



REGIONAL PLANNING MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

**COLORADO, KANSAS, MISSOURI
NEBRASKA, OKLAHOMA, AND
TEXAS**

June 23, 2020

Prepared by SES, Incorporated
10901 West 84th Terrace
Lenexa, Kansas 66214

Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Objectives	1
Scenarios.....	2
Pre-Event Scenario.....	2
Scenario 1	2
Scenario 2	2
Scenario 3	2
Scenario 4	2
Scenario Findings.....	3
Areas of Agreement	3
Areas for Further Discussion	4
Hot Wash	7
Strengths.....	7
Areas for Improvement.....	8
Next Steps.....	9
Attachment 1 Participant Feedback.....	10
Pre-Event Scenario.....	10
Strengths.....	10
Challenges.....	10
Areas for Improvement.....	11
Scenario 1	11
Strengths.....	11
Challenges.....	12
Areas for Improvement.....	13
Scenario 2	14
Strengths.....	14
Challenges.....	14
Areas for Improvement.....	14
Scenario 3	14
Strengths.....	14
Challenges.....	15

Areas for Improvement.....	16
Scenario 4	16
Strengths.....	16
Challenges.....	17
Areas for Improvement.....	17
Most Important Planning Gaps	17
Additional Comments	18

Overview

On March 10th and 11th, 2020, State Animal Health Officials (SAHO) along with beef industry companies and trade organizations from Colorado, Texas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Kansas met to discuss how they could implement the Secure Beef Supply (SBS) plan regionally. The meeting, held in Brighton, Colorado, was supported with funds from the National Animal Disease Preparedness and Response Program (NADPRP).

The meeting opened with an introductory presentation by Dr. Danelle Bickett-Weddle from Iowa State University's Center for Food Security and Public Health (CFSPH). The introduction covered the basics of the SBS plan, an overview of FMD including vaccination, and a description of supporting resources available on the Secure Beef Supply Plan website (www.securebeef.org).

Following this introduction, the group received a short briefing from each SAHO regarding their state's planning efforts for implementing SBS and conducting emergency animal movement permitting for the beef industry.

The remainder of the two-day meeting was conducted as an interactive, facilitated discussion around four distinct response scenarios for terminal animal movements. The topics discussed during each scenario included producer requirements to be eligible for a permit (including record-keeping requirements and biosecurity plans), permit submittal procedures, coordination between states, communication, monitoring permits, and enforcement.

The planning meeting ended with a discussion on the next steps needed to further the region's preparedness to handle emergency movement during a Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) outbreak.

Important to note: This workshop was held just as the United States was beginning to experience the impact of the COVID-19 global pandemic. The stay-at-home orders and market disruptions impacting livestock processing for animal protein had not yet occurred.

Objectives

The two-day meeting focused on the following objectives:

1. Identify communication needed to facilitate regional implementation of the SBS plan, engaging processors, producers, states, and the public.
2. Analyze and discuss states' plans for permitting intra- and interstate movements out of control areas.
3. Identify the permit requirements (and authorities) for the shipping/receiving states.
4. Define industry's role and priorities in the SBS process before an outbreak.
5. Define industry's roles and responsibilities relative to the SBS permitting process.

Scenarios

Pre-Event Scenario

Prior to starting the discussion, the group discussed a pre-event situation. This discussion focused on activities and expectations for planning when disease is not present.

Scenario 1

The initial scenario provided a situation where one state had a confirmed case of FMD on a 200-head cow/calf operation. The scenario included a slaughter facility within the associated control area.

The scenario was designed to drive discussion on the following topics:

- Outreach to producers to implement biosecurity plans in accordance with SBS guidance
- Permit requirements to move into a control area
- Permit submittal process

Scenario 2

The second scenario maintained focus on a single infected state, with one infected premises, but identified a much larger infected premises and considered moving animals to a slaughter establishment outside the associated control area.

The scenario was designed to drive discussion on the following topics:

- Record keeping for premises receiving permits (slaughter and feedlot)
- Biosecurity plan review/validation
- Interstate movement
- Communication

Scenario 3

The third scenario addressed shipping cattle from a control area in one state to a slaughter establishment in another state.

The scenario was designed to drive discussion on the following topics:

- Interstate movement
- Monitoring and enforcement
- Receiving state approval

Scenario 4

The fourth scenario also addressed interstate movement. This scenario presented a dynamic situation where the control area was adjusting to an expanding disease outbreak. The scenario included multiple feedlots located within the control area.

