health subcommittee for Dr. Clifford? Well that was easy. Alright, thank you very much.

Dr. John Clifford: Thank you all.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay, I think just to briefly review what our plan is for our conference call and then for upcoming public meeting in November, I believe we're scheduled for November 1 and 2. Is that correct (Judith), RJ? Yes?

(Judith McGarry): That's correct. Yes.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. So we're going to have that in-person meeting in DC November 1 and 2. And with respect to this call, I think what - what we thought we should do is focus on these 2 high profile areas, the TB and Brucellosis regulatory framework. And then the proposed rule on traceability which is been published. And then, kind of get some discussion going about some of the major issues with both of those topics on the call.

Looking perhaps towards developing some recommendations at the in-person meeting because I think those of us who have discussed this, (Judith) and I and RJ and Michael feel that we might have a little bit more productive discussion of recommendations at an in-person meeting. I just find conference calls to be kind of an imperfect way to - to really get a good discussion going.

But at the same time, I think we can start that discussion now. So I think that's what we're planning on doing today is to kind of set the stage for our public meeting in DC in about 6 weeks. So that being said, does anybody have any questions on that? Okay. Then what I'd like to do is the first item on the agenda is the TB disease status and new TB and Brucellosis regulatory framework.

And we sent out an email to the committee in August, at the end of August. And we asked you to basically poll your stakeholders and come back with what they regard as positive aspects to the framework and also, what you might - what they might have as issues with the framework.

So, and we sent that framework with that email. So I guess what I'd like to do is open it up for committee discussion on the TB Brucellosis regulatory framework.

Michael Doerr: Don, this is Michael. I'll also note that although we don't have any new information to present, we do have appropriate experts on the line in case any questions come up that need technical clarification.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. Thank you. Who wants to start out? I'm going to try to just let people talk for a little while here so. Have any volunteers? That doesn't sound too promising.

Michael Doerr: Don, maybe we could start by recapping the points that we came out with from the last call, the central questions.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Sure. That will be fine. The bullet points are and I'll read them off: the stakeholders support the approach that APHIS proposes with respect to test and removal. If not, what alternatives the stakeholders' suggest. So as a discussing point, why don't we start right out with that bullet point. And I remember John Clifford asked that question on our last conference call, actually on a conference call that we had in July which was our last - I think our last public conference call.

So I would ask for some input on that.

(Gilles Stockton): This is (Gilles Stockton). It's a question, it's not input. But how many cattle had been removed for TB and for Brucellosis in the last 3-4 years?

(Lee Ann Thomas): This is (Lee Ann Thomas) and I don't have the exact numbers. It would be higher for TB than it would be for Brucellosis. And I would guesstimate that it's somewhere all total for TB, again this is a guesstimate, between 1,000 and 2,000 animals. Brucellosis would be much lower, probably I would say somewhere between - right around 500 animals. Again, because it's been awhile since we depopulated a herd for Brucellosis.

The last one actually would have been a small herd of approximately 30 animals in Texas. And that would have occurred actually this fiscal year.

(Gilles Stockton): Is that an annual figure or is that an aggregate figure?

(Lee Ann Thomas): That's an annual figure. It's not aggregate.

(Jerry Rogers): This is (Jerry Rogers). Are we seeing a decline in the number of herds that need to be depopulated for TB and Brucellosis. Are we seeing a decline in that? Is

(Lee Ann Thomas): Oh, most definitely for Brucellosis. For TB, it's somewhat status quo anywhere between 9 to 12 herds that are found to be TB-affected.

(Jerry Rogers): That's annually.

(Lee Ann Thomas): That's correct.

Man: (Leanne), I would just add to that those are herds that we find. That we can trace.

(Lee Ann Thomas): That's correct.

Man: There's animals that we can't trace.

Man: How many can't you trace? How much?

(Lee Ann Thomas): It can be as high as 50%.

Man: Is this concentrated in certain areas and states?

(Lee Ann Thomas): No. I don't believe there is a geographic distribution associated with that.

(Judith McGarry): This is (Judith). To - following up on that number. Can you clarify first of all whether when you say the animals you can't trace, are those cohorts or actually, you know, what's the relationship? What animals can't you trace I guess is what I'm asking.

(Lee Ann Thomas): It's not - I wasn't really focusing and I don't believe I've seen any data on the cohorts. What I was talking about was the - an animal that has been slaughtered is getting back to the actual herd of original of that animal. And the last location - last premises that animal was on.

(Judith McGarry): (Lee Ann)

Dr. Don Hoenig: So culture positive. Go ahead, go ahead (Judith).

John Kalmey: No, this is John. So, (Lee Ann), so can you give - do you have the numbers in front of you on the findings each year for the last few years on TB-affected animals and the actual numbers that we could not trace? And then in addition to (Judith)'s question on cohorts, or exposed animals, we may not have the exact numbers on that but it can be very sizable numbers that we cannot trace out of these herds.

(Lee Ann Thomas): And John, to get those, it would take me a few minutes to get the numbers that you requested. Would it be sufficient for the committee if I provide these numbers to RJ and she forward them back to the group?

Woman: That would be fine by me.

Man: Fine by me too.

Man: Yes, and one other thing, to John in the scenarios, there may be some that you successfully trace. But you did that by having to test 15 other herds. And I don't consider that a successful trace. So be sure we understand how many innocent parties get involved because of lack of ID.

(Gilles Stockton): This is (Gilles Stockton). And another kind of follow-up question. From my understanding from the conversation, many of the animals can be traced or identified at slaughter which means that there is a breakdown in the back take system. What's the problem there?

(Lee Ann Thomas): And there again, I - there's several causes there. And I would have to - when I gather the information, I would have to may pull that out.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay, so once again, we're focusing on the first bullet towards the approach that APHIS proposes with respect to test and removal. And if not, what alternatives will stakeholders suggest. Other feedback on that.

Please somebody should put their mute button on please.

Dr. Willie Reed: Yes, Don, can you hear me? This is Willie.

Dr. Don Hoenig: I can Willie.

Dr. Willie Reed: Okay. My approach is this. Is that I really believe strongly in following, you know, the best science. And you know, I'm comfortable that APHIS feels the same way. And you know, I don't really have an alternative. But that's what (unintelligible) come down on is try to follow the best possible science that we have available to us.

(Charlie Rogers): This is (Charlie Rogers). But - and we're - on depopulation, we're talking that not being able to depopulate herds like we have in the past. Is that correct? We're talking about more test and removal less depopulations?

(Lee Ann Thomas): Yes. We want to use - we've actually established a model for TB. And we evaluate the effectiveness of a test and remove procedure based on the original or initial prevalence of TB in that herd. We look at the ability to contain further spread from that herd - from a herd that's undergoing a test and remove as well as looking at associated wildlife issues or any wildlife issues associated with the premises; any public health implications before we would make a recommendation to either depop the herd or using a customer.

For Brucellosis, given that the focus of Brucellosis is currently within the endemic area of the Greater Yellowstone states, 3 states. And we do have herds there that are under a test and remove. We have had several this year, large bison herds that have chosen to manage the infection via test and remove. But we, because the US is really just, with the exception of the Texas case that I mentioned earlier, is the focus of the diseases in the GYA area.

And certainly, if we were to have Brucellosis pop up in other parts of the US outside the Greater Yellowstone states we would look strongly at the need to

depopulate that herd. But again, we would evaluate circumstances around that infection.

Dr. Charles Massingill: (Lee Ann), this is (Chuck) Massingill, if I may, or Don, this is (Chuck) Massingill. If I may, having spent about 3 years in the development as a TV human herd that has still not been published. We became acutely aware of risk of the recrudescence on Tuberculosis. And I guess I would ask a devil's advocate on this model for TB if that model has been applied to the herds in the El Paso milk shed. And because that was part of the reason such a long quarantine period was suggested for TB-affected herds in the current unpublished human herd.

So I guess that - it makes me nervous. For some reason, we decided we can release affected herds - previously affected herds in a much shorter period than we thought we could just a few years ago. So I guess I'm a little unsure how that model - with Brucellosis, I don't have any concern. For my constituents the marketability of their calves, it's not greatly impacted by Brucellosis unless they're a C Stock producer.

But the commercial producers suffer a heck of an impact with Tuberculosis. So I guess I'm asking if that model would - if that model would work with the El Paso milk shed and calving facilities also? Thank you.

(Lee Ann Thomas): I think (Chuck) to answer your question is the El Paso milk shed was a unique situation. And I think we knew historically by recrudescence in that area it would just - it was a problematic area. We don't have any indication currently that the situation that we are facing now where we have a similar situation to the El Paso milk shed.

That being said, the converse side of your point is we have also depopulated a number of herds only to have them recrudesced. And is it the best use of federal money to keep depopping herds that keep popping up with TB infections. So we recognize your point. The way the model and the way we're moving forward with the affected-herd management, acknowledging the difficulties that individuals have with those beef herds is that while we do - while we are releasing the quarantines, we are also requesting assurance testing to monitor the status of that herd.

Albeit, yes, without the benefit of a formal quarantine in place or any quarantine in place.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Thank you.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Some of the feedback that I got from a couple of state veterinarians having to do with test and remove was one of them just commented that he was in favor of it. Another one commented that he-one of the major concerns with the handling of TB-infected herds is a limitation of marketing options. And he talked about a cow calf herd that marks the product once a year.

