

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON

MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

+ + + + +

PLENARY SESSION

+ + + + +

September 30, 2010

9:00 a.m.

USDA South Building Cafeteria
Washington, D.C.

CHAIR: MR. ALFRED V. ALMANZA
Administrator
Food Safety and Inspection Service

MODERATOR: MR. ROBERT TYNAN
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of Public Affairs and Consumer
Education
Food Safety and Inspection Service

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

MS. PATRICIA K. BUCK
DR. FUR-CHI CHEN
MR. BRIAN R. COVINGTON
DR. CATHERINE N. CUTTER
MS. NANCY J. DONLEY
DR. JEFF FARRAR
MS. VENERANDA GAPUD
DR. CRAIG HENRY
DR. CHERYL D. JONES
DR. HEIDI KASSENBOG
MS. SARAH A. KLEIN

Free State Reporting, Inc.
1378 Cape St. Claire Road
Annapolis, MD 21409
(410) 974-0947

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: (Continued)

DR. ARTHUR LIANG
DR. SHELTON E. MURINDA
DR. EDNA NEGRON-BRAVO
MR. ROBERT G. REINHARD
DR. CRAIG E. SHULTZ
MR. STANLEY A. STROMBERG
DR. JOHN D. TILDEN
MS. CAROL L. TUCKER-FOREMAN
MR. STEVE E. WARSHAWER
DR. J. BYRON WILLIAMS
MR. LEONARD W. WINCHESTER

FSIS:

DR. ELISABETH HAGEN
UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY
MR. JEROLD MANDE
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALVARES
MR. ANTHONY ANDREASSI
DR. PAT BASU
DR. PATTY BENNETT
MR. JOHN LINVILLE
MR. STANLEY PAINTER
MR. JEREMY "TODD" REED
MR. WILLIAM C. SMITH
DR. DANAH VETTER

ALSO PARTICIPATING:

MR. TONY CORBO
MR. CHRIS WALDROP

I-N-D-E-X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Meet to Review Charges to Subcommittees, Then Move to Subcommittee Deliberations	196
Reports from Subcommittees and Discussion	
Subcommittee 1: Data Collection, Analysis, and Transparency Dr. Cheryl D. Jones	201
Subcommittee 2: Strengthening Policy and Collaboration in Pre-Harvest Food Safety Dr. Catherine N. Cutter	223
Final Vote on Subcommittee Reports	246
Public Comment (None)	246
Wrap Up	247
Mr. Alfred V. Almanza Administrator Food Safety and Inspection Service	
Adjourn	248
Mr. Robert Tynan Deputy Assistant Administrator Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Education Food Safety and Inspection Service	

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (9:00 a.m.)

3 MR. TYNAN: Good morning. Can we take our
4 seats just for a minute so we can get organized for
5 the next phase of our meeting?

6 I think we worked everybody too hard
7 yesterday. I'm seeing some missing Committee
8 members. They're sleeping in, I think, to rest up
9 for the deliberations this morning. Ah, here we go.

10 As I mentioned yesterday, this is sort of
11 the working phase. This is where you're doing the
12 lion's share of the work for us in terms of moving
13 forward to come up with reports and recommendations
14 on the two topics we talked about yesterday.

15 Subcommittee 1 is going to be dealing with
16 the data issue. They'll be here in this room.
17 Dr. Jones is going to be the Chair of that group.
18 We have Dr. Chen, Dr. Murinda, Dr. Negron, Ms. Buck
19 will be part of that group. Carol Tucker-Foreman
20 will be part. Veny, you'll be here. Steve
21 Warshawer, Heidi Kassenborg, and John Tilden will be
22 part of the data committee. You'll be staying here.

1 We have a person with a laptop who will be taking
2 notes, helping out, fashioning the report. We have
3 a printer. So as you get to drafts and things of
4 that nature, you'll be able to print those out, talk
5 about them a little bit more and refine the draft.

6 Right now our agenda calls for the report
7 outs at 1:00. I would suggest that the Committee
8 Chairs decide if they want to have a working lunch.

9 Group Number 2, Dr. Cutter will be the
10 Chair of that. We have Dr. Williams, Ms. Donley
11 will be with that group, Ms. Klein, Brian Covington,
12 Dr. Henry, Mr. Reinhard is going to be moving over
13 to the data group. So he will be joining that
14 group. We have Dr. Shultz, Mr. Stromberg and
15 Mr. Winchester will be with the pre-harvest group.
16 And I misspoke yesterday. That group will be in
17 327E, and we'll have somebody escort you over there.
18 That's the Administrator's conference room. So we
19 have that until about 2:00 today if we need it.
20 Again, that room will also have a computer,
21 printers, whatever you need in order to make the
22 session work for you.

1 Dr. Farrar and Dr. Liang, we're going to
2 allow them to maybe work between each group as our
3 ex-officio members, and our employee organization
4 representatives, you may participate in either
5 group, whatever is your preference and your interest
6 area.

7 I would also invite the public to
8 participate in either meeting. You're welcome to do
9 that. Again, the discretion is with the Chair as to
10 your level of participation, and we'll expect the
11 reports, whatever comes out of those reports are
12 going to represent the work of the Subcommittee.

13 So with that, are there any questions on
14 what we'll be doing this morning? There's a lot of
15 work. I think each group has a number of questions.
16 I think that's in your notebooks, and so if there
17 are no questions, and I see none, then what I'll do
18 is I'll get somebody to escort the pre-harvest group
19 over to Room 327, and we'll get started on our
20 deliberations.

21 (Whereupon, at 9:15 a.m., the Subcommittee
22 sessions commenced.)

1 arrange conference calls with their portion of the
2 Subcommittee so that we can get the narrative that
3 supports those recommendations in a format that
4 they're satisfied with.

5 So I admit, we've challenged you beyond
6 probably what time allowed, and I would also mention
7 to you that Dr. Hagen and I had a conversation
8 earlier this morning, and we're going to talk a
9 little bit about the format and how we do this for
10 the future. It is a bit of a challenge to have you
11 start on Tuesday afternoon and you essentially only
12 had one day, and normally we have at least a day and
13 a half for you.