The scenario was designed to drive discussion on the following topics:

- Interstate movement

- Approval process
- Communication between states
- Appeal process

Scenario Findings

Throughout the discussion of the four scenarios, state representatives were asked to discuss their plans for implementing permitting during an FMD response. Industry representatives were encouraged to ask questions and challenge policies and procedures that they felt would have negative impacts on the industry or be incompatible with industry practices.

Notetakers were tasked with documenting areas where the states were in agreement and areas where additional discussion may be needed. Because of the unique geographic and legal aspects of each state, it may not be possible to have a completely identical implementation of the permitting process; however, the goal of the group is to make the process as uniform as possible.

Areas of Agreement

In general, the participating states agreed on the following policies and procedures for implementing the SBS plan regionally:

- Initially, the participating states would implement a temporary standstill (movement control) order. Once this was lifted, they would transition into permitted movement.
- To be eligible for a permit, operations will need to meet baseline requirements to request a permit. These baseline requirements include:
 - A facility having a National Premises Identification Number (PIN).
 - Implementing an enhanced biosecurity plan for their operation which follows the guidelines laid out in the SBS plan.
 - Conducting observational surveillance for a designated period of time.
 - Keeping movement records for their operation.
- Permit requests can cover more than one truck moving from the same origin operation to the same destination. States indicated they would expect one permit per shipment per day initially. This would cover multiple truckloads from the same origin operation to the same destination.
- Both shipping and receiving facilities would need to meet the same requirements for receiving a permit (i.e., enhanced biosecurity, observational surveillance, and record-keeping).
- The general process for submitting a permit was consistent between states. A facility within an area where permits are required for movement will submit a permit request. This permit request will go through the system established by the origin state, the state where the requesting facility is located. The origin state will review the permit, agree that requirements have been met, and approve the permit. The permit information will then be sent to the destination state, the state that will be receiving the movement. The destination state will go through the same process of review. Once the destination state approves the permit, both the facility requesting the permit and the shipment's destination facility will be informed of the approval.

- Industry representatives agreed that a meat processor needs to have a way to monitor submitted permits and their approvals or denials. This is necessary for the processor to know which arriving loads need and have a movement permit. Also, processors will need access to information that clearly outlines what areas require a permit. The availability of this information was a point of concern as some states feel it is protected by confidentiality laws.
- In general, participants agreed that they would be reluctant to allow movement or accept a shipment from any control area during the early days of an outbreak. As the outbreak expands and impacts more numbers of animals, and more information is available on the boundaries of the outbreak, it would be more reasonable to accept animals from a control area.
- While applicable laboratory testing to screen for FMD infection is not currently available, the group agreed that their preference would be to make permitted movement contingent on negative testing results when this capability is developed.
- The SAHOs agreed that, initially, they would look at permitting individual shipments. For a large feedlot, this could mean multiple trucks going to the same destination on a single day. As the outbreak evolves and stabilizes, they would look at permitting longer periods of time. This may include all movements for a week or month, as long as the destination does not change. Kansas intends to require a permit for all animal movement within the state at the beginning of an outbreak. It was stated that the length of those permits may vary depending on proximity to the infected premises. Premises close to an infected operation may initially require permits for individual shipments while premises further away from the infected premises may be allowed permits covering longer periods of time.
- Several industry representatives commented that implementing SBS permitting will help them work with trading partners to possibly mitigate some of the trade restrictions. For this reason, the industry was supportive of creating larger control areas where permits would be required, especially at the beginning of an outbreak.
- The group agreed that industry and government officials need to work more closely together to motivate producers to develop SBS plans.

Areas for Further Discussion

Several areas need further discussion to develop a regional implementation strategy. These areas include both policy issues and operations issues.

Policy Issues

- The group discussed the requirements for cleaning and disinfecting (C&D) a truck that enters a control area before returning to another state. Some states mentioned that it was important to them that the truck is considered clean before return. However, there are no set procedures for determining what is considered clean and who is responsible for the cleaning. Other participants felt this issue could be addressed by the creation of the clean/dirty line (line-of-separation [LOS]) at the facility. This would prevent any

potentially dirty vehicle from possibly exposing healthy animals to a disease, thereby removing the need to meet a specific C&D standard.