And it's dependent upon an unrestricted market. And he makes the comment that he feels that APHIS VS needs to work to help reduce barriers to market these animals during the test and removal process. And I think he also comments that it involves close working relationship with FSIS. And then I got another comment on it from another colleague who was essentially unresponsive. And these people who commented to me were state veterinarians who had extensive experience and working.

(Charlie Rogers): This (Charlie Rogers) again. The - what I've seen from being - I'm from New Mexico. And we've had some - we've had some TB issues in the past. What

I've seen are the unaffected herds and how they're - how we've seen some problems - created problems with them marking their cattle because we've taken a - we've taken an area and quarantined this area, and possibly made it too big.

You know, we're you've got unaffected herds that are - that their marketing is affected from being in a - in a zone. And I guess what I'd like to see is, and I think this is the direction we're headed if I understand everything right, is - is possibly a herd quarantine. And then only expand the zone as necessary as opposed to creating a big zone and then we start. And having an effect on a lot of herds that are not, you know, they're not part of the problem.

And I think that's the direction we're headed in. Dr. Clifford, isn't our next - if we have a new - if we have a new herd somewhere, will we not concentrate on that herd and only expand as necessary?. Isn't that correct?

Dr. John Clifford: That was the original intent in my discussions. But let me defer to (Lee Ann) with regards to discussions that - because that was earlier on and since then, (Lee Ann)'s been very involved in a lot of public meetings and discussions. So (Lee Ann), could you.

(Lee Ann Thomas): Thanks John. Yes, that's exactly what this new framework talks about is that what we would say is that if there were cases of TB in New Mexico, is that - those herds would be quarantined and forced. But we would not necessarily be requiring that, as you mentioned, you referred to the existing milk (unintelligible), (unintelligible) states has a situation where a number of producers whose herds aren't infected are impacted by increased testing requirements to move out that zone.

So, the - the other side of that situation would be where there is a continued threat of spread from a premise and some might look at the existing situation that we have in certain areas of Michigan where there has been a zone established. And there have been addition mitigations such as annual herd tests. They may be testing those animals for movement outside of that zone. That would be what we would look for where in a situation where there was a high risk of further spread of the disease from a premises.

(Gilles Stockton) This is (Gilles Stockton) again. Back to that issue of you know, 1-2,000 had per year in TB and 500 in Brucellosis, how many of those animals were found in interstate commerce versus just within the state itself?

(Lee Ann Thomas): You mean how many of - I would take that to mean how many did you find at market versus how many were on the premises?

(Gilles Stockton): No. How many were outside of their state of origin?

(Lee Ann Thomas): I would have to go back and look at the data on that. For Brucellosis, I would say that the majority of those animals were inside their state of origin. For TB, it would be different because the vast majority of those animals would have been picked at slaughter. So it would be the opposite from Brucellosis. It would be at slaughter and so a greater percentage of those would be outside of their state of origin.

(Gilles Stockton): And a follow-up on this. On the indemnification to the producers and the program must be costing what about \$2 million a year?

(Lee Ann Thomas): Speaking of indemnity, we currently use - we have \$1 million in indemnity for TB and \$500,000 for Brucellosis. For TB, we tend to use that money up every year. For Brucellosis, not necessarily so.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Other input on this first question? I guess what we ought to be thinking about is - you know getting in our minds is whether we want to be formulating up a recommendation on this issue. Because I kind of looked upon this as John has asked for some feedback on this. So, we don't need to do that now. But as I said, I think we could probably formulate something maybe between now and the November meeting or at the November meeting.

But I certainly have colleagues who have some feelings about this. So, I won't be at a loss for coming up with my own - not my own, but a recommendation based upon what my colleagues tell me. So if there aren't any other - if there isn't any other input on that, let's go on to the next one - surveillance of wildlife. Wildlife with TB-affected herds have been identified, how would these activities would be funded? Cross a sample collection if applicable, and diagnostic testing of samples.

So let's get some discussion going on that.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Don, this is (Chuck) Massingill again. And I guess I would start off by saying that the agency that has authority over the animals would be the ones that should be responsible for disease control in those animals or surveillance in those animals.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay.

Dr. Charles Massingill: The reasons even the animal health do have jurisdiction on wild life. So wishing them to pay the bill for decisions made by other people would seem inconsistent.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay.

Dr. John Fischer: Hey Don, this is John Fischer. Just to kind of add to what (Chuck) was saying there, I think, from what he said. It's a complex issue and both of the agency with authority, which would be the state fish and wildlife management agency with infected deer in most cases. They would need to be collaborating with the animal health folks.

Most of the state fish and wildlife agencies are not going to be able to test for something like bovine Tuberculosis. In the past, there has been funding provided through - primarily through APHIS vet services for this type of work to assist the states. And I'm referring to Michigan and Minnesota there. Those agencies, generally their funding is specifically directed towards the conservation of those animals. And so health issues do fall into that area.

But a lot of them are funded by the hunters and with a large percentage of revenues coming from hunting licenses. And so they get into some grey areas there when they wonder if they are - if it's an appropriate use of those types of funds to be doing disease testing in the animals. So again, just to reiterate what I said from the start, this is something that needs to be looked at from the prospective of collaboration of wildlife and animal health agencies.

Dr. Charles Massingill: On this, it's (Chuck) and I agree with John completely.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. The feedback that I got, one person said state and federal cost share and another made the comment that they're just - the USDA just needs to include active and (unintelligible) surveillance in wildlife - potential wildlife reservoirs. They didn't address the cost issues.

Any other input on the surveillance of wildlife and TB? Okay. This next bullet involves implementation of test and remove management plans and beef herds

and options for marketing calf crops. And I know, I think this was something that (Chuck) brought up in the July call. And so, that's one of the reasons why it's on there. And I just mentioned that one of my colleagues did comment specifically on this as far as the challenges in marketing beef from a cow calf herd. So I don't need to reiterate that. But I'll open it up here.

Jump right in (Chuck).

Dr. Charles Massingill: Gee, thanks. This is (Chuck) Massingill. And I think one of the things that we would certainly hope we could find in beef producers is an accommodation through some sort of a - an approved feedlot facility where people with Tuberculosis-affected herds could still market their calves knowing full well that when those animals are taken out for harvest, you would expect some sort of a price differential applied to them when they go to the packer because they're going to be concerned about finding infected animals that are not going to pass FSIS inspections.

So the other thing would be for the Brucellosis, marketing steers and spade heifers is no problem. But if one had the opportunity to market or feed out in tact heifers and save that expensive spaying and the reduced performance in the feedlot that I believe the company's at, then again, the approved feedlots would be important. I don't know if it's a problem in areas that have TB endemic.

But I know at the tail end of our Brucellosis eradication program in Missouri, we encountered several inspectors in charge - FSIS inspectors in charge at plants that would condemn an S-branded animal on any mortem inspection and not allow them into the plant. I would certainly hope there would also be provisions that would prevent that. Not to reduce the authority of the inspector

in charge. But that seemed a bit draconian when an animal was S-branded and then condemned on anti-mortem inspection.

So those are all things that I'd like to know if USDA is working with the states to provide the capability to sort of approved feed lot. Quarantined feed lot, I think has become a bad name. So we'll call them approved feedlots.

Dr. Don Hoenig: (Lee Ann) or John, do you have any - any comment on that?

(Lee Ann Thomas): You know we did when the working group got together. We did talk about this as a possibility, as a mechanism of relieving the burden for the beef producers. I think one of the difficulties that we face is a lot of states that won't have the moniker of having a - I was going to say a quarantine feedlot. (Chuckie) used the term approved feedlot.

But I think - bottom line is we recognize that this is a challenge and that we are open to suggestions of ways to provide relief at the same time as prevent - mitigate further spread of the disease.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. Thanks (Lee Ann). One of the sub-bullets under that was are there any additional factors that AFIS should consider when determining whether to implement a test and removal plan or herd the population in a beef herd. And the previous discussion probably touches on that a little bit.

And the other is what option the stakeholders think should be available for mitigating risk of disease transmission while allowing for continuity of operation in the herd if a test and removal plan is used.

Dr. Charles Massingill: This is (Chuck) again and I would hope that there would be ongoing surveillance in the area of - around that herd if adjacent herds may

not, hopefully would not be under quarantine and restricted. But ongoing surveillance certainly including the - the same time that would be surveillance would be placed on the affected herd including the post quarantine release testing.

Dr. Don Hoenig: One of the comments that I got on this was involved standardizing epidemiological investigations nationally. And that state and tribe reports be submitted in a timely manner. There were some other comments on that. But that was the one that most - is most relevant to this.

Other comments on the test and remove in beef herds? Okay, hearing none than I would go onto the next which is the issue of indemnity in the context of the TB and Brucellosis framework. And I think that we definitely would - could have some lively discussion there. Do stakeholders have specific comments or recommendations concerning the indemnity element as described in the framework (APHIS is specifically looking for comments on the use of a calculator to evaluate or value animals and the need for an appeal process).

Comments on that?

Max Fernandez: This is Max Fernandez. I believe you know that the market value plus an additional assessment value to the cattle such as genetics, etc. to be always taken into consideration. And, you know, we need to treat the producers fairly. And that way, we will get their cooperation.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Thanks Max. Others?