14 So, again, I appreciate all the hard work.
15 I recognize that you're probably not at a point
16 where you're completely satisfied with your reports,
17 but we will give you some time to fix that up.

18 And with that, we'll get into the
19 Subcommittee reports. Dr. Jones, would you like to
20 begin?

21 DR. JONES: Yes.

22 MR. TYNAN: I'm glad you said yes.

1 DR. JONES: I'm going to go ahead while
2 it's still fresh in my mind.

3 First of all, I'd like to really, really
4 thank the Subcommittee. Everybody was so involved,
5 and we were discussing so much that it feels like
6 trying to figure out how to get all of the most
7 important points out is almost an impossible task,
8 but we're going to do it.

9 We were looking at data collection and
10 analysis, and the first question that we had is who
11 are the likely audiences or the primary customers
12 that FSIS should consider when looking at the whole
13 issue of data collection and analysis? And what it
14 broke down to was who was the audience? Who are we
15 providing this information for?

16 We initially identified that there were
17 both internal and external stakeholders. However,
18 we said that the main objective, when we had to step
19 back a little bit, one of the questions that was
20 asked yesterday, it seemed like last week, yesterday
21 was what are the public health objectives or what
22 are the public health goals? So one of the things

1 when stepping back, we realized that the main
2 objective is to ensure the public's health, and so
3 we needed to identify what those goals were. Those
4 goals needed to be clearly identified, clearly
5 stated, with measures that we could develop metrics
6 for to ensure that the data that's collected or the
7 data that is utilized addresses or allows all of the
8 stakeholders to evaluate where we're going or where
9 FSIS and their agencies are going relative to the
10 goals. So that was one of the recommendations, and
11 that those goals should be looked at from a
12 perspective of the short, the medium and the long
13 term.

14 So we suggested originally that a team of
15 experts would come together to identify the answers
16 to some of the questions, specific questions, 2
17 through 5, and that these experts should represent
18 the stakeholders. And we called them experts, but
19 in hindsight, I think maybe we will have to look at
20 that and say are we really looking at an expert team
21 or rather a design team, a design team in the sense
22 of designing how this data will be used, but they

1 will still represent the stakeholders who are the
2 people that will be utilizing the data.

3 If I'm leaving anything out, anybody who is
4 on the Subcommittee can please chime in and ensure
5 that I cover everything.

6 And that design team would identify the
7 data to be used, ensure that training is done
8 adequately because one of the issues with data is
9 ensuring accuracy. So we have to ensure that the
10 proper data is being entered. So the design team
11 will not just look at how the data is used and who
12 it goes to but also how the data gets into the
13 system.

14 So one of the issues was also transparency.
15 So involving this expert or design team in the
16 development of the actual data collection and
17 dissemination process is going to ensure the
18 adequate level of transparency. And this design
19 team will also identify who actually enters the
20 data.

21 So that was question number 1. Did I leave
22 anything out of question number 1?

1 Okay. Number 2 is FSIS is considering
2 posting more detailed sampling results, and the
3 question was what kinds of results should be made
4 available? Should they be just the inspection
5 results? Should they be the public health related
6 results? Should it be microbial? And we said that
7 both results should be available but that the
8 inspection results should be driven by the public
9 health objectives.

10 So to ensure that the public is healthy,
11 the data that's pulled should ensure that that looks
12 at the health of the public.

13 DR. KASSENBERG: And there's also a
14 recommendation to look at both the microbial
15 isolates that are involved in looking at the
16 epidemiological characteristics of those, the
17 molecular characteristics as well as more of the
18 sample information, the descriptions of how the
19 sample was taken, where it was from, et cetera. So
20 both of those.

21 DR. JONES: We also said this expert team
22 or this design team would be more knowledgeable

1 about defining what the datasets themselves should
2 look like.

3 And, of course, within the inspection data,
4 the focus should be on data most relevant to public
5 health with the key indicators, and one of the
6 things that was said was that FSIS already has a
7 collection of data, and to build on that data and
8 those datasets is what is going to be key. And so
9 building on the data includes looking at, from the
10 short term, what can we do with what we have, and
11 the medium term and the long term is what do we need
12 to ensure the public's health, how do we ensure that
13 we develop that and also develop this data
14 collection process in a manner that can be
15 reevaluated so that as things change, the necessary
16 changes could be put in place so that over time, the
17 most effective data is actually collected and
18 disseminated.

19 I guess we talked about the consistency of
20 data, ensuring that there are SOPs in place for the
21 consistency of data and also get guidance from
22 various external bodies such as NAS and NACMCF on

1 the standardization of data formats so that data can
2 be transmitted between agencies and still utilized.

3 There was also an acknowledgement that
4 there was a need to standardize the language for
5 inspections so that a glossary can be provided of
6 the FSIS language that is used when we talk about
7 inspection, which will make it easier for, I guess,
8 the training and ensuring the accuracy of data.

9 Does anybody want to add anything to
10 question number 2?

11 Okay. Number 3 is addressing the actual
12 reporting, the sampling data and the results. Our
13 Subcommittee really could provide recommendations
14 for only number 3A. We didn't have any
15 recommendations for B, and we had somewhat of an
16 indirect recommendation for C, but for A, the
17 question was what criteria should FSIS use to
18 evaluate what information to release publicly? Once
19 again, this expert/design team, we felt would be
20 more able to answer those questions.

21 And, of course, we went into a little more
22 detail about who should be on the expert/design

1 team, and that would be consumers, humane groups or
2 those interested in humane activities, academia,
3 industry, government, which would include FSIS,
4 USDA, and other various agencies.

5 One of the other issues that we addressed
6 was that proprietary information should not be
7 shared, but other information should be clearly
8 communicated and indicate the limitations of the
9 data.

10 One of the other issues was that data be
11 provided in a format that is user friendly, meaning
12 I think some of the data's provided in PDF files or
13 files or reports that you can look at, and the
14 question is in the situation where data can be
15 provided in a way that it's manipulative, where you
16 can do queries on it, that's a better word, that the
17 data be provided in that way, whether it be an Excel
18 spreadsheet. That was an example of one of the
19 methods for providing data.