- There was considerable discussion on how to validate that a facility has met the requirements to have a movement permit approved. One state is helping producers develop SBS plans and asking that they be submitted, and then contact the facility annually to determine if anything in the plan has changed. During a response, they plan to conduct validation through a phone conversation which will include a phone conversation to discuss the implementation of the plan and, in some cases, may include a request for the facility to submit pictures verifying certain practices. Other states do not have a process to conduct this validation and/or had concerns regarding storing SBS plans within their office. All states agreed they need some confirmation that a facility meets the requirements to be approved for a movement permit.
- The group discussed what types of movements would need a permit. They did not reach consensus on whether feed or rendered products would require a permit out of a control area. The SAHOs in attendance asked the industry representatives for feedback on how they would want rendered products handled. Industry expressed limited concern regarding rendered products; however, there was discussion about the need to make the shipment/movement of the products biosecure. The issue of rendering raw source material was not discussed.
- The focus of this workshop was the discussion of terminal movement. There were several questions related to the movement of cattle to stockers and feeders. This needs to be further discussed by the partnering states and industry representatives.
- While there was agreement that both the consignor and consignee need to meet the requirements for receiving a movement permit, the SBS plan does not include guidelines for packing facilities. These requirements are currently under development.
- The states vary on how they will determine the geographical area that will require movement permitting. Most indicated that they would be looking to permit out of the control area which would be determined at the time of the response and would evolve as the outbreak expanded or contracted. One state plans to initially require permits for the entire state and then reduce the area as information on the outbreak extent becomes available. Challenges were noted with both approaches. Under the concept of requiring a permit out of a smaller control area, it was noted that, at the outset, the area might be changing daily, making it challenging to stay up to date on who needs a permit. In addition, it was noted that some states are legally prohibited from providing specific data on a control area to protect the confidentiality of impacted producers. This would create a significant challenge for packers, preventing them from knowing who would need a movement permit. This approach would require fewer permits as compared to making a whole state a control area. The concept of initially requiring producers in the entire state to request movement permits would result in a large number of permits needing to be processed. This approach has the advantage of allowing the industry to help enforce the permit requirement since packers would know who needs a permit. In addition, it would create fewer changes as the outbreak evolves.

- There was a discussion about visual inspection of shipments before leaving the origin location. Logistically this would be a challenge; however, many from the industry felt it would assist them in being comfortable with the movement. Some felt a veterinarian needed to be involved with the permit application process, providing a pre-movement inspection of the animals. This would make the permit like a Certificate of Veterinary Inspection. Others suggested that workers at the facility could be trained to conduct the pre-movement observational surveillance, eliminating the need for a veterinarian who would be an additional person on the farm. The recommendation was seven days of continued inspection prior to shipment. Several industry representatives felt this level of surveillance could be conducted by pen riders. In this instance, pen riders may need to document each time they ride the pens and make note that they were looking for clinical signs or other indications that animals may be off from normal behavior.
- The states varied in their interest in knowing about animals that may be permitted to move through their state, i.e., pass-through animals. Ideally, this information would be useful; however, many felt it might not be manageable depending on the number of permits issued. The group also noted that it may be of more interest initially when there is only one control area and movement has just started, versus months into the response.

Operations Issues

- Industry expressed concerns regarding the enforcement against illegal (unpermitted) movements from a control area. Several industry representatives indicated that they had knowledge of similar illegal movements in past responses. They suggested that sealing loads might help with enforcement. USDA representatives expressed concerns regarding how this could be done to meet the legal requirements of an officially sealed truck. Industry representatives indicated that they would not expect an official seal would be necessary.
- The group discussed how to make the SBS plans for packers. Developing a plan and understanding the process would allow them to know who is even eligible to receive a permit during an outbreak. On the state side, several indicated that the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) creates challenges. In some cases, states are reluctant to keep copies of the plans because of the risk of associated FOIA requests. There was a discussion on how the National Cattlemen's Beef Association's (NCBA) Beef Quality Assurance (BQA) program could be leveraged to assist with SBS implementation and with housing the individual SBS plans, reducing FOIA concerns. Classifying the information as Protective Critical Infrastructure Information through the Department of Homeland Security was also discussed as an option.
- While the state representatives all mentioned their desire to utilize USDA's Emergency Response Management System (EMRS) for their permitting process, there was some concern as to whether this system would be available for cattle permits. Some of the concerns over using EMRS, if it was available, include the large volume of permits that may result, and using EMRS would likely limit the number of individuals who would have access to the system. In other commodity groups, the limited access issue is handled by having a centralized company representative or the processing plant submit the permit

