

COMMITTEE ON SWINE

Chair: Lisa Becton, IA

Vice Chair: Maryn Ptachinski, TX

Bobby Acord, NC; Gary Anderson, KS; Celia Maria Antognoli, CO; Marianne Ash, IN; Rich Baca, CO; David Baum, IA; Mohit Baxi, ON; Karen Beck, NC; Lisa Becton, IA; Philip Bradshaw, IL; Becky Brewer-Walker, AR; Steve Brier, MO; Robert Cobb, GA; Dana Cole, CO; Jim Collins, MN; Marie Culhane, MN; Fred Cunningham, DC; Angela Daniels, TX; Thomas DeLiberto, CO; Barbara Determan, IA; Brandon Doss, AR; Roger Dudley, NE; Tracy DuVernoy, MD; Sean Eastman, SC; Jamee Eggers, IA; Cody Egnor, AZ; Dee Ellis, TX; Tony Forshey, OH; Heather Fowler, IA; Cyril Gay, MD; Tom Gidlewski, CO; Michael Gilsdorf, MD; Stephen Goldsmith, DC; Julie Groce, NC; Patrick Halbur, IA; Rod Hall, OK; Steven Halstead, MI; Beth Harris, IA; Karyn Havas, NY; Michael Herrin, OK; Dennis Hughes, NE; Noah Hull, WY; Marcus Kehrl, Jr., IA; James Kober, MI; Charlotte Krugler, SC; T.R. Lansford, TX; Elizabeth Lautner, IA; James Leafstedt, SD; Donald Lein, NY; Randall Levings, IA; Christina Loiacono, IA; Bret Marsh, IN; David Marshall, NC; Michael Martin, SC; Chuck Massengill, MO; Thomas McKenna, MA; Sara McReynolds, KS; Miranda Medrano, VA; Gay Miller, IL; Richard Mock, NC; Jason Moniz, HI; Michael Neault, NC; Cheryl Nelson, KY; Dustin Oedekoven, SD; Elizabeth Parker, TX; Boyd Parr, SC; Maryn Ptachinski, TX; Dave Pyburn, IA; Susan Rollo, TX; Steve Rommereim, SD; James Roth, IA; Mo Salman, CO; Joni Scheffel, MN; David Schmitt, IA; Richard Sibbel, IA; Harry Snelson, IA; Darrel Styles, MD; Paul Sundberg, IA; Gregory Suskovic, MN; Todd Tedrow, SD; Beth Thompson, MN; Sarah Tomlinson, CO; Bruce Wagner, CO; Liz Wagstrom, DC; Patrick Webb, IA; Kelli Werling, IN; John Williams, MD; Nora Wineland, MI; Stephanie Wisdom, IA; Marty Zaluski, MT.

The Committee met on 10-29-19 at the Rhode Island Convention Center in Providence, Rhode Island, from 1-5pm. There were 34 members and 22 guests present. Housekeeping items were reviewed including sign-in, member eligibility, resolution discussion and points of order.

Presentations & Reports

Title

Review of Upcoming NAHMS 202 Swine Study

Dr. Amy Delgado, USDA CEAH

Dr. Delgado reviewed the upcoming plans for the NAHMS 2020 Swine study. There are 2 components of the study to include both small enterprise (<1000 pigs) and large enterprise (>1000 pigs) The large enterprise survey will initiate from July-August 2020 – phase 1; phase 2 through January to include biologic testing for enteric pathogens as well as SVA testing for rope samples.

The small enterprise will be a mail-out survey and will focus on movement and mortality channels as well as emergency response planning. This will not include any biologic testing. There will be a follow-up phone call after the survey is sent out. See the NAHMS website for the launch sheets that detail the states that are participating and what will be completed. Next steps are to reach out to industry to get awareness level increased for the upcoming study and to garner good participation.

Swine Disease Surveillance update: FAD's and IAV

Dr. John Korslund, USDA APHIS VS

Dr. Korslund presented on the surveillance for swine FAD's and IAV. A background and evolution of swine surveillance was provided during the meeting to include FADs, IAV, PRV, PEDV and now CSF and ASF. Now many program efforts are looking at surveillance, preparedness and risk assessments.