20 That's number 3. Does anybody have
21 anything to add for number 3?

22 Number 4 dealt with how the variables would

1 be defined and also exactly what the variables were,
2 how would it be defined and the frequency in
3 reviewing them. And we said that for number 4, the
4 overall answer was that we agree with the general
5 approach of focusing on public health outcomes that
6 FSIS is already using, but we suggested that they
7 run it by NACMCF and that the expert/design team
8 would advise on the variables. The data that
9 already exists needs to be examined for best
10 practices and utilizing the short term as best as
11 possible, and then as the expert team or design team
12 makes whatever recommendations for changes to the
13 data, that those changes be put in place where
14 necessary or where appropriate. Time intervals
15 should also be decided by the expert team.

16 And that's number 4. Anything to add?

17 And, number 5, we pretty much said we agree
18 with the way presently FSIS is using the term annual
19 proportion positives instead of prevalence. We
20 didn't necessarily think that prevalence was a good
21 term to utilize, and that a position paper should be
22 developed by FSIS which addresses verification of

1 the sampling techniques and the prevalence, and
2 based on that position paper, and the feedback that
3 comes back from NACMCF, that the actual expert and
4 design team would be able to answer that question
5 also.

6 MS. GAPUD: For letter B, what FSIS
7 considered to address differences in inspection and
8 compliance rates between establishments, circuits
9 and districts, and we also talked about the critical
10 importance of training the inspectors, going to the
11 establishments because that is the one that can
12 give, you know, different evaluation, that they
13 consider noncompliance and so. So it's a critical
14 thing, a critical factor that inspectors are
15 calibrated and trained properly. Thank you.

16 DR. JONES: Is there anything that needs to
17 be added from the Subcommittee that I missed?

18 MR. REINHARD: I have also a question about
19 5B. We really didn't list anything in this report
20 out, but in the record, in the discussion, we talked
21 about what was available through noncompliance
22 reports, what FSIS has currently done related to

1 scheduling FSAs based off of noncompliance reports
2 that are outside two standard deviations over the
3 past six months, and looking at those FSAs'
4 outcomes, versus they were triggered for a for cause
5 FSA, and seeing what NRs, if the NRs meant something
6 to the FSA outcome versus normal FSAs when they were
7 for cause, and potentially which of the types of NRs
8 related to those FSA outcomes that were of most
9 public health significance.

10 MR. TYNAN: Any other comments from the
11 Subcommittee and then if not -- John.

12 DR. TILDEN: Yeah, and just to say, on
13 balance we felt that there was just a whale of a lot
14 of good work that FSIS has been doing, and most of
15 the documentation we went through, we looked at and
16 said this is significant and it's heading in the
17 right direction.

18 And then we also recognized that this is a
19 complex enough subject matter that we wouldn't be
20 doing it justice by whipping out a couple quick easy
21 answers in a half a day, and that's where we
22 suggested to integrate with a longer term process,

1 like a process improvement that FSIS is already
2 doing, to continue to touch base with experts that
3 represent the cross-section of folks that they would
4 be utilizing, integrate that into the ongoing
5 development efforts.

6 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Thank you. Any other
7 Subcommittee comments?

8 How about we open it up for the entire
9 Committee? For those of you who participated in the
10 other group, do you have some comments or questions?
11 Let's discuss them now. Stanley, we'll start with
12 you.

13 MR. PAINTER: Stan Painter with the
14 National Joint Council. I want to make a comment on
15 what was mentioned earlier about training for the
16 inspectors. It's been a concern to me and the
17 people that I represent regarding the training. The
18 Agency will throw something out on AgLearn or do
19 some kind of web-based training which is not as
20 effective as a classroom type setting. So just to
21 say that the Agency has trained the people, so there
22 needs to be training but there needs to be a level

1 of quality training.

2 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Thank you, Stan. Other
3 comments from the Committee? Ms. Donley.

4 MS. DONLEY: I just have a quick question.
5 On question number 5 with the FSIS data collection,
6 and I understand that the Subcommittee in part B,
7 what should FSIS consider to address differences in
8 inspection, noncompliance rates between
9 establishments, circuits and districts, I'd be
10 interested to know what FSIS does with that
11 currently. How FSIS currently addresses differences
12 in inspection, noncompliance rates between
13 establishments, circuits and districts.

14 MR. TYNAN: Chris, can you respond to that?
15 Why don't you hit the microphone right up there.

16 MR. ALVARES: So this is Chris Alvares with
17 FSIS. I think I'll be able to give you a partial
18 answer but not a complete answer. Certainly part of
19 what the data analysis and integration group does is
20 communicate with the other program areas within the
21 Agency, and one way we do that with OFO in
22 particular is to provide them information about

1 tasks being performed, tasks being completed,
2 samples being collected at different levels, and
3 those levels include by district and by circuit.
4 That is one way that we work with OFO to really help
5 them identify differences that may exist between
6 circuits and districts. It's then sort of their
7 role at that point to kind of assess that, work with
8 the districts, find out why those differences are
9 occurring. So there is a communication and a
10 feedback process that occurs there, but that's one
11 approach in which we try to identify differences in
12 circuits and districts, communicate to that OFO,
13 give them some direction on where they might be able
14 to track down whether those are training issues,
15 whether those are issues related to the types of
16 plants that are in those locations, a variety of
17 other things as well.

18 MS. DONLEY: And do you expect anything
19 different to occur under PHIS, or do you expect to
20 get different information that's going to make you
21 react differently?

22 MR. ALVARES: Well, there's different

1 answers to that. I think one way that PHIS is going
2 to help us is to provide some more real time
3 feedback to OFO about things that are going on. So
4 through our alerts and reports, PHIS will be able to
5 present those alerts and reports more quickly than
6 what we're doing now, and so that allows us to I
7 think more effectively monitor what's going on and
8 assess whether changes are occurring or whether
9 actions need to be taken. So that's one approach.

10 In terms of new data through PHIS or
11 additional data, I think it's going to have to be
12 assessed and determined certainly whether
13 differences even exist between circuits and
14 districts, and certainly if there is, the data
15 itself doesn't tell you the answer. So what we
16 would have to do is work with the supervisors and
17 the field personnel to determine why those
18 differences may exist and whether they need
19 correcting and how to go about doing that.