requests. The beef cattle industry is structurally different, not having these centralized hubs that could be used for requesting permits. Because it is not an integrated production system, a single company may not own both the packing plants and all the associated production operations. The interest in having processors submit the permits was mixed. One company felt it was a viable option and indicated this would be a preference. Other company representatives felt it might be a challenge because they have limited understanding and monitoring capacity for management practices used at the farm level. This level of information would be necessary to support a movement permit application. The state representatives agreed they need to use one system and it needs to provide easy access for them to share permit information and document approval. If EMRS cannot fill this requirement, the group felt they needed to find a system that all states could utilize and that would allow access for producers to submit permits.

- There was considerable discussion regarding how to verify that a facility meets the movement permit requirements if they have not completed the process before an outbreak. Some state representatives acknowledged that they may not have sufficient staff to review new SBS plans during a response; other states felt it was important to have some form of validation. SAHOs indicated that they need a system that will provide them verification that a permit, approved by another state for movement into their state, is based on some verification that SBS practices are being followed by the shipping operation. In addition, some industry representatives felt this was important, especially when animals from a control area are entering a state that does not have infected premises.

Hot Wash

At the close of the meeting, attendees participated in a hot wash. This session focused on a discussion of what went well (e.g., meeting format, topics discussed, planning gaps and solutions, and next steps) and how to improve future meetings. The group outlined the next steps to help continue the discussion and preparations for supporting regional movement permitting during an FMD response.

In addition to the hot wash, attendees were asked to complete an evaluation form as an additional tool to provide input on meeting conduct and other feedback. This information is included in Attachment 1.

The hot wash feedback is organized below into three sections: strengths, areas for improvement and next steps. The information provided in these sections was collected by notetakers.

Strengths

- The opportunity to network.
- The transparent sharing by the SAHOs.
- Focusing on a single type of beef movement, from feedlot to slaughter. This approach provided an opportunity for in-depth discussion.
- Provided more awareness of everything that is in the SBS.

- “Preparing to Implement the SBS Plan” webinar was recorded, made available on the USDA TEP website: <https://youtu.be/Kd9gc3OejqQ> and sent out to all registered attendees prior to the meeting.
- The ability of a group of states to work together to develop SBS plans as similar as possible so that states work together more seamlessly.
- Industry taking the time to come to the table and provide input.
- The pre-workshop webinars were useful in preparing for the meeting.
- The focused nature of the scenarios helped meet the group's objectives and prevented discussion on unrelated areas of a response. Because this was the initial discussion of these issues, it was helpful for the scenarios to be simple.
- The problem-based approach was useful in allowing participants to think in-depth regarding specific situations.

Areas for Improvement

- More microphones would have made the discussion easier.
- Attendees needed general information prior to the meeting regarding what FMD is, how a response generally occurs, a state's plan for implementing the response, and what the SBS includes.
- Scenarios should be provided ahead of time to allow participants to be prepared for the meeting.
- The screen size was not large enough for the size of the meeting room. Those individuals that sat in the back had trouble reading the slides.
- Scenarios need to be more challenging. The scenarios should be ones that the group cannot solve.
- Additional groups should be invited, including the trucking industry, public relations staff, and commodity suppliers.
- The meeting should include a primer for how the beef industry operates, the general flow, and the structure of their processing plants.
- The focus of the meeting needs to be communicated better to those invited. Some did not realize the meeting was just focused on permitting and Secure Beef Supply.
- Additional meetings structured the same way should be held on different topics. Topics may include standstill, diagnostics, surveillance, etc.
- If webinars are used for pre-meeting information, they need to be recorded. In addition, more notice about the date and time needs to be provided. Several in the group suggested at least 90 days' notice.
- If smaller workshops are needed, we need to know what topics should be covered. Do they need one on how to build an SBS plan? One on diagnostics? Putting together these workshops takes a lot of money and manhours and logistics, but smaller ones inside the states may be more manageable. Smaller ones can be shared with other states. State agencies need more information from the industry on what they are interested in.
- Participants need more notification of when webinars are occurring. If notices were put out 60 or 90 days in advance, participants could add them into their calendars.

Next Steps

The group was asked to identify the top five planning actions for the coming 12 months. These items are focused on continuing the collaboration and further preparedness activities related to emergency movement permitting for the cattle industry. Below are the items discussed.