ASF/CSF surveillance started in June 2019. CSF has been ongoing for approximately 10 years. Now with the addition of ASF, multiple diseases are being monitored. The surveillance early data shows 1550 dual tested samples, half come from slaughter plants and 1996 for CSF specific testing. There have been non-vesicular 26 FAD investigations. The samples are collected from the diagnostic labs that meet case-compatible criteria. There is a protocol that utilizes the same tissue process to run both ASF and CSF PCR for cost-savings. All samples run are tested for both diseases, if case compatible. Other areas for sampling include packing plants, garbage feeders and other transitional herds. Garbage feeders are also tested for CSF only. This accounts for the 1996 samples collected at high risk, backyard pigs to include

garbage fed. The locations are in FL, Puerto Rico and other locations. There is not approved serology for ASF, but it is done for CSF. This is done to try to detect low level of disease through antibody testing. Feral swine are also tested through Wildlife Services for CSF in high risk populations in southern/southwestern states. Feral swine are not tested for ASF but will be done if there are suspect dead pigs. FAD investigations still provide a means to perform investigation and testing on suspect cases. Numbers have been increasing for FAD investigations and testing, so this remains a means for additional coverage on FAD surveillance. In most cases, sick or dead pigs have triggered the FAD investigations. The data is covered in the USDA EMRS system. There is serologic testing occurring for swine populations for FADs. Serology is mainly for CSF. There are some concerns that serology could still catch some cases that are not apparent. If it is needed for recovery when we are positive, is there work in this sphere? There is an approved Ab test, commercially available in limited supply. There is work on an in-house test that can become available. It is underway at FADDL. Validation of the confirmatory test at FADDL has been done.

Swine Vesicular FAD investigations are occurring. Surveillance has increased since 2015 and continues to rise in 2019. There is a seasonal trend of higher cases in late summer, early fall. The USDA does account for on-farm vs plant submissions. Location of cases = 88% from slaughter streams; 12% are on-farm; of the 88%, 44% are in sow slaughter and 37% are from roaster or light slaughter. Slaughter streams are definitely the highest incidence and some partly due to the length in time in slaughter channels. They are picking up SVA in transit and end up in FAD investigations at slaughter. Many cases are difficult to track completely through the farm. From the epidemiology work that USDA is completing, the pigs do not appear to be originating from the farm.

Influenza surveillance showed limited influenza at fairs. There is good reporting of sick pigs at fairs and expositions. This is happening before reporting of people illness. The number of samples positive and sent to Genbank is still working and being completed. There is continued participation in the program. Samples that are virus positive should be able to be sequenced. Regions may not be indicative of what is occurring within the surveillance sampling areas. Funding is stable. It is time to review the need to assess influenza surveillance.

Customs and Border Protection update

Mr. Kevin Harriger, DHS CBP

Goal is to exclude FADs from the US. The charge for coverage is huge. This encompasses food and agriculture as well and drug interdiction and other areas of focus. CBP is protecting export markets and yet provide consumers with products that they would like to have. Have seen 3-5 % increase in volume of products over the border. 1.1 million passengers to the US every day, many by air, vessels, and other means. 2900 international arrivals daily. This does not include rail entry. 22,500 law enforcement to help deal with the entry of people and products. 2500 agriculture specialists with further training in ag-specific activities. What is CBP doing to address the current risk? When a country is announced positive, they find out how many citizens visit on an annual basis, how they transit and gather that data. Then there is continued vigilance for disease protection. ASF education have been included in training sessions and curriculum. There are messaging boards up at points on entry to help alert passengers. There is a significant effort to prevent smuggling efforts and other illegal activities. There is a targeting platform that looks at the attributes of the movement and how that outcome has occurred. This is compared to country of origin and disease status. Then surveillance is done according to this platform. There is a more successful effort to this process. There is 119 working dogs for interdiction. They are deployed at all major airports and ports of entry. Looking to get more signage for disease prevention and including screens that show education on ASF. "Don't Pack a Pest" campaign that is collaboration with USDA and tied to Farm Bill. Also looking at the potential to have in other countries prior to coming back to the US. Also performing education with students that are from foreign countries and working with them on risks of product entry. Developing a strategy to do internal "in-reach" to train internal staff on threats. Working to get funding to get additional 60 more canine teams for support; enhance awareness of passengers to declare their risks and how they can mitigate those risks, i.e. on-farm visits and secondary screening.

Feed Risk Task Force update & Feed Risk Focus

Dr. Paul Sundberg, SHIC

An overview of the risk associated with feed was presented. There was a request for a task force to discuss the issue of risks for feed and disease transmission. The group has met twice since April. Once in

June and second in September. The action should be focus on minimizing trade disruptions, be based on science and achievable. The Task Force is broad participation. They have identified gaps and research needs including development of capability for testing feed/ingredients, an industry initiative with metrics on responsible import programs, infrastructure to have Canadian-like import holding program. Additional actions include development of a plan to assess and mitigate contamination within the feed system once the virus is identified and further overall development of efficacy of mitigations for feed contamination. There is how to reduce the risk of introduction and also how to reduce the chance of spread once the virus gets into the US. FDA has been involved in this task force. The next meeting will continue in 2020.