Charles Rogers: This is Charlie Rogers. Yes, I think what we some is more of a replacement cost issue. I mean you've got - sure you've got marketing value but you got

replacement costs also. In a dairy situation for example, in a dairy situation when the - when the herds bought out or depopulated, than they have to start over. They have to start with - they have to start with a heifer that - with most areas have to start with a heifer that's not producing yet.

So there's a loss of production there that has to be taken into account on a depopulation I think.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Thanks Charlie. Others?

(Judith McGarry): This is (Judith). I think there's going to need to be some process either incorporated within the calculator or in an appeals' process or both to address. And I think this may have been Max was touching on the more usual genetics. Particularly in the (unintelligible) community we're using a lot of breeds that are not very common.

And we can't just go to the local sales barn and pick up a replacement. And that's going to have to be addressed at some stage of the indemnity process.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Thanks (Judith). I can relate a story of an experience that I had in the UK in 2001 regarding an indemnity and some herds - herds and flocks that I was asked to go out and negotiate an indemnity agreement. And essentially what they did in the UK at that time and it was - and it obviously involved a time constraint because we wanted to get these herds and flocks settled quickly, was a - for commercial grade animals, and that was either sheep or cattle.

There was a calculator. It was available for all to see online. And if there weren't any purebred animals involved, the government agent, which at the time, which at the time was me, would just go into the farmer and fill out the form and figure how to take a census of animals. And if the farmer was -

agreed with the indemnity, they signed off on it and it was done. And the farms that I did that - that, they accepted the indemnity, it seemed to be very fair.

In the couple of cases that I had that had both purebred Holsteins and pure bred certain brands of sheep, we actually engaged the services of an industry person to come in. And we sat down at the kitchen with the farmers and arrived at an agreement. And it happened right then. And I - and in my mind I've always used that as a model of how indemnity should be or ideally how it should be done.

Especially in a - where there's a urgent need to move thing forward. And it worked pretty well because I think it was fair and there was some - there was some allowance for some give and take for the issue of registering purebred animals. And that's the feedback that I've gotten from my colleagues too is that there should be some sort of a - of a process for assisting with the issue of purebred animals and possibly an appeals process.

But I think - well I'll leave it at that. I also have a comment from one of my colleagues who actually said he didn't think the calculator would have worked in the infected herds that were found in his state. I think that probably it's because they might have been from purebred. That's (unintelligible) animals involved there. And he was in favor of an appeal.

Other comments on indemnity? Here again, I think we ought to be thinking about perhaps how to draft a recommendation that would come out of our in-person meeting in November. Anything else on the indemnity.

Brian Thomas: Yes. This is Brian Thomas.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Sorry.

Brian Thomas: This is Brian Thomas.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Hello Brian.

Brian Thomas: Hello, I called in late but on the indemnity, with some of the tribes that are so remote that the remote locations from the sale barn or however on the indemnity was the part of where they had to travel so far to pick up livestock that they had to replace, that was one of the comments in our outreach with this traceability and other programs APHIS has. That was there concern really was, you know, the buy back. And we have to use our own daughter to pick up the livestock if we had to build our herd back up in any case to (unintelligible).

Dr. Don Hoenig: So basically it's the cost associated with the long distances involved. And going to purchase animals to bring back to the herd.

Brian Thomas: Yes. That was really about one of them.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Yes, yes.

(Lee Ann Thomas): Don, this is (Lee Ann). And I think I'd be amiss if I didn't mention that under our animal health protection act that we cannot cover replacement costs. So, I just want to let folks aware that we have within our own authorities that we have been given by congress, we have some limitations. We are limited when it comes to, we're actually prohibited from (unintelligible) replacement costs.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay.

Woman: Make it a little simpler rather than us having to hunt for that language, could you maybe forward that language to RJ and so that we can see exactly the limits or the relevance section of the app so we can see what the statutory guidelines are.

(Lee Ann Thomas): Be happy to.

(Don Hoenig: Thanks (Lee Ann). Other comments? Other comments just on the TB and Brucellosis framework that may not have been brought up so far?

Charles Rogers: Yes, Don, this is Charlie Rogers. I've got just a question that we might haven't answered at this time. I'm curious about just cross fence contamination on Tuberculosis. How much of that do we see? I mean a neighbor where there is just a fence involved. Do we have anything on that?

(Lee Ann Thomas): I can - I don't have a number in my head. I can tell you it is uncommon when we go in and we are doing adjacent fence-line or contact, fence-line testing of an affected herd. It is fairly uncommon to find another adjacent or fence line-affected herd.

(Gilles Stockton): I have a question on Brucellosis and wildlife.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Go ahead (Gill).

(Gilles Stockton): Sometimes I understand that bison from Yellowstone Park are captured and tested. And then purchased or donated to other people. Does that animal continue in the status as wildlife or does it become a domestic?

(Lee Ann Thomas): For the - and it would depend on how that animal is going to be managed after it is captured. And I think that's your question. And is a subject to released. It no longer is a captive animal.

(Gilles Stockton): But leaving Yellowstone Park and going into some other commercial herd or bison area.

(Lee Ann Thomas): It's - if they are going into a situation where they are going to be managed, then they would be - they would be considered a captive. If they are going to be released into the environment with - without what I would refer to with management of that herd on an annual basis, then no, they don't - they aren't subject to our regulations.

Dr. John Fischer: Hey, (Lee Ann), this is John Fischer. And you bring up and (Gilles) did to an interesting point there. I think that this definition of wild and captive animals gets kind of grey and that's something that I wanted to bring up when we were discussing traceability issues. But as I recall, Tuberculosis rule that was passed a few years ago defined wild animals as captive as soon as they are captured from the wild. Even if they're just going to be moved 10 miles down the road and released again.

This language is also in the CWD rule which has not yet been published as a final rule. So clarification there would be great.

(Lee Ann Thomas): John, you are correct. For the purposes of interstate movement.

Dr. John Fischer: Yes.

(Lee Ann Thomas): Assuming that 10 miles was across the state line.

Dr. John Fischer: Exactly.

(Lee Ann Thomas): Then yes, you are correct. For the purposes of our animal disease control, if a wild animal is captured for the purposes of interstate movement, than they are considered to - while in that timeframe, to be part of the program. And regulated by the program.

Dr. John Fischer: So after they're released, they are no longer regulated by the program?

(Lee Ann Thomas): I think the definition is after they lose their ID, but yes, that's correct.

Dr. John Fischer: Okay. And that ID issue is something that will be discussed in a little bit.

(Lee Ann Thomas): Yes. But, you know, certainly is that if the group feels that a recommendation is needed to handle that differently, that would be great. I would ask you - the question that I have to the group is how can you address these potential disease issues in those animals that being translocated.

Dr. John Fischer: True. Thank you.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Other comments on TB/Brucellosis framework? Well we're moving right along, aren't we.

Michael Doerrer: Don, this is Michael. Just to clarify, so am I hearing that there's some homework for the group before the face-to-face? That is continue to talk to the stakeholders about these issues. And to come to the November meeting prepared to offer an official, you know, to propose an official committee position and recommendation on these various issues.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Yes. And I would, you know, furthermore, I would suggest that if anybody has any language they would like to draft as a result of hearing this discussion, please feel free to do so and we can, you know, just if you want to try to develop some bullet points on a potential recommendation, go right ahead and do that. And then we'll distribute to the committee beforehand. You don't need to be wordsmithing too much, but just some general concepts on a recommendation that might have come out of this discussion so that we can kind of crystallize our thoughts a little bit more.

And certainly have more discussion on it in November. Okay. Onto proposed rule and traceability, the livestock moving interstate. And I hope that you've all had an opportunity to read the rule. RJ and Michael, did you want to - are you able to say anything about what we talked about on Monday?

RJ Cabrera: Monday.

Michael Doerrer: Yes, Don, you're talking about the extension of the comment period. Yes, the comment period where the secretary has decided to do another extension and that'll be appearing shortly. So that will bring us - I don't know the exact date off the top of my head. But it's an additional 30 days of comments.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Thank you

Michael Doerrer: So that brings a total to 120 days.

Dr. Don Hoenig: So that...

RJ Cabrera: Which is what the committee requested.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Right, so that's, I think, good news. It also gives us a little bit of breathing room if we wanted to make a recommendation to the secretary from the committee on the traceability rule. And what I would say is that as I read through that rule, probably sometime late August, I noticed there were several areas within the rule that USDA specifically highlighted in which they were seeking input and comments.

So I would urge you if you haven't read the rule in detail, to look for those areas and some of you may already have some comments right now. So, and I have a few from some of colleagues. But I'll - I'll hold off until others have had a bit of a chance to pitch in here. So why don't we go ahead with the traceability rule discussion.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Hello, Don, this is (Liz) Wagstrom.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Hello (Liz). Welcome.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Thanks, sorry I was a little late. This is more from (unintelligible). The (unintelligible) comment period and the expectation that they're going to get a lot of comments and you know, in the pork industry, we really feel a sense of urgency that this gets done before it becomes political pitfall during a potential or during the presidential race. Is there extra staff that's going to be assigned to going through those comments and putting together final rule. Or yes, I guess one of the research issues about trying to move this.