- State-based cattle associations should become more engaged in sharing information about SBS and emergency movement permitting with producers.
- The group should discuss and prepare for public information messaging needed during the movement permit process. These preparations should include industry and state public information officers. Specifically, the group would like to see the development of message maps specific to movement permitting.
- The SAHOs and industry representatives should formalize their expectations for USDA, specifically for EMRS, related to movement permitting and permitting management.
- Additional meetings should be conducted to continue the discussions started at this meeting. The group suggested that there should be meetings within the individual states, between industry and state partners, as well as additional regional meetings.
- The group set a goal to, over the next year, increase the number of beef production operations with completed SBS plans. Each state will need to determine an appropriate goal for the next 12 months.

Attachment 1 Participant Feedback

The information below was obtained directly from participant feedback forms. This information was used to verify information presented in the Scenario Findings section.

Pre-Event Scenario

Strengths

- Good idea on what to permit
- Industry weighed in from the start
- Good discussion
- Basic Kansas plan is great start
- Kansas pro-active in planning
- Real scenario that's relatable. Good plan for coming in, but out??
- Simple but realistic to begin with
- Explaining that each permit is different and has to design their own plan
- Planning efforts occurring in all states involved in workshop
- Good information – Needs to be reinforced and repeated over and over and over and over
- Good webinar to prepare, other trainings were helpful
- With Kansas, there is a specific plan in place and everyone can find out what it is.
- Rapid initial response
- Helped set stage
- Information?
- Discussion of stakeholders always beneficial
- Enjoyed listening to each state's resources/involvement
- Five states participating

Challenges

- Not likely to happen (move animals into zone, producers wouldn't take risk and plant would be busy killing all cattle in zone), C&D trucks
- There was some confusion at first. Participants kept wanting to talk about affected herd management
- Getting a doable plan in place
- Contact all agencies involved
- Cart before the horse – not specific. Leaving the control area is equal risk
- Permits are going to change on a case by case basis
- Slides were impossible to see from the back so it would be better to describe the basics – line at separation, dirty vs. clean
- Industry on varying level of understanding of SBS, FMD response
- Need to reach "deeper" into the typical producer population -> FFA, Ag depts at High schools, 4-H – Big effort here
- It seems like little prep work has been done

- C&D discussion seemed to be an area of concern
- Alignment on items of concern. Common path to answers
- Stimulate producers to designed and implement SBS plans
- Lack of planning between the states to standardize the permitting process
- Differences in policies between states. Biosecurity of trucks can be done but not on topic
- Show update
- Lack of understanding of basics of FAD response
- General knowledge across industry w/out cause undo concern

Areas for Improvement

- More plans on C&D or other ideas – transfer stations for cattle, off land supplies, don't cross LOS
- Perhaps spend an hour at the beginning going over what would happen initially – setting up joint command, ICP, etc.
- Get the simple (Basic areas) which need to close and then develop the details
- Get emergency managers to feedlots
- Who – specifically – are the players ~ Facilities are important!
- Need to know who initiates permit process
- States and Industry need to work together to promote and encourage completion of SBS plans
- Clarity time for tracebacks. Lesion agency (+) 1-14 day incubation period w/ high risk period for traceback 2-6 days before first clinical sign.
- Lots of unanswered/unanswerable questions but generated good discussion, very helpful
- Need prescription guidelines / SOPs
- Get more consistency between the states in the permitting process
- Need bigger screen, can't see anything on it. 2 microphones
- Governmental notification process needs to be explained – apply these comments to all scenarios
- May consider control area border wash stations, along with LOS stations
- Need to start discussion
- Find the right setting. Maybe veterinarians. VCPR?
- Not entirely sure what info we got out of this section
- Overall has gone well
- Need a short presentation on FMD itself and transmission for background info

Scenario 1

Strengths

- Several groups have a lot of experience w/ plans and have a lot of ideas
- Keeping focus on animal movement helped narrow discussion, which was very productive
- SBS Templates, producers actively asking to complete plan

- Stop movement a permit process
- Secure beef supply biosecurity plan in place
- Origin plant (and any brokers) make permit request. FSIS @ slaughter plant wants to see permit(s) and an affidavit
- Most people in industry and state seemed to be clearly aware and informed about establishing good biosec., C&D plans, LOS, etc.
- Stop movement protocol
- Learning about CISA and DHS role in protecting critical infrastructure information (i.e. – SBS plans)
- Made industry realize struggles of state vets
- 72-hour transport stop!
- Having each state describe their response
- Everyone seem to agree that after initial stop movement plan, high priority is continuation of business.
- Good scenario
- Valid point for discussion
- Many cattle n their region; also there's a packing plant (more than one)
- My take on all the scenarios is that they were fairly equal and focused on permitting
- State vets seem to have good working relationship
- Good recognition that relaxing of permitting requirements may be possible
- Good starting scenario-supply for plant w/in control area
- Smaller operation within a large finishing including harvesting region

Challenges

- A lot of plans need to get written
- Assumptions listed included “Beef cattle and beef products are moving freely outside the control areas (without a permit)
- Reaching all producers
- Trying to bring in enough cattle to a plant within a control zone
- Trucking – how do we handle the sanitation (Return Truck) Are other states/premises have SBS plan in place which is adequate
- Trusting producers to be honest with movements and inventories. They will attempt movement to clean area for financial survival.
- Vehicle return from permitted pavement. S&D trucks
- Origin or destination requests permit. Destination would be backwards for everything else
- There was a bit of confusion regarding the concept of the 72 hour standstill and communicating this to industry reps: figuring out how industry requests permits
- Need to have a universal plan for 1st 72 hours
- How to manage vehicles leaving control area (trucks leaving packer and returning to feedlot)

- Permitting Mechanism Harmonization, SBS plan assessment Auditing – Who says the assessment
- C/D of trucks moving in/out of control area
- Very vague on who requests and to whom. Feedlot or packer. Ongoing state or destination state
- Many industry sectors not here like trucking
- Cleaning trucks when they leave control zone. Permit feed?
- No plan evident for moving stocker calves. No plan for continued continuity
- States having differing levels of stringency on permitting – industry wanting continuity only way to do is follow most stringent state
- Discussion took a long time to get going
- Highlights diff in/btwn states
- It might not be too representative of most regions due to no plants.
- What to do with cattle already traveling across country
- Industry needs to understand that what may be possible may not be feasible
- Realistic-
- Handling transportation cleaning issues (C&D trucks) and which ones. SBS Plan uniform validation across states.

Areas for Improvement

- Still reluctance to get started on SBS plans, too complicated?, plant idea that it is a work in progress
- Kansas' requirement for a permit on everything threw a kink in things.
- How we handle transportation
- Are permits needed if in transit to slaughter plant w/in control zone first 72 hrs.
- Print out scenarios for participants to reference back to during the discussion
- Can you regionalize a state w/ confirmed FMD
- On what a movement is based is accurate and trusted.
- Lots of unanswered/unanswerable questions but generated good discussion, very helpful
- Better plan for moving stocker calves
- Create more interactive/discussions/ideas
- More information on index case. Do they have good biosecurity where movements into control area are less risky?
- Work to have common rules state to state
- Truck C&D, where does permit request originate?
- Determine logistics between state health departs/state vets
- Did not discuss depop of infected premises
- Add responsible plant and site for C&D of transport to the permit. Design SBS plans with limited commodity crossing!

Scenario 2

Strengths

- Permit required to move into or out of a control zone
- Same as above “Made industry realize struggles of state vets”
- Permit plan development
- Observational surveillance plan helpful (need more detail on practical ways to enact)
- Good discussion
- Shift focus for scenario
- Pass through states all in agreement on no permitting
- Seemingly straightforward
- Good discussions
- Control processes at start but what about after period of time?

Challenges

- Permit enforcement
- Timing of observational surveillance – and extent of observation/examination/inspection. Cow-calf/stockers SBS plans
- Troubleshooting-good
- Decision is on destination state on if they will accept this movement or not
- Not necessarily directly related to scenario
- Permits - knowing who to call first
- Verification of plans staffing to approve new plans once permitting begins
- Identifying all the moving parts-anticipating dynamics
- Permitting (administratively) vs actual steps to minimize further exposure
- Truck C& D. If packers won’t accept from control zone where do those cattle go
- Transport is a challenge

Areas for Improvement

- Lots of unanswered/unanswerable questions but generated good discussion, very helpful
- None-if people are on topic-keep discussion going.
- Coordinate between states/state regulations
- Testing for negatives
- Identifying truck who are passing through states. System for packers to know if cattle are coming from a control area.
- How risky are the movements out based on the location and biosecurity of index case need more info

Scenario 3

Strengths

- Highly likely situation, challenge to keep plant noninfected

- Realistic issues presented in scenario
- Permit requirements
- Secure Beef should be positive
- Secure beef plan at feedlot gives some comfort
- Communication to public thru JIC
- Discussion of observational surveillance and SBS resources to prepare a producer for possible questions that would be asked on a permit
- Same as above “Made industry realize struggles of state vets”
- All in agreement to have SBS plan in place prior to moving or requesting permits
- Permit
- More good discussion
- Crossing multiple states was good discussion
- To define the issue more precisely
- Pass through state doesn’t have to be permitted
- Permits need to have load numbers of head
- Good discussion. Feedlots were very vocal of their concerns

Challenges

- Permitting is a cumbersome piece, need more thought and refining
- In real outbreak, we would be dealing with multiple scenarios at once
- Interstate movement requires verification (thru permitting) at negative FMD stations
- Detection of disease by observation
- Are you willing to accept cattle from w/in control zone to plant outside zone. Depends
- Moving through the state
- 7 day observation for clinical signs will be difficult
- Truck Driver Behavior assurance
- Enforcement of permit violations.
- Origin or destination requests permits?
- Not specifically on topic
- Man power
- Consistency among states in defining control zones
- Again, diff btwn states-highlights need to explore more commonalities btwn current state guidelines.
- Standardized permit for/document
- Every permitted movement will be different depending on many factors. Feeders/packers want a definite answer of what to do which is not possible.
- Getting consensus among states
- Many of the questions regarding transporting keep seeming to come back to no real management of individual loads

Areas for Improvement

- Continue to define the permit process, get EMRS ready and make it functional and more user friendly
- None at this time
- Permit enforcement
- Education of safe beef strengths and how each situation will need to be evaluated
- I would encourage more thought given to science of the disease and how it may affect permitting. The cattle in Q Zone move to slaughter plant in Kansas
- Need to re-evaluate rendered products
- Continue to work on a cohesive permitting process between the states
- When do you want a Visual Inspection of the Cattle – Where is the logistic process?
- Decide if origin requests permits
- Sealed trucks. Permits should be requested from entity in the control area. In all three scenarios needed to get in or out of area or who is transporting the cattle.
- Lots of unanswered/unanswerable questions but generated good discussion, very helpful
- Seal trucks; need public map
- Truck seals make sense for enforcement/compliance/confidence for destination along with paperwork sent ahead and long with truck
- Best said “...kill the virus – not the industry...”
- Probably need to look at load by load permits not clear on how we know who is in control area and needs permits
- To think through logistics of execution

Scenario 4

Strengths

- Realistic situation, interstate mvmt
- Discussion of enforcement, and industries support, was encouraging
- Control zones establishment
- Communication between states – facilities involved
- Self-regulate (industry) for truck seals? Not enough manpower for APHIS to seal trucks
- Really liked discussion on enforcement of permits because it seemed to be a hot button issue
- Discussion on who would initiate the permitting process
- This was the most known scenario and the one where there was the most agreement between the regulators.
- Very realistic
- Didn't do this one
- Networking – work for united plan across industry
- I like how industry & state questions could be answered
- Questions was a great idea to get everyone talking!

- Same as above “Made industry realize struggles of state vets”
- Good discussions and raising more questions/challenges
- Questions – ability to ask additional questions outside strict agenda

Challenges

- Permit for all KS movements is a challenge, communication along the process, transparency of who is in control zone
- Real world challenge would be dealing with a large volume of requests, and the lack of bandwidth of EMRS2 would be a huge issue.
- Using visible landmarks so the public understands where the zone is
- Getting around control areas, knowledge of problem & who is involved
- Trying to come up with a consensus on how to ensure the utilization of permits were used seemed to be bit all over the place
- Consensus with industry as to who initiates it. States agree origin of shipment should initiate permit
- Hard to take more than snapshot, the scenario is quickly evolving
- Aggregate samples/tests for surveillance testing of clinically normal animals.

Areas for Improvement

- Sharing of info to those whose need it
- None at this time
- Requesting of permits (origin vs destination) needs to be consistent
- Explaining the permitting process
- Enforcement _ Communication
- Continue education on permitting process
- Diagnostic plans and tests
- Lots of unanswered/unanswerable questions but generated good discussion, very helpful
- Might work better to request end of 1st day and allow presenters overnight to think about.

Most Important Planning Gaps

- More concrete permitting qualifications and steps
- Desperately need to address the limited capacity of EMRS2
- Permit enforcement, truck checkpoints
- More discussion on how to develop and implement SBS plan. Industry unaware of SBS website with wealth of resources.
- This could use an EMRS Demo on permitting. Focus on a 30-day permit w/ multiple shipments under that permit. Go thru steps, who would do what, etc. This same lack of understanding w/ permitting process comes up @ every exercise concerning movement.
- Proof of Negative FMD infection testing; Develop Man Power Gap analysis for state & federal Regulatory Response agencies
- States tasked with coming up w/ universal algorithms – challenge. Industry operations that explains movements

- Which permitting system to use? Can EMRS keep up with demands?
- Smaller groups for the scenarios and integrate at the end; might allow for sharing of more ideas by more people. What happens at sale barns what can be done w/ animals that are unable to move forward in the production system but are not infected
- Maybe some smaller group work and making sure everyone is on the same page- never heard of SBS-plan in place
- Focused on continue of commerce, but will need to be focused on survival of industry
- Permitting - need a clear path to when/how to secure a permit. Need some sort of a decision tree for feed yards
- Notifying the public about SBS and its importance. Lock the state veterinarians in a room until they can come up with a common permitting process.
- Have representatives from all aspects of industry – trucking-communication, TSA, Security-emergency management
- “ramp up” plan for states to facilitate action. Rapid response is essential to proving to the world our product is safe and return focus to reopening our export mkts.
- Producers need to be aware of what is going to happen in the first few days of an outbreak. The scope of this meeting appeared to use to be too narrow and too “advanced” for the producers in attendance based on their knowledge of FMD and Response
- The inside of cattle trucks, washout facilities, surveillance diagnostics (pooled sampling(fecal?)PRC)
- Permitting between states I.E. requirements, info sharing.
- C&D of trucks leaving control areas. Standardized permit document where do cattle from a control zone go if packers won’t accept?
- Appreciate the meeting to discuss but I am not sure the message has gotten out to a wide group as yet. Understand the 6 states in attendance kind of wondered about the other western states particularly NM, UT, ID, WA, AZ
- Implement at SBS, logistic following suspect, confirmed, movement
- Industry back into problem. Establish where they want to be during FMD break then figure out how to get there.
- SBS plans verified by private practitioners on educating them about how to contribute

Additional Comments

- Nice work! More industry at the meetings in future (less USDA and more industry)
- Workshop was well designed, perhaps needed a little time to go thru the “response” up to permitting to help with some of the confusion on what happens before permits are issued.
- Smaller Groups
- We need to get producers signed up first before we start talking about the details of the scenarios
- Focus on producers not state regulatory
- I would recommend sources for additional information APHIS Website, state & federal veterinarians

- More “from the ground up” in the event of an FMD break. Involve diagnosticians. Example of SBS plan. Specific players? PR preparation. Pre-print scenarios
- Recommend do annually and next time in Nebraska; more networking time – add banquet or something; more microphones; more problem-based discussions/scenarios; involve slaughterhouse aspect more; send scenarios out ahead of time; print powerpoint/scenarios; larger/clearer screen
- More microphones needed; more streamline format so there is a better foundation of FMD & SBS plan for everyone before discussion; printouts of scenarios; more input from observers; was not quite sure what my role was here (like if I should speak up about different topics); but I did enjoy this workshop as it will help with further development of animal response planning
- 1. The group was too large. With the amount of knowledge that was in the room, I felt it was counterproductive to have only 10-15% of the people interacting. 2. The SBS plans need to be adopted by the producers. The emphasis seemed to be more how states are going to permit. 3. I think the question that was put in the “parking lot” needed to be considered. 4. Producers need to adopt the SBS plan first!
- I think this type workshop would work better/more smoothly if you quickly reviewed all the steps leading up to an FMD positive & what would happen in that infection zone, quarantine zone & then control zone rather than starting at the control zone level.
- Could only attend day 1 – coronavirus
- The wrap-up Q&A was very helpful, especially using the separate sheet of paper to ask questions from audience.
- 5 things to do next: coordinate and integrate state plans (regionalize); continue to talk b/w state vets and university and industry reps, etc. ; set up and validate SBSP’s possibly link to VCPR and BQA; development of “chute-side” PCR diagnostics; integrate SBSP into clinical rotations for veterinary students (us at UNL).