20 So I can't say that PHIS will identify new
21 differences, but I think that what we'll have to do
22 is look at the data, and certainly one way that we

1 always try to look at the data is by differences due
2 to geographic location through our districts or
3 through differences in profile characteristics, meat
4 versus poultry plants, for example.

5 MR. TYNAN: Ms. Foreman.

6 MS. TUCKER-FOREMAN: Yes, I was on this
7 Subcommittee, and I apologize for not speaking up
8 when we were going through the Subcommittee members.
9 As I read this, you know, we've been writing this,
10 and frankly I couldn't see the screen. There's a
11 problem that I think we could address.

12 All the way through we refer to an expert
13 team, experts, and we all agreed that we should have
14 this outside team.

15 The problem comes to a head or the
16 possibility of misunderstanding, when we get to
17 question 3 and the first line is experts can more
18 clearly define answers, and then it says needs to be
19 defined by expert working group, who should be on
20 it.

21 We really are looking for experts here, but
22 what we're really looking for is stakeholders and

1 data users, and I am concerned that because this
2 work expert keeps getting put in there again and
3 again, that we might end up with this notion that it
4 should look more like a NAS committee or the
5 National Advisory Committee for Microbiological
6 Criteria for Food, and that really isn't what we
7 were talking about. To the members of the
8 Subcommittee, am I right about that?

9 MR. REINHARD: That is correct I think.

10 MS. TUCKER-FOREMAN: So we might, you know,
11 it might want to be knowledgeable stakeholders or
12 stakeholders with expertise in statistics and so on
13 and so forth. We have a little chance to refine
14 these after now, and I just want to raise that and
15 ask that we work that out before tomorrow.

16 MR. TYNAN: Well, if we want to change the
17 language now, we can change that now and work from
18 there when we talk about refining the Subcommittee
19 reports later. Robert.

20 MR. REINHARD: Just procedurally, my
21 understanding is that the Chair of the Subcommittee
22 is going to get a chance to refine the language that

1 was drafted in this document and complete the
2 statements that are partial --

3 MR. TYNAN: Right.

4 MR. REINHARD: -- and return that back to
5 FSIS. So I don't know that we need to do it now.

6 MR. TYNAN: Okay.

7 MR. REINHARD: But I think the
8 Subcommittees, both of them, because we had to put
9 together very brief comments for this closing part
10 of the session, is that correct, we're going to have
11 that opportunity?

12 MR. TYNAN: Yes. We'd like to stay with
13 the basic recommendations you have. So otherwise
14 the Subcommittees could be going on forever trying
15 to come up with recommendations, and that wasn't the
16 intent.

17 MR. REINHARD: So that's what we need a
18 timeframe for.

19 MR. TYNAN: So I think it was just trying
20 to stick with the basic recommendations you have now
21 in refining the language --

22 MS. TUCKER-FOREMAN: Yeah.

1 MR. TYNAN: -- later.

2 MS. BUCK: The time is awfully short for
3 this big of a topic and so, you know, that's why
4 it's important that we have the opportunity to
5 reflect and put the refinement in there.

6 MR. TYNAN: And that's why we suggested
7 the --

8 MS. BUCK: But if there is a time limit
9 like one week, we can certainly I think meet that.

10 MR. TYNAN: I'll work with the Subcommittee
11 Chairs, and we'll find a reasonable timeframe for
12 them to develop the reports, to get them back to
13 you, for you to review them.

14 MS. BUCK: Maybe one month.

15 MR. TYNAN: Yeah. Six months, eight
16 months, no, no. We'll work on a timeline and get
17 that accomplished after the session.

18 MS. BUCK: Thank you. I think in all
19 fairness that would be best.

20 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Other comments from
21 either the Subcommittee or the full Committee? I'm
22 sorry. Chris.

1 MR. ALVARES: I wanted to follow up a
2 little bit more on the comment about data and
3 informing districts and circuit differences. I
4 think it's important to acknowledge, and we talked
5 about this in the Committee, the value in the data
6 that may be available in FSAs and how those may help
7 us to better understand what's going on in
8 establishments and correlate that to inspection
9 activities. And so certainly feel that through some
10 of our improved data collection methods, that those
11 FSAs will become a much more informative source of
12 data for us in terms of understanding what's going
13 on in plants and circuits and districts.

14 MR. TYNAN: Yes.

15 MR. COVINGTON: To follow up on that, did
16 the Subcommittee have an opportunity to discuss a
17 further breakdown of the classifications of
18 particularly the establishments issued in ours so
19 that you get a comparative analysis to see where the
20 differences occur? As I understand it now, we're
21 looking at slaughter, slaughter/processing and
22 processing in the tiered system for PHIS, and an

1 example of being able to go into the plant profile
2 as Chris indicated and look at poultry slaughter to
3 poultry slaughter versus beef slaughter versus poor
4 slaughter, understanding that some operations do
5 multiple species.

6 DR. JONES: We actually looked at -- we
7 didn't get into that level of detail where we were
8 comparing the different -- not in detail. I think
9 that was question on 5B. We didn't get to finish
10 5B. We actually got into some discussion about 5B,
11 very little, but I don't think we got into that
12 level.

13 DR. VETTER: We did talk about that there
14 were different variables that needed to be known and
15 considered when looking at that, but we just really
16 didn't have time to consider it.

17 MR. TYNAN: Are there other comments,
18 thoughts that we need to address right now?

19 Is the Committee then generally in
20 agreement with the materials that the Subcommittee
21 has provided? Do we have a thumbs up or a thumbs
22 down from the Committee members? Sarah, are you

1 okay with it?

2 MS. KLEIN: Yes.

3 MR. TYNAN: I couldn't see your thumb
4 behind the bottle. Okay. So we have general
5 agreement on that, and so we'll consider this the --
6 I'm sorry.

7 MS. GAPUD: I just want to make a comment
8 regarding I think Brian's. I think that's very,
9 very important to look at like the slaughterhouse
10 and everything like that. Unfortunately, we didn't
11 have enough time to really discuss that, but I think
12 it's of critical importance, too, to look at.

13 MR. TYNAN: Okay. So based on -- I'm
14 sorry.

15 MS. BUCK: Yeah.

16 MR. TYNAN: I keep missing everybody.

17 MS. BUCK: If the whole Committee would
18 like us to discuss that, then maybe FSIS will become
19 more creative and think of some way that we could
20 delve into that, but it could not be done today.

21 MR. TYNAN: Okay.

22 MS. GAPUD: Maybe we can do some conference

1 call, the Subcommittee, and talk, I don't know.
2 It's up to you if you want us to do it.

3 MR. TYNAN: I'm sorry, Veny. I'm just
4 having a little bit of trouble hearing you.

5 MS. GAPUD: Well, I'm saying that I agree
6 with Brian, looking at the slaughterhouse, et
7 cetera, but we didn't have enough time to look at
8 that today. Now, again, we can have a conference
9 call, our Subcommittee, and discuss farther if that
10 will be okay with you. It's up to you.

11 MR. TYNAN: Thank you, Brian. I think
12 we're going to designate Brian. Dr. Hagen had a
13 good idea. Brian will be the Subcommittee Chair for
14 that question for the other Subcommittee.

15 Why don't we do that. If that's a
16 reasonable thing to do as part of this Subcommittee,
17 then maybe in a conference call, we can try and deal
18 with that issue as well, but again I'll talk with
19 Dr. Jones since she's the Subcommittee Chair and
20 make sure that we're all in agreement on that.

21 But generally we have a thumbs up? We're
22 okay with the report.

1 Okay. Then why don't we move to -- I'm
2 sorry. Dr. Negron, I apologize.

3 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: I just wanted to say
4 that we all agree except that in 5B, we didn't have
5 enough time to talk. So if we have the chance, we
6 can look at 5B.

7 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Why don't we move to
8 group number 2 and, Dr. Cutter, if you could give us
9 an overview of your report.

10 DR. CUTTER: I don't have nothing printed
11 out. So I have to see whatever's on the screen. So
12 Elizabeth has got to get it up, get the information
13 up on the screen.

14 MR. TYNAN: You can see how we're running
15 the Committee as a well-oiled machine.

16 DR. CUTTER: Well, I'll go ahead and
17 preface and echo much of the sentiment of Cheryl
18 with regard to the work of the Committee. It was
19 daunting task initially, but I think we made a lot
20 of headway. So I really appreciate the help of the
21 Committee and other individuals who provided input
22 in our discussions. We do have something to show

1 for our work. It's just not coming up. Build
2 suspense. Can you blow it up any more? I'll just
3 have to read off here. That's a little better,
4 yeah.

5 Okay. We did collectively as a
6 Subcommittee develop a preamble, and just to sort of
7 reiterate some of the very similar issues that the
8 other Subcommittee had, the questions regarding pre-
9 harvest are incredibly complex, and NACMPI
10 recognizes the great need for and importance of pre-
11 harvest controls among the industry. The Committee
12 appreciates the opportunity to begin tackling the
13 necessary and complicated issue of pre-harvest and
14 supports FSIS and its partner agencies on the
15 federal and state levels in their pursuit of the
16 development of policies, verification activities and
17 the efficacies of practical and applicable
18 technologies regarding pre-harvest controls among
19 industry that can improve public health. So again,
20 with time constraints and other things, you know, we
21 do realize that this is a huge undertaking.

22 So the first question we had which was

1 basically in order to fully explore how to address
2 pre-harvest controls and evidence based
3 documentation that producers can provide at
4 slaughter plants, what type of technical or public
5 meeting would be helpful, and then what content and
6 types of speakers should be included?

7 Our Subcommittee recognizes that we need
8 multiple public meetings, possibly a series with all
9 stakeholder groups and many areas of expertise
10 represented. It should focus on various market
11 classes and species of livestock and poultry. It
12 should also be focused on existing programs and
13 policies and the potential application and
14 technologies that are not necessarily used by the
15 U.S. industry, their current regulatory status and
16 where we could go.

17 Elizabeth, if you keep typing, I can't
18 follow the text, unless you could print something
19 out for me. I can't. Okay.

20 We also recommend to include HHS agencies,
21 USDA, FSIS, APHIS, ARS, GIPSA, and federal employee
22 groups, state and local regulatory partners,

1 possibly information sharing from foreign trading
2 partners such as the EU and Canada, with regard to
3 previous experience with pre-harvest controls,
4 experts on microorganisms, public health concerns,
5 representatives from sectors of livestock and
6 production and marketing and -- I'm having a real
7 hard time seeing with the red. Sorry. Including
8 brokers and dealers and consumer representatives.

9 At these meetings, we'd recommend that we
10 should consider the way in which or the Committee
11 recommends that FSIS consider the way in which
12 multidrug resistant foodborne pathogens are
13 generated, how we can make use of existing data and
14 what can be done at pre-harvest to prevent them. So
15 a very comprehensive series of meetings that address
16 all of these different issues with this expertise.

17 So that was our input on number 1.
18 Subcommittee, if you'd like to weigh in on some of
19 this additional information, anybody?

20 Keep in mind when we say, we need to go
21 back and wordsmith this to say that we, the
22 Committee, recommended FSIS do some of these things.

1 We do recognize that we've got a little bit of work
2 to do with regard to what we means in some of these
3 paragraphs.

4 MR. COVINGTON: Dr. Cutter, I think it's
5 important that we did recognize the complexity of
6 each one of these four individual issues that were
7 brought before us, and I think our outcome was that
8 they would probably have to be treated individually
9 to address each one of them and create some
10 outcomes.

11 DR. CUTTER: Anything else from the rest of
12 the Committee?

13 Okay. Moving on to number 2, regarding
14 pre-harvest controls in support of reducing
15 *Salmonella* Enteritidis in FSIS-regulated products,
16 what does the Committee recommend FSIS take into
17 consideration when developing associated policies?

18 FSIS should analyze and monitor the impact
19 of *SE* in public health and should pursue strategies
20 to reduce *SE* in products that it regulates. So
21 that's just a general statement with regard to that.

22 Can you scroll down because I don't

1 remember what we have written next?

2 Okay. There were some particular bullet
3 points with regard to this. Are there particular
4 strengths in FDA or EU approaches for controlling *SE*
5 that FSIS should consider? We recommended FSIS
6 analyze the approaches of FDA and the EU with regard
7 to *SE*. So definitely go in and look and see what's
8 being done.

9 Are there additional existing or novel pre-
10 harvest approaches that the Agency should consider
11 to promote the reduction of *SE* in FSIS regulated
12 products?

13 We recommend that FSIS analyze the baseline
14 data that exists between FDA and FSIS on *SE* in order
15 to determine *SE* hotspots in the production process.
16 So that requires survey and surveillance work. We
17 also recommend that FSIS consider the various
18 measures such as lethality treatments or other
19 interventions that a plant should take if a flock is
20 identified to be *SE* positive.

21 We also recommend that FSIS consider
22 conducting a new study about the lifecycle of birds

1 and other types of food animals and pre-harvest
2 controls such as the length between production
3 practices and environment and *SE* contamination. So
4 again looking at sort of a holistic approach and
5 looking at the *SE* in the production process.

6 Does anybody have any questions about any
7 of the bullet points so far since we just keep going
8 with regard to the next one? Yes, go ahead.

9 DR. TILDEN: A little more about what you
10 were thinking about the lethality?

11 MS. CUTTER: Nancy, would you like to
12 clarify some of that?

13 MS. DONLEY: Yeah. Basically is that we do
14 know that, you know, there are some other countries
15 that do things where they'll actually, you know,
16 cull the flocks, but also it's that if flocks
17 present *SE* positive when it's entering a slaughter
18 facility, that FSIS really should consider
19 diverting, not diverting, that the disposition of
20 that food, of the meat from those contaminated
21 flocks, that it must go into some sort of a cooking
22 or lethality step and not be allowed to be sold as a

1 raw meat product or raw poultry product.

2 DR. CUTTER: So that would be RTE, soup --

3 MS. DONLEY: Right.

4 DR. CUTTER: -- or anything that gets a
5 full heat lethality treatment. Anything else from
6 the Committee on that?

7 MS. DONLEY: No.

8 DR. CUTTER: Brian.

9 MR. COVINGTON: Yeah, that was one of the
10 suggested outcomes relative to disposition of the
11 product.

12 DR. VETTER: Yeah.

13 MS. DONLEY: So basically you would have to
14 a step in place that the plant knows that if they
15 are receiving a contaminated flock, and/or that if
16 it's discovered at the plant, that these are, in
17 fact, *SE* contaminated birds, that they then have to
18 undergo a lethality treatment of some sort.

19 DR. CUTTER: Edna.

20 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: I have a question. When
21 do you get the data of the result for *SE* positive
22 because it takes a long time to, depending on

1 whether you are measuring the flock, and then the
2 results.

3 DR. CUTTER: You'd have to do something
4 before they'd even get to the slaughterhouse.

5 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: Yes.

6 DR. CUTTER: You'd have to do it on farm.
7 Go ahead, Sarah.

8 MS. KLEIN: I think that these are all good
9 points, and I think the Committee was just
10 suggesting that FSIS needs to really take a look at
11 this issue as part of the pre-harvest --

12 DR. CUTTER: Exactly.

13 MS. KLEIN: -- consideration and answer all
14 these questions.

15 DR. CUTTER: And then the last bullet point
16 was what recommendations does the Committee have to
17 overcome the barriers in the use of *SE* vaccines in
18 broilers? What solutions can FSIS consider under
19 the current constraints?

20 And our Committee felt that the FSIS needs
21 to collect information about and identify the
22 barriers to the use of *SE* vaccines in broilers

1 because we don't have a very clear picture as to why
2 vaccines are not being used. Anybody else?

3 Okay. Issue number 3 was regarding
4 providing more detailed reports to Agency data to
5 affect the establishments? What does the Committee
6 recommend FSIS take into consideration when
7 evaluating additional detail to include?

8 This was a very complex issue. I think
9 because of the time constraints, we didn't get to go
10 in and specifically address each and every one of
11 the points. So we summarized our recommendations to
12 just these points, although I think under further
13 discussion there would probably be more information
14 that we could include in recommendations for this
15 particular issue.

16 There's a number of bullet points. I'm not
17 going to go into them, but we recommend that FSIS
18 relay information to industry as quickly as
19 possible, and that FSIS gather input from industry
20 about what is useful to them. So obviously,
21 especially with antibiotic residue testing and
22 things like that, trying to get the information back

1 as quickly as possible and then figure out how the
2 information is being conveyed to them and then
3 what's useful to them especially with regard to some
4 pathogen testing, serotyping, and those kind of
5 things.

6 We also recommend that FSIS track and
7 harmonize Agency residue testing including screening
8 across species classes. The Committee has a
9 collective interest in the development of a
10 comprehensive animal traceability system. So prior
11 to coming in, that there's a way to follow those
12 animals back to various origins.

13 Committee members, go ahead. You can weigh
14 in on this issue number 3.

15 MS. DONLEY: I think that was one of the
16 things that kind of, you know, underneath all of
17 this is, if we're really going to be effective at
18 pre-harvest interventions, that we have to be able
19 to have that traceability piece in place which will
20 also provide a lot more of transparency to the
21 producers and identity, I guess I should say, to the
22 producers, and will result in additional practices

1 being put in place, and incentives to put in place
2 pre-harvest interventions.

3 DR. CUTTER: The rest of the Subcommittee
4 first, and then we'll see if anyone else has
5 anything to say. Anybody else from the
6 Subcommittee?

7 Okay. Edna.

8 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: Well, in 2002, in Puerto
9 Rico, we held a conference for two days, where we
10 had FSIS and FDA join in a conference in good animal
11 productions at the farm level, and we had several
12 roundtables with groups, small animals, beef, pork,
13 seafood, egg, dairy and, you know, they had that
14 roundtable discussions, and at the end, most of them
15 recommended that the harvest interventions should
16 not be necessarily voluntarily. It should be really
17 established as a requirement because even though
18 they were -- they thought it should be established,
19 not really let it on the air like a voluntary
20 program. Thank you.

21 DR. CUTTER: Okay. Pat.

22 MS. BUCK: I think the suggestion about

1 looking into animal identification is very
2 important, and I'm glad your Subcommittee, you know,
3 looked at it. Are you calling for a public meeting
4 specifically on animal ID at any point or is that
5 not one of your recommendations?

6 DR. CUTTER: We can discuss that further.

7 DR. HENRY: You know, we got into this.
8 The animal ID was driven heavily by antibiotic usage
9 and residue issues, but we certainly acknowledge the
10 fact that our preference is to see the Federal
11 Government take a proactive approach as opposed to a
12 reactive approach in the event that we deal with
13 food and mouth disease or reactive as we did with
14 BSE because right now two of the leading highly
15 developed countries in the world outstrip us hands
16 down, and that's certainly Canada and New Zealand
17 and Australia, and it doesn't make sense for us to
18 continue to do this when this is a critical
19 component relative to pre-harvest if you're going to
20 deal with the repeat violators which was highlighted
21 in yesterday's presentation as well as within our
22 data.

1 DR. CUTTER: Well, I'm kind of sensing that
2 the Committee, taking Pat's recommendation that we
3 recommend some kind of meeting or do we just sort of
4 keep it as a recommendation and leave FSIS to make
5 the decision from the Committee input.

6 MS. KLEIN: This is Sarah Klein from CSPI.
7 I think as we discussed it in the Subcommittee,
8 there was a sense that there had been a series of
9 public meetings previously that had been largely,
10 I'm trying to think of another word, I don't want to
11 use the word hijacked, but I'm looking for another
12 word.

13 MR. COVINGTON: That works.

14 MS. KLEIN: I want to get that in the
15 record, I don't mean to use that word, by a small
16 but very vocal minority who is really opposed to the
17 development of a regulated animal ID system, and so
18 although I think we would all participate in a
19 public meeting and think that the process to
20 creating the system should, of course, be public and
21 transparent, we didn't necessarily call for a public
22 meeting because we have seen what previously

1 happened.

2 DR. HENRY: Well, and secondly, this fits
3 back in under our question 1. This has got to be
4 one of the pre-harvest controls and barriers that
5 was discussed. So we kind of implied from the
6 beginning that there are going to be without
7 question public meetings. That was a recommendation
8 in the beginning. So it kind of happens, but to
9 what Sarah brings, I mean we're repeating history
10 again. So it's still coming back down to
11 question 1. What are the barriers? What's our
12 ability? And it does lie certainly, total, if
13 anything, it's partially an opportunity for FSIS
14 because it's somewhat outside their regulatory
15 jurisdiction.

16 DR. CUTTER: Thanks. Craig.

17 DR. SCHULTZ: I just wanted to point out
18 also that FSIS plays a critical role in overseeing
19 the collection of animal identification devices at
20 slaughter, and they work with APHIS in the recovery
21 of those and under the new traceability framework,
22 animal disease traceability framework, that's being

1 developed, that will become increasingly critical.
2 The retirement of tags, being able to report data
3 back to states on official animal ID that has been
4 retired that they know no longer is the system, it
5 will be extremely important to them, and I also
6 believe that as we're seeing a movement within the
7 animal disease community away from some of the
8 traditional animal disease programs that drove the
9 collection of ID.

10 For example, the MCIP program for
11 brucellosis at slaughter is now being reduced so
12 that rather than a 95 percent performance standard,
13 we're down to maybe a recommended 50 percent
14 performance standard on collection of data, that
15 we're going to have to fill in that gap with some
16 kind of an understanding between the two agencies on
17 how data will be recovered at slaughter and retired.

18 DR. KASSENBERG: I have a comment about
19 some of the barriers to getting, putting controls in
20 particularly for the antibiotic residue issues. I
21 think there's not a lot of carrot or stick for the
22 residues when a producer does have a residue issue.

1 So I would suggest that FSIS work with the milk, the
2 dairy, the processors, to look at some creative ways
3 of looking at residues in dairy cull cows. Perhaps
4 there might be some pressure that could be applied
5 by the processors if one of their members comes up
6 with a positive dairy cow.

7 DR. CUTTER: Any other input from -- go
8 ahead.

9 MR. WARSHAWER: I come from one of the
10 hijacking states and regions regarding NAIS, and
11 would like to make the suggestion that if there's
12 going to be a new -- well, two things. First of
13 all, I know that MRP right now, there is some kind
14 of an alternative to NAIS being worked on. I had
15 heard that it would be released for initial review
16 perhaps by December. I think looking back at that
17 process, the major groups who fought it I think were
18 not viewed as stakeholders informing the proposal in
19 the first place, and if we want to see a proposal
20 about animal identification that will work, then the
21 parties who were disenfranchised in the last process
22 need to be included from the start or the same thing

1 will happen again, one way or another or at least
2 attempts will be made in that direction. So I'm not
3 going back to them to say what happened and why,
4 and who's right and who's wrong, but it's what did
5 we learn from that and what are we going to do
6 differently if we approach animal identification as
7 an important feature and how are we going to include
8 the stakeholders who were dead set against it so
9 that we can come up with something that will be
10 acceptable and implementable by all interested
11 parties?

12 DR. CUTTER: Any other comments on item 3?

13 All right. Moving onto item number 4.
14 Regarding pre-harvest controls in support of
15 reducing *E. coli* O157:H7 in FSIS regulated products,
16 what does the Committee recommend FSIS take into
17 consideration when developing associated policies?

18 Again, we sort of collapsed our comments
19 into these two points. FSIS does not have authority
20 to regulate certain pre-harvest activity in vectors
21 such as feedlots that's under FDA and farms and
22 ranches which is under APHIS. And this is authority

1 that we might pursue. However, since this would
2 require a statutory change, we can work within the
3 bounds of the slaughter facility to encourage
4 industry to implement pre-harvest management
5 controls.

6 We need to move forward. I feel like I'm
7 in an eye test here. I'm sorry. We need to forward
8 with policies and methodologies that work. We
9 should have a separate meeting including CVM, state
10 and universities on technologies in use by industry
11 including vaccines and probiotics. The meeting
12 would include a discussion of the status of draft
13 compliance, guidance related to pre-harvest measures
14 for controlling *E. coli* on the farm. So we
15 obviously have information out there. We need to
16 bring that all together, see what the status is, see
17 what the research says with regard to these various
18 measures, and sort of be up to speed with what works
19 and what doesn't work.

20 Okay. Committee?

21 MS. DONLEY: I think this is an area where
22 I didn't really get into, so I'm going to apologize

1 to my Subcommittee members in advance because I
2 didn't raise this at our session, but I'm just kind
3 of speaking, you know, in general that there are,
4 and we didn't get into the specific questions about
5 barriers, but there is, and historically has and
6 continues to be, some resistance on the part of
7 producers in really resisting having any regulatory
8 authority over them, and that's the state of where
9 we are today.

10 So I think this is an area where we really
11 need to have a public meeting or meetings where you
12 get the stakeholders to the table there and say
13 particularly, and we know we have gaps, and I'll
14 just give one example, and I did bring this up. We
15 know we have gaps to know, what are the microbial
16 loads, and I'm going to use the cattle industry as a
17 for instance. What are the microbial loads there on
18 the farm? And then what happens once they get to
19 the feedlots? And then what happens when they get
20 to the slaughterhouse door? We don't know those
21 things, and if they've been tracking of it, we don't
22 really know that either, but there may be an

1 opportunity here to foster some more cooperation
2 between the regulated industry and the unregulated
3 part of the industry and get some cooperation going
4 to put in place some practices and standards.

5 Now I've spoken with, you know, the
6 Cattlemen's Association as a for instance, and I
7 know that they have practices in place, but we still
8 have the gap there at the feedlot that we can't get
9 someone, a public meeting, with the stakeholders
10 sharing the information that they have,
11 opportunities that exist, holes, gaps that exist and
12 come to some sort of program or a process of getting
13 us into the next level because I really don't think
14 anyone has a really good handle on, at the producer
15 level, of just what is going on particularly in the
16 livestock industry. The poultry industry is more
17 vertical. So you have more of a sense of what's
18 going on, but you certainly don't with the livestock
19 industry.

20 DR. CUTTER: Any other comments from the
21 Subcommittee first and then -- okay. Pat.

22 MS. BUCK: I agree with Nancy that a public

1 meeting on the barriers is really important for a
2 better understanding of what's going on. I think
3 integral to those barriers though is the discussion
4 about animal ID, and I would like to see the
5 Subcommittee consider expanding that to include that
6 element.

7 DR. CUTTER: Anything else from the rest of
8 the Committee?

9 Okay. Last but not least, number 5.
10 Regarding antimicrobial resistant strains of
11 *Salmonella* such as MDR *Salmonella* Newport and
12 *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT104, what does the
13 Committee recommend FSIS take into consideration
14 when developing associated policies?

15 Again, collectively we recommend that FSIS
16 work with sister agencies to require additional
17 veterinary oversight on the use of therapeutic
18 antibiotics. We also recommend an alignment between
19 federal expectations and state capabilities or else
20 federal policies wouldn't be implemented fully.

21 For example, APHIS does not have authority
22 over state programs but works with state animal

1 health vets with regard to interstate shipment,
2 levels of on-farm authority that vary in different
3 states, or vary greatly. So we would need to
4 understand these varied levels before developing
5 policy.

6 Any other feedback from the Subcommittee at
7 this point?

8 Okay. Outside, any other Committee
9 members?

10 Any clarification on the antibiotic use,
11 veterinary use we talked about?

12 I think maybe I'd just clarify that the
13 Subcommittee felt that, you know, there needs to be
14 a little bit more, help me here, I'm trying to
15 think, more idea oversight with regard to how
16 antibiotics are being used in these animals.

17 All right. Robert, that's it.

18 MR. TYNAN: Okay. I'm not sure if the full
19 Committee has weighed in. I think we did it a
20 little differently that time. Are there some other
21 comments or concerns or issue that have not been
22 addressed, changes we want to make to the report?

1 There being none, do I understand then we
2 have thumbs up?

3 Okay. Thumbs up. Good.

4 And again, just to close out this portion,
5 I would mention again that while I'll work with both
6 Dr. Jones and Dr. Cutter to come up with a process
7 for getting these back out to you, kind of
8 wordsmithing a little bit, and having some kind of
9 time constraints as Ms. Buck points out, that we
10 can't let it go on forever. So we'll have some kind
11 of a time constraint, and we'll help out in any way
12 we can in terms of arranging conference calls or
13 whatever needs to be done to get these reports
14 finalized.

15 But if the Committee has generally accepted
16 both reports, we're going to move onto the public
17 comment phase of the meeting?

18 I don't have a list of anyone that has
19 signed up to comment. I know it's been a long two
20 days, but if anyone in the public has a comment that
21 they would like to make, we can have you do that at
22 this particular point. Going once, going twice.

1 Okay. Then there are no public comments at
2 this point, and we're going to move onto maybe the
3 closure, and I'm going to ask Mr. Almanza if he
4 wanted to come up and make any final remarks.

5 MR. ALMANZA: Well, I just want to close
6 this meeting with expressing my gratitude to all of
7 you. A lot of work's gone into this, and we
8 recognize now, Pat, that there was an enormous
9 amount of work that needed to be done, and certainly
10 for those of you that are new to the process, I
11 think have gotten a little bit more than your feet
12 wet, this was a huge, huge endeavor, and so I do
13 appreciate the work of all of you, certainly all the
14 different groups, the employee groups, the community
15 groups, and certainly all the members of the
16 Committee. This is what this is about, in helping
17 us have a straight path forward, in helping us
18 getting to the real core of what we do with food
19 safety and public health, and you all are important
20 to the process. So I appreciate all your work and
21 safe travels back home. Thank you very much.
22 (Applause.)

1 MR. TYNAN: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Motion.

3 MR. TYNAN: Second.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

5 MR. TYNAN: We're done. Thanks very much.

6 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

This is to certify that the attached
proceedings in the matter of:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

PLENARY SESSION

Washington, D.C.

September 30, 2010

were held as herein appears, and that this is the
original transcription thereof for the files of the
United States Department of Agriculture, Food Safety
and Inspection Service.

TIMOTHY J. ATKINSON, JR., Reporter
FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.