Michael Doerrer: I can say that, you know, we're carefully monitoring all the comments that are coming in and we'll evaluate everything that comes in. And then we'll assign appropriate staff to do that as quickly as possible. So we're mindful of the issue you are raising. And while I'm sure that we have appropriate resources to move as soon as expeditiously as we can.

Dr. Howard Hill: Michael or Don, this is Howard Hill. I would agree with (Liz)'s comment. Of course, we both come from the pork side so you'd expect that. But I thought the committee, we recommended 120 days. And then the secretary or somebody in the secretary's office put it out at 90 days. And now they're going back to 120 days. Or that's what they're recommending. So we're did they get comments already that they want to extend the comment period?

Michael Doerr: I think the - the department just has a desire to ensure that we hear from as many people as possible and get as much input as possible into the rule.

(Judith McGarry): Howard. I can speak. I don't know if this affected (unintelligible)'s decision at all. But just as a point of information, we had about 45 or more groups sign a letter requesting a comment period extension. And I think a separate letter - I'm not - I think there may have been another letter from another set of organizations but I'm not sure. So there definitely were comments submitted asking for an extension.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Yes. This is (Chuck) Massingill. And I've seen copies of 2 separate letters that went to the secretary requesting extension. The one (Judith) mentioned and another one from the cattle identification group.

Dr. Don Hoenig: I don't think it's unusual for comment periods to be extended with proposed rules, is it? Michael or RJ? I've heard of it in the past.

Michael Doerr: No, it's not unusual.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Yes.

Dr. Howard Hill: What's the norm - This is Howard Hill again. The normal period - comment period though is 60 days, correct?

Michael Doerrer: I'm not sure you can say there's a normal comment period. I mean it depends on the rule. But yes, I mean generally comments periods are around that 60 days. But you know, there're a lot of factor that are considered. And I should also note just as a point of clarification that, you know, as a federal advisory committee, you could submit comments. You're not bound by the comment period as an official federal advisory committee. So, you know, we can continue to explore this issue as needed aside from the official comment period. Just as a FYI aside.

Dr. Don Hoenig: I'll just start the ball rolling here. The state veterinarians had a - had some pretty good input in the development of the - of the provisions that we're proposing a rule. And so I think the fact that we had workgroup was a really good - a good template. And that is one comment that I got from that working group was that he felt it was a very collaborative process. And that and could serve as a - as a model for future rulemaking but.

So, in general the comments that I've gotten have been fairly positive on the rule. The one reservation that I had from one state veterinarian was on the feeder cattle based on a - un determined set of criteria in the future was causing a little bit of concern on him - his part and on the part of the industry in his area.

But then I had another colleague who also was supportive of that's so but I think in general the state veterinarian section in favor of moving ahead with where we are right now which is certainly unsatisfactory.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Say Don this is (Liz) Wagstrom and I think I would echo from the pork industry point of view that we're pleased with the swine specific parts of the rule.

They're basically what we already have with mandatory ID and continuing to be able to group that ID.

The concern we have -- and it goes back to, you know, the concern with the feeder cattle is that if we got a disease like Foot-and-Mouth disease it would be both cattle and swine affected, yet we do feel that there are gaps in protection because of the feeder cattle exemption at this time.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Thanks (Liz). Other comments on the traceability rule?

Charles Rogers: Yes this is Charlie Rogers, just need a little bit of clarification probably on the - on feeder cattle. Are we talking about - are we also talking about heifers under 18 months of age we're considering them feeder cattle is that correct?

Dr. Don Hoenig: Can somebody answer that?

(Judith McGarry): I think - I mean in the rule itself it never actually talks about feeder cattle.

That's sort of the term I think we've all fallen back on.

The rule itself talks about cattle over the age of 18 months and cattle under the age of 18 months.

So for myself, you know, this is (Judith). All I can say is I've been - when I say feeder cattle I'm sort of using that as a lump of under 18 months old cattle.

But I don't think - I mean that's a good question - point Charles and none of us
- there isn't the definition in the rule as far as I know.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Is there our - is one of our USDA subject matter experts on to also further
clarify that?

Man: Is Dr. Weimer's on the line?

Dr. Don Hoenig: Wow.

Man: I'm sorry Don we're checking. We were supposed to...

((Crosstalk))

Dr. Don Hoenig: That's okay.

Man: ...have on the line.

(Judith McGarry): Well we're also running quite a bit early so Don?

Dr. Don Hoenig: Yes that's true so we're really taking care of business here today.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Don this is (Chuck) Massingill. And we...

Dr. Don Hoenig: Hi.

Dr. Charles Massingill: ...have kind of wrestled with some of this through our cattle
identification group. I'm looking at Page 50093 Federal Register on the
attachment that we received.

At the top of that page it says official identification numbers of cattle or bison moving interstate would have to be reported on the ICBI or other documentation accompanying them except under the following circumstances, if cattle or bison are moved from approved facility. If cattle or bison are sexually intact cattle or bison under 18 months of age or are steers or spayed heifers of any age.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Now there's your answer.

Dr. Charles Massingill: This exception would not apply however to sexually intact dairy cattle of any age or to cattle or bison used for rodeo exhibition or recreational purposes.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Thanks (Chuck).

Man: You (unintelligible) too.

Dr. Charles Massingill: You're welcome. Thank you.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Yes. Thanks (Charlie). Yes good.

Max Fernandez: Excuse me, this is Max Fernandez and I - we would like to know where we at with the branding, with the iron brands?

Dr. Don Hoenig: Max I don't - is anybody on from USDA? If not my understanding is that - from what - from the discussion we've had is that they're not going to be considered to be official forms of ID anymore but that states, brand states can agree if the state animal health - both state animal health officials agree to allow them to be a form of identification for movement of animals between their states then that is going to be allowed.

Dr. Boyd Parr: Yes Don this is Boyd. And I think Don's just right. I think it's important to point out that that is - that makes it unchanged because that is the current situation now.

Max Fernandez: Okay. Well thank you in the state of Washington. We plan to keep being our main way to identify our cattle. Thank you.

Charles Rogers: This is Charlie Rogers. And some - I know that some - that the concern of some of the brand states and mine being one of those is if brands are not listed as official ID - and there could be a qualifying statement with that.

I mean and they could still be listed as official ID with a qualifying statement only when agreed on by states and tribes.

But the concern is the - how much in a legal process? If it's not listed as official ID if we wind up in court over say stolen cattle or something like that what if an attorney pulls that out and says well this is not recognized as official ID by the federal government? That's some - that's a concern for some of the states.

(Judith McGeary): This is (Judith) and, you know, that's - I've definitely been hearing concerns about the brand issue.

One idea that yes, some of our stakeholders have raised would be somewhat similar to what Charlie was just mentioning would be saying that, you know, the brand is official ID. You know, the proposal from our end has been its official ID among states with the official brand program and it's supplemental official ID in all other states.

So it's addressed, you know, I understand the concern the USDA's got or in the structure of this rule that if we made it literally official ID with no qualifier, you know, every state would have to accept it.

So, you know, if we could qualify it in a way that makes it official ID within official brand states and give it some sort of official recognition in the remaining states that certainly - I've been hearing plenty about that.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Other comments on the traceability rule? Pretty quiet group today.

Man: Can I just go back? (Judith) do we want to capture that as a potential recommendation for consideration at our face to face, the language that you just used or something along those lines?

(Judith McGeary): As I think what Don suggested and I think maybe I don't want to cut short because I think probably there's still more concerns, it's just difficult for people to figure out onto queue up on the conference call is that for all - for any of these issues people take charge of providing, you know, potential recommendation or briefing in preparation for the next meeting.

Sort of what we did in preparation for our I believe it was April meeting when beforehand, you know, everyone submitted or anyone who wanted to, you know, submitted a statement of here are the issues and here are some concerns. And yes the positive thing would be to come then with a formal recommendation for us to consider in November.

I think your brand won't be only one. I think we'll want to keep it much broader or much more open.

(Gilles Stockton): This is (Gilles). You know, I, you know, second (Judith)'s issues there on the brand. And I do think it would be something to market something that the committee could make a recommendation on, you know, renaming it official with contingent to certain conditions.

There's quite a bit of problems at the Western livestock regions cattle regions see with this rule. And I think just kind of start off at the top is the matter of unfunded mandate.

That's not addressed anywhere within the rule. And I know that this committee made a recommendation that we did want to, you know, have an unfunded mandate.

But there's no definition of how you decide that the mandate is unfunded and therefore suspended or terminated.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. Thanks (Gilles). Other discussion?

(Judith McGeary): I'll just talk very briefly not off animal ID rule but away from cattle for a moment if I could...

Dr. Don Hoenig: Sure.

(Judith McGarry): ...and say that we definitely have some concerns. You know, we've been hearing concerns about the poultry provisions.

I'll just say upfront I misunderstood the provisions in the framework when it came to poultry. We were all so focused on cattle And I read the way the, you know, framework was one way and it's not.

Going back and looking at it I realized it was my fault for misreading. And the language in the proposed rule has raised some - because of the very specific way it's written it - the application as it's written would require individual ID on a huge percentage of small backyard flocks and farm flocks and pasture poultry.

It's a bit confusing but when you look at the definition and the rule requirement the requirement states on anyone who sends or receives animals from across state lines. So there's a burden on the purchaser.

And the definition of group ID addresses the animal throughout his entire lifetime. It's only a group if it's handled as an isolated group throughout the entire pre-harvest chain.

Now when you apply those two issues, those two definitions and requirements to the non-integrated, the non-vertically integrated poultry world many, many, many poultry owners and farmers order day old chicks from hatcheries in other states.

I mean I don't have the numbers but I just know from experience and watching this, you know, huge percentage of small-scale poultry is raised based on out of shipment - out of state shipments of baby chicks.

They're also not raised in isolated groups. They are raised in integrated mixed groups. And because of that ultimately I mean take this rule as written the way the actual language of it would require individual ID on, you know, the majority of small farm flocks.

((Crosstalk))

Dr. Philip Stayer: (Judith) this is (Phil) Stayer with Stanchion Farms. Would not interstate shipment be covered on NPIP?

(Judith McGeary): See that's what I thought when I looked at the framework.

Dr. Philip Stayer: That's what I understood it to be. Those hatcheries that shipped interstate would be covered under NPIP wouldn't need individual animal ID then.

(Judith McGeary): That's what I thought when I read the framework. Your - and that's why I didn't raise the poultry issue when we were just talking on the framework.

But because the rule, the actual language of this proposed rule applies the requirement to both the sender and the receiver, the purchaser and it's a very short requirement on ID for poultry, either they have to be group ID'd or they have to be individually legged banded, period end of statement.

I mean there's no exceptions to the ID. Where they - where this proposed rule brings in the NPIP is under the certificate of veterinarian inspection issues. But on a ID it's group ID or individual ID -- end of story.

(Genell Pridgen): This is (Genell Pridgen). You know, I looked at this too and I've got a lot of concern for those small farmers particularly - and I'm thinking about people that bring in particularly laying hens.

Because I know as a small producer, you know, I'll bring in a batch from one hatchery and then a batch from another hatchery and, you know, they get put together.

And usually the only ID that they have is the fact that one group comes in might be a barred rock and the next one might be, you know, (red halla) on top.

And so like she just said the way it's worded you can't go - my understanding is you can go with a batch ID or group ID.

You know, the hatchery can send it out that way. But if you're not going to keep those segregated in different places you're going to mix those (Bart rocks) with those red high lines and you've get to use individual ID.

That's going to be, you know, the burden's going to be on the farmer to do that and I said that was a problem.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Excuse me. This is (Chuck) Massingill and I'm a little bit confused. Is there a provision in here that I've missed that says when I receive the animals I have to ID them on a receipt...

Woman: Let me pull up the language...

((Crosstalk))

Dr. Charles Massingill: (Unintelligible) talking about? Did I miss that completely? I could.

Woman: I don't have the language in front of me at this moment. (Judith) do you?

(Judith McGeary): I'm working on digging it up.

Man: I didn't realize there was any requirement on the receiver.

(Judith McGeary): Section - it's on page - hold on a second let me pull this. Page 50107 of the Federal Register version. In the second column Section 90.2 the general requirement for traceability subsection B, no person may move covered livestock interstate or receive such livestock moved interstate unless the livestock meet all applicable requirements of this part.

Dr. Charles Massingill: So that applies to the shipper?

(Judith McGeary): No, no, no receive.

Dr. Charles Massingill: But it means if I except an illegal shipment it's like receiving stolen property, right?

(Judith McGeary): Well it means if I get an animal that's crossed - that's gone across state lines it's my responsibility just as much as the shipper's responsibility to have - to make sure that it meets the requirement.

Dr. Charles Massingill: That it was in compliance when it crossed the state line right?

(Judith McGeary): Yes.

Dr. Charles Massingill: So when he gets to your house it's already done that?

(Judith McGeary): Yes. But the funky thing about group ID is it looks at the animal throughout its entire lifetime. It's not at the moment - group ID and whether group ID applies or not depends on the animal's entire lifetime.

It's a very odd, you know, sort of difficult thing to put together.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Let me - (Jen), maybe you can get the swine people to help us. So if you ship - if the swine people sent a truckload of (gilt), potential breeding (gilt)s early winged to a facility to be reared and those go to another facility they would be regrouped, is that correct? Am I wrong in that?

Dr. Howard Hill: Yes this is Howard. I was going to bring that up Chuck. You know, if we have animals for example that are in wing to finish facilities and then they go and then they might get mixed with another group from another winged finish facility move to a finishing facility they get a new group ID.

Now we can trace those animals back all the way back to the south farm but we couldn't tell you which south farm they came from if they were being supplied, those two winged finish facilities were being supplied by two different south farms.

The only difference here is that a lot of these facilities were run all in, all out. And I think what Ms. (Pridgen) was talking about was maybe adding a bird to a flock and on a continuous flow type of situation.

And that might be a little bit more problematic. I don't know how you would give them a new ID hardly.

(Judith McGeary): So....

Woman: But, you know, most of them coming in as breeding stock, you know, like you talked about (gilt), normally we would individually ID the (gilt)s coming in because you know that you're not going to keep them. There's a distinct rule if they're going to go out at separate times.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Okay so is it the understanding of the other people on the call that the receiver is responsible to identify these animals?

Woman: That's the way the language reads at this point for the poultry is that, you know, the receiving has to make sure that they're properly ID'd.

Dr. Boyd Parr: Yes I think that's that has been in that rule. This is Boyd. And to me that's a significant enhancement because the problems we have in enforcement with people now on existing regulations is the buyers assume no responsibility and their complicit in bringing them in illegally.

And unless both are responsible they have no incentive or responsibility to cooperate in meeting the requirements.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Boyd would that apply to the month after they arrived at their destination? I mean they still need to be identified a month after they arrive?

Dr. Boyd Parr: I - the way I read it it - they are equally responsible to be sure they had the proper paper and documentation to enter.

Dr. Charles Massingill: To enter okay to enter but not to remain?

Dr. Boyd Parr: No not to remain.

(Judith McGeary): Not to - but wait a second, that would be the logical thing okay guys? So to me there's a difference between what you're saying and what the language of the rule is because group ID doesn't say that it's a group when it crosses or when it enters the state.

The definition of group ID is that it's a unit of animals of the same species that's managed together as one group throughout the pre-harvest production chain.

And you - when you combine that with the requirement that the receiver do -- and I'm not arguing against - Boyd I'm not arguing against the requirement on the receiver. I'm just saying the combination of these two things...

Dr. Boyd Parr: Yes.

(Judith McGeary): ...in the context of poultry means that if we bring in poultry from an outside hatchery and we know that they're not going to be remaining in a group they're destined to going to a mixed laying flock, you know, and sort of do this continuous flow type thing that (Genell) described then we know they aren't - they don't qualify for group ID when we receive them.

Dr. Charles Massingill: Yes and I...

Man: Well (Judith)...

Dr. Charles Massingill: ...guess the argument and the discussion that we're having is really about group ID and its application. And I think that's appropriate. I would have to admit that I had not thought of the implications of the chick coming from the hatcheries.

It's really not about the requirement to meet import requirements. It's about the definition of group ID and whether some additional language may be needed to cover this type thing or not?

Man: Sure.

Dr. Howard Hill: This is Howard again, Howard Hill. If, you know, you think about this from a practical standpoint -- and (Judith) I'm not - you're the attorney. You're going to have to wrestle with the wording.

But from a practical standpoint if you have a group of animals and you receive another group of animals and those animals are now mixed so you have a new mixed group and but one of those groups that was shipped in there is identified as carrying an infectious disease and it's going to require depopulation then the whole mixed group gets depopulated but because that's now the group.

(Judith McGeary): But the point for us is in our farm flocks in the situation, you know, very few of our farm flocks are ever found to be diseased.

I don't know the numbers but for the most part the incidence of disease that requires depopulation in farm flocks is quite low.

So the problem with trying to manage groups based on a fear or depopulation means that you're having to do significant management changes.

I mean I think you're right. Obviously impact with what you're saying is right. But in practical terms, you know, our people would be doing major management shifts based on, you know, a risk that's actually quite low.

Man: (Unintelligible) a sticky situation.

(Judith McGeary): So I think I mean I understand I think maybe this goes back to I think it was Phil who said - took very early in response to what I said also what we

thought the framework was talking about was actually basically just relying on NPIP.

That the NPIP was working well and we're just going to reinforce the NPIP. So in terms of how to solve this that, you know, going back to what I think we thought the framework was talking about would probably be the direction of our recommendation on this.

Man: Yes I agree. We sure need a clarification or at least a definition on this from USDA because if it's as far reaching as you're describing then that has lots of implications for our beef cattle people.

Dr. Don Hoenig: So RJ and Michael are you taking notes on this?

Man: The whole call is being recorded and we'll have a transcript of everything.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. I think that, you know, for our November meeting it would be helpful to have that clarified. And, you know, my understanding of NPIP is that it's - it was mostly a voluntary program that was intended for breeders although they included the commercial birds with the H5 and H7 program a few years ago.

But still was, you know, limited to breeders. But okay other traceability issues?

Man: Don...

Dr. Don Hoenig: I'm going to have - go ahead?

Man: Don, you know, group ID is basically our identification system on finishing pigs, not so on breeding stock. Breeding stock is individually ID'd either with tattoos or ear tags.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay.

Man: Because this is so important to our industry if we're going to propose a change in the wording -- and (Judith) I don't know if that's something you plan to do - - I'd really like to have you send that around so we can kind of digest it and understand it before the November meeting.

(Judith McGeary): But first of all I think anything I'd suggest that all of us send stuff around so that we can all be looking at this.

I will say from my perspective it's not so much a change in the group ID per se. I think it needs to be changed specifically in the poultry section. But yes I agree, we all need to be circulating this stuff ahead of time.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Good idea.

Charles Rogers: Don this is Charlie Rogers. And I missed a little bit on the comment period. The comment period is currently for the rule is currently what?

Dr. Don Hoenig: It's 90 days. And the secretary has agreed to extend it another 30 days so the total comment period will be 120 days.

Charles Rogers: Okay great.

Dr. Don Hoenig: And I assume that'll be sometime the first week of December.

(Judith McGeary): I think it takes us to December 9 is my...

Dr. Don Hoenig: Yes.

(Judith McGeary): ...number. Is that correct?

Dr. Don Hoenig: And as RJ and Michael pointed out that this committee is not limited by that comment period.

Certainly if you want to put comments in on your own or on behalf of your own organization you need to put them in by December 9. But the secretary's advisory committee can comment at any point.

Charles Rogers: Okay. Thank you very much.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay Charlie. Other input on the traceability rule?

(Gilles Stockton): This is (Gilles Stockton). What - we might as well tackle feeder cattle because it's certainly going to be the issue that's going to have the biggest blowback.

And, you know, the cattle groups out here in the West are mobilizing to protest the entire rule if feeder cattle are included.

(Judith McGeary): (Gilles I think when we talked about when the issue of feeder cattle was raised in April for a while there we were talking about putting together brief explaining concerns about it. But I think a lot of this committee knows the issue of feeder cattle pretty well and then there's some that don't I mean it's just not their area. Do you think you could put something together?

(Gilles Stockton): Yes certainly I could.

(Judith McGeary): Cool. I'm just hearing the sound of silence so I'm thinking that might be a productive way to move on that because I agree. And let me just say, you know, I've been hearing a ton of feeder cattle too. I mean that is going to be a major blowback area for my stakeholders.

Charles Rogers: I think - this is Charlie Rogers again. I think one of our major concerns of feeder cattle are the enormous numbers of cattle that move at certain times of the year.

And probably - and I'm just kind of speaking for me at this point not anybody else. But what I see - the problems I see if feeder cattle are tagged that - that's not necessarily a problem.

Most producers when it becomes necessary will tag their animals. It is - but we do not want to get in a position of reading (unintelligible) because that's almost - I think that's almost an impossibility because there's certain times of the year when so many feeder cattle move at such a rapid pace that we can create more problems than we can solve by trying to read movement.

Now making sure that an animal has official ID in their ear or has some type of official ID that might not be a problem other than there would be times when if we're talking about only veterinarians being able to do that, I'll go back to an example of New Mexico.

From October the 1st to November the 15th I did a - from the brand board I got some figures. They have approximately 50 deliveries every day and that would include adult and feeder cattle. But it's mostly feeder cattle.

They have approximately 50 deliveries every day during that timeframe. They've got 54 employees to take care of that, that inspect these animals for brands.

Now I - in this state I can't imagine that we can find 50 veterinarians every day to take care of these deliveries of feeder cattle. That's kind of where we - I mean those are the problems associated with feeder cattle.

And I realize that there are - there probably are solutions to some of those problems. Possibly, you know, we you there's a brand inspector at these deliveries.

If that brand inspector were able to inspect the animals also for official ID that's - that would solve that problem in this area. But there's going to be different problems in different areas along the same lines.

(Judith McGeary): All right I...

Dr. Don Hoenig: Charlie just like to just butt in here. This is Don. I need to go off. (Judith) can you take over for a bit?

(Judith McGeary): Sure.

Dr. Don Hoenig: Okay. Thank you.

(Judith McGeary): Thanks Don.

(Gilles Stockton): Charlie this is (Gill) again. I disagree with you that it's possible to put in official ID and let me explain why here.

Well first of all of the rule as it's written does not require that the numbers on the ear tag, the IDs be recorded on the (ICD)s. So, you know, that's a good thing.

And I'm assuming the program -- and this is just an assumption -- would work somewhat similarly to the Scrapie program where each producer has a box of tags and you just put the tags into the sheep's ear.

Charles Rogers: I listen to (unintelligible). No, no they just extended the comment period days to discuss the...

((Crosstalk))

(Judith McGeary): Folks if you're not the one speaking could you please put your phone on mute? I don't think everyone realizes how much the background noise can take over. (Gilles) you were in the middle of saying?

(Gilles Stockton): I was saying that with sheep then on the shipping days that we tag each one of those lambs going to the auction market.

The problem with feeder calves though is that if you tag them at branding time with that inch and a half size tag you're going to have to put it in loose. So you're going to have a certain amount of loss over the summer.

And the reality of how we like to wean and ship out here is that, you know, we like to wean right there in the pasture where they've been grazing.

And often those pastures have just rudimentary corrals to ship from. There's no way to capture any calves and replace tags that are missing.

And there's no time. You know, you've - you're out there with your crew on horseback, you're getting those cattle, you're sorting them up. The truck is there ready to go to go to the facilities where you're going to get them weighed.

They're offloaded there. They're sorted by the buyer and they want to get those trucks gone by 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

So it's sort of logistically impossible to send a truck load of calves out that would all have ear tags in them.

Charles Rogers: See now I will agree with that that that is another problem. You're exactly right.

(Genell Pridgen): This is (Genell Pridgen). You know, being a sheep farmer myself I've had problems with the Scrapie tags that APHIS provides staying in the ears of my sheep.

And we used to use a dual tag system, our farm tag and then we used the USDA tag, scrapie tag.

And then we went to just using the Scrapie tag. And we've had to go back to using a dual tag system because those scrapie tags when USDA changed companies just will not stay inconsistently.

And I mean I can - of course I'm tagging sheep that are staying on the farm. I'm not just tagging them when they're leaving.

But what I'm finding is, you know, they're out in the pasture and they come back in four months later and I'm trimming hoofs or whatever and I'll find out of the group of 100 I might find 15 that are missing tags.

And, you know, you cannot always identify who that animal is so you've got to go - you've got to use a dual tag system.

My concern particularly with the feeder cattle, you know, we're supposed to be tracing disease over the life of that animal (albeit it) to trace that animal particularly when they go to a feedlot and they're eating out of, you know, out of feeders and stuff I'm just wondering what the tag loss is going to be.

Or I'm not familiar with a feedlot system but are they using - would it be suggested to use a dual tag system because if they're using a single tag I'm just imagining there's going to be a lot of tag loss.

Dr. Keith Roehr: This is Keith Roehr. I'm the Colorado state veterinarian. I was part of the rulemaking group with USDA. And I guess just a couple of comments to some of the discussion.

Because first of all the requirements for interstate certificates a veterinarian inspection and I think it may have been made in reference to New Mexico, we already have existing agreements with New Mexico to accept brand inspections for certain types of interstate movement.

I've talked to Dave Fly, the state veterinarian in New Mexico and we fully intend to continue that.

And specifically in the rule as an exemption to requirements for ICVIs it says additionally cattle and bison under 18 months of age may be moved between

shipping and receiving states or tribes with documentation other than an ICVI. And it says i.e., a brand inspection certificate.

So we intend to continue to use some of those tools. We also have exemption for feeder cattle for other types of ID. And it can include brands.

So we understand that there's a lot of cattle production systems that are not routinely installing individual animal identification presently.

We also understand that a lot of industry people do. And I'll speak for Colorado Cattlemen's Association.

I think of our producers the use of production ID is rivaling 100% but they use they dangle tag for ID purposes. It's a visual tag.

When that requirement comes in for feeder cattle they intend to go to A40 visual tag that is one tag that meets all purposes.

I don't think they'll have any intent of doing that until they're required to. But that may use that visual 840 tag for adult cattle as well because it will qualify them for interstate movement.

Man: Okay.

Dr. Keith Roehr: So I think in the end there are some specific requirements. There's a number of exemptions that exist in the rule. And state animal health officials will continue to do what we've always done is facilitate movement between states that makes sense for industry and for production practices. And I think the rule gives us the latitude to do that.

Man: Great because we will need that.

Dr. Keith Roehr: Well we always have. And I think the point is that for livestock today are they required to have certificates of veterinary inspection? I don't know of many states that have a universal exception to that.

We operate with MOUs and just other agreements between states that work well. I think that will continue to happen.

But there's really not a carte blanche exception across the board for certificates now. And the way it is in the Code of Federal Regulations presently cattle over 24 months are required to be individually identified.

It's not being administered. And there's a number of things I think that are in TB rule, and brucellosis rules, that we have used as the foundation for our animal ID program. There really isn't a program.

There's a number of things in rule that worked well when there was a large participation percentage-wise by cattle moving between states.

And that function for disease control purposes is those requirements have diminished and they've diminished significantly between states. We no longer have a system that's functional.

(Gilles Stockton): This is (Gill Stockton)again. Yes but those requirements were on breeding age cattle. And...

Dr. Keith Roehr: That's correct.

(Gilles Stockton): ...yes and never have been much of a requirement on feeder cattle other than brand between our states in the West.

I think another issue that is bothering us is that the number of cattle in - the number of feeder cattle in interstate commerce must be ten or 15 times as many as breeding cattle which, you know, could make for, you know, really inundate the data retrieval system for the different state veterinary offices.

Dr. Keith Roehr: Well if we or tag companies with 840 tags they'll be in the Animal Identification Database in the AIN database.

If producers choose to use a state issued tag that's tied to a location identifier in the (Brag) tag system and we've got the capability to do that now I think the important point is that cattle under 18 months of age or feeder cattle are not required to be ID'd to move interstate until a phased in process occurs.

And how many years that'll be I don't think anyone knows. And it will come back before this advisory committee to look and see that 70% of adult cattle are being ID in addition to perhaps other measures that may be necessary to ensure that we have a functional system.

You know, I think there was a comment a moment ago about if animals lose tags. There's nothing that we do with identification in CVIs that's ever been 100%.

And I think state animal health officials understand that. We'll still continue to be the individuals that receive CVIs through whatever means, either through mailed copies to our office or electronically.

And we end up being the administrators of this rule because we're the ones that are involved with interstate movement, not USDA.

Woman: Well...

Dr. Keith Roehr: And I think we understand in the industry if veterinarian writes a certificate that says the animals on the certificate are officially ID'd and six of them are not, you know, if there's not a willful...

Woman: Well wait...

Dr. Keith Roehr: ...problem that's a - if it is a statistically significant set of livestock we're not here to - we never have -- and we look at CVIs every day -- we're not here to try to strain out a gnat.

We're here to make sure we have a functional system. And so I think that's the key of how it will continue to be administered.

(Judith McGeary): I think it's also very much incumbent on this committee however to recognize that personnel change, this committee may not be around two years from now.

You know, there may be an extension of this committee there may not. You know, any other state vets currently providing input may or may not be in their positions two years, five years, ten years down the line.

And I feel very strongly that this committee needs to look at the language of the rule of the proposal and ensure that the best possible proposal is made and that flaws are pointed out because, you know, this is the chance to fix it.

Dr. Keith Roehr: I agree.

(Judith McGeary): So...

Dr. Keith Roehr: But I think the foundational system that includes state veterinarians, you're not going to see a wholesale change in the way state veterinarians do business.

We've been moving livestock between state states for decades. And we understand logistically how that works.

And we - and I understand too it's - it is exceedingly important that we stay connected with industry as we move forward to make sure that the rule says functionally what it means to say to enable us to do what we need to do which is protect animal health.

(Judith McGeary): And I'd like to circle back to the committee members and sort of make sure we're flushing out the things that the committee members want to build on for - or hash, you know, bring out more for our next meeting.

Are there - (Gill) have you finished with what you were wanting to talk about on the feeder cattle or did anyone else have additional comments on the feeder cattle?

(Gilles Stockton): I could continue this conversation a little bit, go back to practical issues. You know, a state like Colorado which as a huge feeding industry has got to have a, you know, a very well-staffed and funded veterinary service. A state like Montana doesn't.

And it's my understanding in Montana the state veterinarian is more interested in keeping tabs of animals that enter Montana versus those that leave.

And, you know, probably annually we have, you know, a million some feeder cattle leave Montana but probably just a few thousand breeding cows that enter.

So for Montana to ramp up and be able to, you know, keep records of those outgoing ICBI's will require a significant upgrade to their department.

And in this economic and political climate I'm not sure where that money is going to come from.

Charles Rogers: I believe we'll see a lot of states with the same problem.

(Judith McGeary): I'll serve one specific piece on feeder cattle that caught my attention. And again this is sort of lawyer eye on language.

It's if I'm reading this correctly particularly the sales barns will be required to keep copies of interstate certificate of veterinary inspection for five years.

And the preamble to the proposed rule raised the justification of long term diseases such as brucellosis and tuberculosis. And certainly in that context something like a five year recordkeeping requirement, you know, has some logic.

But again at - when it is phased in, you know, at the stage when feeder cattle are phased in I am very concerned and I'd love to hear from Charlie or anybody else who's hearing from sales barns literally just in terms of storage capabilities of how the sales barns are going to function in terms of keeping copies for five years of all of the feeder cattle that, you know, copies of the CVIs of all the feeder cattle going through there. To my mind that becomes a huge logistical problem for them.

Charles Rogers: It does become a problem. You are correct. This is Charlie. It is a problem. Although we have a tremendous amount of paperwork we keep up with at this time, that's just one more step for us, can be done but it will be a problem yes.

I've got one other question and it's probably been asked before and I don't remember the answer.

When we were talking about feeder cattle and the - and disease that's discovered in feeder cattle probably when they - okay feeder cattle under 18 months of age and their next steps a feed yard and the next step's slaughter, that's probably when we discover disease in feeder cattle.

What - what's the percentage of an example of TB that's discovered in feeder cattle opposed to adult cattle at the slaughter of feeder cattle at...

Man: (Unintelligible) know?

Charles Rogers: ...30 months of age? What is the - what are we looking for here? Are we looking...

Dr. Don Hoenig: We still have a significant number of cases every year of TB that's discovered in fed cattle. A lot of those are Mexico origin but they're still discovered at slaughter through FSIS trace back.

Charles Rogers: But we're talking about US feeder cattle. If we exclude the Mexican cattle then where are we at with feeder cattle?

Dr. Don Hoenig: I don't have an exact number for you. I will tell you in Colorado we had six TB herds infected from feeder movements in our TB outbreak.

So is it significant potentially? Yes it is.

(Lee Ann Thomas): This is (Lee Ann). And I actually can give you that - some - that breakdown that we have had through June 30 of 2011.

We have had a total of 20 TB cases detected at slaughter. Four of those were in adult cattle, 16 of those were in feeder cattle. And of those 16 seven were determined to be of Mexican origin. So there are roughly nine feeder cases that are of US origin.

Charles Rogers: Great. Thank you very much.

Dr. Howard Hill: Charlie this is Howard Hill. I, you know, and I know that most of the traceability, well all - fortunately all of the traceability that we're doing now has to do with domestic diseases.

But, you know, if we get a foreign animal disease it's not going to ask that the bovine, what the age of it is when it affects it.

Charles Rogers: Okay.

Dr. Howard Hill: You know? So I just always want to make sure everybody realizes these traceability - all this traceability work is for domestic disease. But also we've got to keep in mind that it's for foreign animal disease traceability too.

Charles Rogers: Okay.

Dr. Howard Hill: So I hope you never have to use it for.

Charles Rogers: Well I hope you're right. Thank you very much.

(Gilles Stockton): This is (Gilles) again, which one of those foreign animal diseases would this traceability be useful to contain?

Dr. Howard Hill: In our case hog cholera, multi-species foot and mouth disease would be, you know, we've got rinderpest in Europe; we've got African swine fever.

I mean, you know, African swine fever is moving from Eastern Europe and it's approaching Western Europe.

So all those kind of diseases are - that are considered foreign animal diseases would be potential candidates.

(Gilles Stockton): Well I can understand on the swine fever being a real concern. But I think we discussed in this committee already that, you know, traceability isn't going to be, you know, worth a hoot and a holler if we have an FMD outbreak.

Dr. Howard Hill: Yes I don't know that everybody would agree with you on that. I think there's a lot of veterinary officials in USDA and universities that would not necessarily agree that that's the case.

You know, it all depends on when it gets identified and how widespread it is before we can get it surrounded.

(Judith McGeary): Well that actually brings up a slightly different point that I doubt - I'll just be upfront and say I doubt this committee will come out with a recommendation on but it is an issue that I'm hearing from I stakeholders.

So I'm just going to put it out there which is still not being satisfied frankly with the data backup for the justification for this rule.

You know, we submitted a lot of questions to USDA back in January I believe after our first meeting.

I submitted a list on behalf of our stakeholders of wanting to understand the current traceability, where the gaps in the traceabilities were, what sort of problems were working, you know, what sort of problems weren't working, where they were coming from -- things like that.

And those questions were really [not] answered in the - by the regulatory analysis. There was more - we were looking for more across the board data to give us the full numbers whereas the regulatory analysis appears to focus more on case studies.

So like I said I'll just be upfront and say I don't expect this committee will come out with a recommendation specifically on that, but that is a major issue for my stakeholders that's going to inform sort of their overall reaction to this rule. And it's simply - it's not clear if this rule - which problems this rule is solving.

Dr. Keith Roehr: You know, and let me comment on your statement that you're looking out for your stakeholders.

We all have our expertise with our particular species or sized farms and all that.

But really this committee needs to be concerned about the livestock industry in general, livestock and poultry industry in this country and protecting it, not just protecting our own, just our own stakeholders.

(Judith McGeary): I'd agree...

Man: Well said.

(Judith McGeary): ...with that. I would agree with that absolutely. And from the perspective of a lot of what we understand, you know, coming from the community I come from about animal health and protecting animal health there are a lot of issues that would be more important for instance than animal traceability.

We'd like to see much stronger import controls. We'd like to see much less emphasis on the - of how to protect the export market as opposed to protecting animal health per se and a lot more emphasis on prevention.

So it's not an issue of trying to protect our specific farms although that certainly plays into some of the comments including for instance the poultry concern.

But it also, you know, who we are and we'll inform what we consider our top priorities for animal health in general.

I'd like so that seems to have brought the sound of silence back. Are there other issues that people on the committee wish to raise as again preliminary? This doesn't rule out bringing up more as we move forward but just preliminarily.

Michael Doerrer: I'm sorry (Judith). This is Michael. Dr. Cindy Wolfe is trying to join. I just wanted to see if she's managed to join. Dr. Wolfe are you on the line?

Dr. Cindy Wolfe: Michael can you hear me?

Michael Doerrer: Yes I can.

Dr. Cindy Wolfe: Okay.

Michael Doerrer: Go on.

Dr. Cindy Wolfe: Thanks. (Judith) I'd just like to throw out a thought process for us between now and November.

I was very involved with the first few years of the pain that the scrapie rule brought to the sheep producers.

And as a machine producer I'm very concerned about many things including the cost of hay, the cost of feed.

And so I feel like if we had a disease that shut down a region of our country I would hope that that would be a major goal of this traceability rule is that we could reopen markets as rapidly as possible.

And we live in Minnesota so we need to feed hay some of the year. And if all of a sudden we couldn't drive between farms or to a market that would be something where we would end up with suffering animals.

And that was my hope of what a traceability rule could give us a framework to begin to move forward on how to protect our livestock industries.

And so my suggestion is that if we have issues could we put forward those issues and decide which of those we could work on as a committee that would make this proposed rule better and potentially submit those as comments from the committee and maybe sub portions of the committee?

I don't know that we can get them all discussed today but we certainly could share them in writing and then move forward on those on the 1st of November.

(Judith McGeary): I think that's - that is where we want to go with this. Can I put that on pause for a moment? I agree with you and I think that's a very good place.

Let me put it on pause long enough just to say are there other ones - with the recognition we're not going to settle anything exactly today. But there are other ones does anybody want to just raise and bring in - bring up today?

John Kalmey: This is John Kalmey with - from the dairy industry's perspective we are concerned about replacement tags.

I think there's been some discussion earlier today that animals lose tags. And in the dairy herd animals tend to stay in the herd much longer and we're going to have more issues with animals losing tags.

And as an industry we're to comply with this proposed framework we're going to try very hard to encourage most everyone to use 840 tags.

We think a one animal one number system works better for us. And for a tag to be practical for that it - we're going to have to be looking at 840 tags.

And we need to come up with a system where we can replace tags on animals that lose tags if at all possible without changing that animal's number.

And I think some tags that you could - can be replaced now from manufacturers but I don't think 840 tags can without changing the animal's number.

Another concern of ours is that if we're going to be concentrating on 840 tags we need - there are some places in the country where it's very difficult to get a premise ID number for a particular herd so that you can get an 840 tag for the animals in that herd.

Those are a couple of the things that are of real concern from the perspective of the dairy industry.

But I think in light of the general discussion we just had recently, the dairy industry feels very strongly that there is a huge need for animal ID and traceability if we're going to have any hope of slowing the spread of - or stopping the spread of infectious - for infectious diseases.

And while as an industry we don't think that this plan goes as far as it needs to we think it's certainly an improvement over what we have now. Thank you.

(Judith McGeary): Thanks. Additional comments on sort of big topic areas or small topic areas for that matter?

(Gilles Stockton): Well this is (Gilles) again. And speaking of dairy since it got brought up I think there's a definition problem that needs to be addressed on what constitutes a dairy cattle. Because if the rule as written requires that all dairy regardless of age be identified.

But for beef cattle, the feeder cattle won't be required for the time period, time being. So what is a dairy cow and what is a dairy?

There's a lot of dual-purpose breeds out there that people are raising -- a heritage breed. Some of them might be managing them as a dairy. Some of them might be managing them as beef cattle.

What about the cross bred steers that would be coming out of dairy production?

(Judith McGeary): Yes the definition of dairy cattle to me was incredibly vague. I believe it simply says an animal of a dairy breed.

Man: Yes I don't think that's vague (Judith) I think that's really precise.

(Judith McGeary): Really?

Man: Yes an animal dairy (unintelligible)

(Judith McGeary): What's...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's what they're using as a definition that...

(Judith McGarry): Yes.

Man: ...doesn't sound definite?

(Judith McGeary): Someone tell me what a Devon is, tell me please, you know? So I can guarantee you my producers will give you tell you two different - tell you different things about whether a Devon is a milking breed or not?

Okay so we've got dairy. So let me touch on - I mean we brought up a lot of issues and this is not exclusive.

So I'd like to say first of all, you know, as we go forward folks should absolutely feel free to bring up additional issues whether it's in the remainder of time of this call or in writing, you know, in an email between now and November 1.

But it sounds like ones that I think are very likely to at least be, you know, arguably committee recommendations, something where we could hash out possibly is there's the branding issue, there's the feeder cattle issue, the poultry issue.

Tag replacement has come up more than once and this dairy cattle definition. Are there additional pieces of it someone wants to bring up?

Dr. John Fischer: This is John Fischer and I alluded to it earlier when we were discussing tuberculosis. But wildlife that's captured for interstate movement and translocation there is some issues there as well.

(Judith McGeary): Okay, so captured wildlife?

Dr. John Fischer: Yes.

(Gilles Stockton): And (Judith) this is (Gilles). The unfunded mandate issue?

(Judith McGeary): Oh yes. Because and that's something the committee has done a recommendation on already but let's take back up since the USDA didn't incorporate it into the proposed rule. Thank you (Gilles).

Looking at a calendar we've got basically five weeks between now and the November 1 meeting.

Do people think it would be realistic to try to circulate some more in-depth material on these topics or, you know, again additional topics if you come up with them from your stakeholders by the 17th?

That gives us two weeks ahead of the meeting to review them and think about them before we come together as a group.

Is this a case where silence is assent?

Is there any - let me try this. Is there anyone who would not be comfortable in providing, you know, an email to the committee members by October 17 explaining, you know, there are issues if appropriate providing a proposed recommendation or simply, you know, flushing it out more?

Dr. Willie Reed: Now that - this is Willie Reed.

(Judith McGeary): Willie sorry, I didn't catch what the first part what you said?

Dr. Willie Reed: Yes I would not.

(Judith McGeary): You would not?

Dr. Willie Reed: Yes.

(Judith McGeary): Okay. Is that a timing issue, amount of time issue or...

Dr. Willie Reed: Well maybe I didn't understand your question. I think that timeframe is fine for me.

(Judith McGeary): Okay. Is there anyone who doesn't think the timeframe is okay? I'm figuring that way if it's silence I can tell you all you all agreed. Is there anyone who doesn't think that the timeframe by October 17 was workable?

Okay. And then we're going with it. RJ if you could perhaps send us all a reminder a week ahead of time like on the 10th?

RJ Cabrera: Okay. We will take care of that (Judith).

(Judith McGeary): Awesome.

RJ Cabrera: And also we can try to provide some kind of distillation of the transcript from this call, you know, to try to identify, you know, capture some of the issues and discussion that was raised here as well.

(Judith McGill): That would be wonderful. Thank you. So I'm pulling up. So is there anything else before, any last minute thoughts on animal ID?

Okay my apologies, I've managed to close out the agenda so I don't have it in front of me to see what's next on our agenda if anything.

Michael actually I think we turn it over to you if there's no other comments from anyone on the traceability rule.

Michael Doerrer: Now I think this was a great call. I appreciate all the feedback. It was a really good discussion.

I would just advise everyone to be on lookout for e mails from RJ, logistical emails, to get us ready for our November 1 meeting.

We'll be having emails about travel and other, you know, logistical arrangements -- hotel, all that good stuff. So just be on the lookout for that.

And...

Woman: We'll also want to plan a prep call at some point. I heard the October 17 date for feedback. But we probably want a prep call shortly thereafter. And I'll send out a Doodle or an email of some sort to plan that.

RJ Cabrera: So just be on the lookout for more information. Thanks (Judith).

(Judith McGeary): Thanks. And the question just on logistics for you all, will we be contacted shortly - should we start making our own travel plans or is USDA going to be contacting committee members shortly about that?

RJ Cabrera: We'll follow the same procedure as we did for the last meeting so we'll have people be in touch.

(Judith McGeary): Okay. Thank you.

Man: Didn't we make our own travel arrangements last time?

Man: RJ?

Woman: Yes we do have a hotel block set up for you. But everyone made their own travel arrangements. And we've got you set up in our system so that doesn't have to be done.

RJ Cabrera: Okay.

Woman: .this go round.

RJ Cabrera: That's what I was thinking of in terms of contacting everybody but that's already been done.

Woman: That's already been done.

Woman: So we should be making our own travel arrangements?

Woman: Absolutely.

Woman: Okay.

(RJ Cabrera): Just stay tuned for the next email from me on instructions on when to do that.

I want to thank everyone. I think this was given particularly the difficulties of managing our conference call I think actually this was a very good discussion. And thank you to everybody for making it a positive discussion.

RJ Cabrera: All right, well thanks (Judith) for leading the call and thanks to all the committee members. So unless there's anything further I guess we can do meeting adjourned for the day.

Man: Thank you.

RJ Cabrera: Okay. Thanks everybody. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you everyone.

END