ASF Exercise Outcome Panel

Benefits:

- Have more that 20 or more private sector participants
- Do have lab capacity and continuing to ensure that the capacity to deal with a disease is available
 - Continued assessment of oral fluids is necessary to facilitate surveillance
- Multi-country disease collaboration and coordination
- Planning is valuable and is a must - need to take advantage of these exercises to continue to improve policy and existing plans
 - Need to be prepared to make the early, hard decisions
 - Continued collaboration is key!!
- Communications and collaborations with industry vets has improved and continues to grow
 - Next phase is to garner upper-management company involvement
- Farm Bill application for additional funds to address the response and preparedness efforts
- Developed new teams for incident control
- Having a multi-state collaboration to address disease management = current 12 state coordination efforts

Challenges/Gaps

- National movement standstill and how best to implement this
 - What is start time?
 - What is stop time?
 - Do we have the testing capacity to get out of the standstill!
 - Does that extend to additional hours?
 - What does having feral pigs impact the shutdown?
 - Need to have some level of consistent surveillance on pigs prior to outbreak but also within the outbreak
 - What is included in the standstill?
 - How best to permit movements out of control zones?
- How to pay % of indemnity in the event of a positive farm
 - Current 50% fair market value of pig with administrative discretion to pay more up to 100%
 - Will depop method influence indemnity
 - Need to address farm types for differences – i.e. sow farm vs. finisher
- Business continuity in the event of a disease outbreak
- Continued testing about capabilities for oral fluids – continue to understand true capacity and time to process tissues etc.
 - Need to test surge capacity!!
- Need to assess how to incorporate farm staff to collect samples (including farm veterinarians)
- VDLs need to have samples they can process quickly – common matrices can speed up the amount of testing
- Need to understand the epidemiology of the initial outbreaks quickly
- Need to have additional methods for rapid depop that conforms to AVMA practices and that are acceptable by industry and farmers
- Incorporation of packing into the discussion

- Need to have biosecurity plans in place, data in EMRS gateway – are all types of operations prepared to have a biosecurity plan in place?
 - Need to get widespread communications to additional folks on-farm to raise and build awareness on the slat level
 - Need to focus on getting producers in SPS
- Communicating lab results in real-time
- External authority to assist in shut-down (highway patrol or other?)
- How to handle how packing plants accept animals with known status or how to get known status for pigs inside or outside of control zones?
- Address state to state variability for managing the outbreak
 - CVI's
 - What/who is included in 72 hour standstill order?
 - How to work within different state animal health laws?
 - And deal the variability between federal and state rules
- IT coordination and Gateway capacity for permitting is important – need to have multiple permissions during an outbreak
 - Encourage others to “pre-load’ data if at all possible
- Social media messaging and addressing non-farm people and how they perceive disease management
 - Stress messages for swine specific diseases and make sure all involved are on the same page
- Will the stand still order be a formal Secretary order to extend beyond those states directly involved?

USDA

Dr. Jack Shere, USDA

Dr. Jon Zack, USDA

Dr. Kim Dodd, USDA

State Vets:

Dr. Jeff Kaisand, IA

Dr. Doug Meckes and Dr. Mike Neault, NC

Dr. Bret Marsh, IN

Dr. Suskovish (?), MN

Dr. Jim Kober, MI

Assistant State Vet, PA

Dr. Cobb, GA

Academic

Dr. Marie Culhane, UMN

FADDL

Dr. Kim Dodd

VDL/NAHLN

Dr. Jerry Torrison, UMN

Producers

Steve Romereim, SD

Steve Brier, MO

Jamee Eggers, IA

Nick Lauterbach, MO

Committee Business:

Old Business:

2018 Resolutions

The responses provided for all of the 2018 resolutions were adequate.

2018 Recommendation

No action for 2019. Sundberg made the motion to look at the 2018 Recommendation for 2019-2020 Cobb seconded. Member made the motion to accept amended version and Daniels seconded. The amended recommendation passed. The final amended motion was passed with majority voice vote.

New Business/Resolutions:

ASF/CSF NAHLN: Amended and passed by voice vote

Farm Bill/NAHLN Funding: Amended and passed by voice vote

Feed Sampling Validation: Passed by voice vote

Efficient Dx of Samples: Passed by voice vote

FAD Prevention: Passed by voice vote

FAD Compartmentalization: Amended and passed.

FAD Movement Controls: Amended and passed.

Garbage Feeding:

OTHER NOTES: