

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOOD SAFETY

Chair: Dr. R. David Glauer, Reynoldsburg, OH
Vice Chair: Dr. Bonnie J. Buntain, Washington, DC

Dr. Marilyn F. Balmer, MD; Mr. John R. Behrmann, PA; Dr. Joseph L. Blair, VA; Dr. Dale D. Boyle, DC; Dr. Richard E. Breitmeyer, CA; Mr. Terry L. Burkhardt, WI; Dr. Donald W. Butts, VA; Dr. David M. Castellan, CA; Dr. Jan Charminski, WV; Dr. Max E. Coats, Jr., TX; Mr. Carl W. Cushing, VT; Mr. Kevin M. Elfering, MN; Dr. Wyatt Frampton, UT; Dr. Don A. Franco, FL; Dr. Bob Gerlach, AK; Mr. L. Wayne Godwin, FL; Dr. Eric C. Gonder, NC; Dr. Larry M. Granger, MD; Dr. Donald E. Hoenig, ME; Dr. Tom Holder, MD; Dr. Rex D. Holt, GA; Mr. Danny R. Hughes, AR; Dr. John P. Huntley, NY; Dr. Lee C. Jan, TX; Dr. Robert F. Kahrs, FL; Dr. Susan J. Keller, ND; Dr. Spangler Klopp, DE; Dr. Elizabeth A. Krushinskie, GA; Dr. Daniel E. LaFontaine, SC; Dr. Elizabeth A. Lautner, NY; Mr. Michael M. Mammaing, IA; Mr. Arthur P. Marquez, NM; Dr. Bret D. Marsh, IN; Dr. David T. Marshall, NC; Dr. James D. Mckean, IA; Ms. Phyllis Menden, WI; Dr. William Mies, FL; Dr. Lee M. Myers, GA; Dr. Jill A. Nezworski, MN; Mr. Tom Nunes, CA; Dr. Carol A. Olmstead, MT; Dr. Kenneth E. Olson, IL; Dr. Gary D. Osweiler, IA; Dr. Gerardo Quaassdorff, VT; Dr. John R. Ragan, MD; Mr. Steven Roach, IL; Ms. Nancy J. Robinson, MO; Dr. Kerry Rood, VT; Dr. Leon H. Russell, Jr., TX; Dr. John P. Sanders, Jr., WV; Dr. Charles R. Seagren, SD; Mr. Glenn N. Slack, KY; Dr. Harry Snelson, DC; Dr. Bruce N. Stewart-Brown, MD; Dr. Manuel A. Thomas, Jr., TX; Dr. Kenneth L. Thomazin, CA; Dr. H. Fred Troutt, IL; Dr. Lyle P. Vogel, IL; Mr. David C. Warren, FL; Dr. Larry L. Williams, NE; Dr. Terrance M. Wilson, MD; Dr. Nora E. Wineland, CO; Dr. Richard R. Wood, IL; Mr. John F. Wortman, Jr., NM; Ms. Ria de Grassi, CA.

The Committee met on November 6, 2005 from 12:30 to 5:30 pm. Chair David Glauer presided assisted by Vice Chair Bonnie Buntain. Approximately 60 committee members and guests were welcomed to the annual meeting by Chair David Glauer followed by reading the mission of the Committee. The presentations were reviewed from last year's meeting. Chair Glauer asked the members to consider if the mission statement needed to be revised and if the Committee was meeting their expectations. These topics would be discussed during the Committee business session.

The meeting was divided into two sections. The first was "Directions for the Future: Five Year Forecast for Food Safety on the Farm." The second was "Will Industry Quality Assurance Programs (QAPs) Meet the Needs for Food Safety on the Farm."

The first presentation was by Dr. Barbara Masters, Administrator of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), entitled "FSIS Expectations for Food Safety at the Farm Level." The agency's top priorities and preharvest food safety initiatives dovetail with Hazard Analysis of Critical Control Points (HACCP) expectations in the slaughter plant environment. Next year is the 100th anniversary of the Meat and Poultry Inspection Acts. The next 100 years will focus more on integrating food safety and public health goals that are rooted in science.

Recent Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) data indicates a decline in the relative rates of foodborne illnesses which continued from 2003 through 2004. For example, Salmonella illnesses reduced 8%, Campylobacter 31%, *Listeria monocytogenes* 40%, *E. coli* O157:H7 42% and Yersinia 45%. The CDC attributes these decreases to farm to table approaches to food safety that are necessary to continue foodborne reductions. FSIS is making progress in pre-harvest food safety. FSIS has activities in the following that impact the animal production sectors:

1. HACCP Regulations: slaughter and processing establishments must consider hazards before, during and after entry into the plant. For example, establishments need to look at antimicrobial interventions in regard to incoming animals when validating their interventions.
2. Cooperation between FSIS and animal producers, scientists, academia and other government agencies. The Animal and Egg Production Food Safety Staff has Cooperative Agreements/Outreach Program. Various projects including control of residues in food animals, poultry and eggs.
3. Research by the private and public sectors on pre-harvest food safety: FSIS held a preharvest food safety meeting for broilers and brought the best scientists together to report on what may need to be done to reduce Salmonella on broilers.

FSIS has five key priorities and is constantly raising the bar for public health success.

1. Training, education and outreach: the agency has improved workforce training by investing \$60 million over the past 4 years. In animal production, the agency has worked with stakeholders on

outreach programs via cooperative agreements. For example, FSIS supported cull dairy third party verification and certified State programs such as the South Dakota Beef QAP. For Kansas State University, a cooperative agreement is supporting bilingual feedlot workers' programs on food safety. All results of cooperative programs will be available for public use on the FSIS web site www.fsis.usda.gov.

2. **Communications:** FSIS has many initiatives to assist the agency in better understanding how to improve policies and programs. Food handler education is important. FSIS holds many public meetings including preharvest research to reduce Salmonella and the transcript is on web site. Compliance guidelines for preharvest food safety will be published in FY 2006. A web cast on Food Defense-Make it Your Business has been very successful. State Meat Directors and others are using the web casts to extend outreach on how best to educate small and very small plants on food safety and defense.
3. **Risk analysis** is another key priority and is important for policies and communication. Risk analysis includes risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. Risk assessments allow us to focus resources on hazards that pose the greatest threat to public health. Risk assessments are an essential part of policy making. The agency will be collecting more data through *E. coli* O157:H7 first, then Salmonella national baseline studies. FSIS supports the Collaboration in Animal Health and Food Safety Epidemiology (CAHFSE) program to help determine the relationship of various public health hazards from farm to table.
4. **Food Defense:** model food defense plans help identify the types of preventive steps that establishments may take to minimize the risk that their products will be subject to tampering or other malicious criminal activity.
5. **Inspection and Enforcement:** FSIS will continue to develop a risk-based approach to assuring food safety as modeled in the *Listeria monocytogenes* regulations. That regulation is a risk based approach to verification and inspection with incentives for plants to do more interventions. FSIS is also supporting the development of a comprehensive zoonotic disease surveillance system that will integrate FSIS data on incoming animals and condemnations. This integrative system will be like a syndromic surveillance database to notify the agency of real-time emerging animal health and food safety concerns. Regarding humane handling inspection and enforcement, the agency has taken a very proactive approach and advised industry in two Federal Register notices that a systems approach should be utilized to prevent problems. One recent notice reminded the poultry industry of its responsibilities to use Good Commercial Practices to prevent adulterated products and to develop systems to assess, actions to minimize problems then verify humane handling is working all the way back to farm. For example:

Federal Register Notice 04-037N:

- *Step One:* Conduct an assessment of where handling problems occur.
- *Step Two:* Determine whether facilities are designed and maintained to prevent excitement, discomfort, and accidental injury to poultry the entire time that live poultry is held in connection with slaughter.
- *Step Three:* Evaluate handling methods to ensure that employees are minimizing excitement, discomfort or accidental injury to poultry the entire time that live poultry is held in connection with slaughter.

In conclusion, Dr. Masters said the agency's vision is that industry will continually raise the bar on food safety and in doing so will consider implementing more preharvest QAPs. We need to know how QAPs impact in-plant interventions. Plants control processes that include QAPs will give FSIS more data on how risks can be minimized. FSIS intends to assign resources where real hazards and risks exist. It will take all of us to protect public health, and our mutual challenge is to hold ourselves accountable to better protect the public health by continuing to reduce foodborne illnesses.

The second presentation was by Ms. Celie Myers, Cargill Taylor Beef, Technical Services Superintendent, entitled "What Processors Will Need From Food Animal Producers."

Taylor Beef processes 1800-1900 cattle per day, resulting in 4 million pounds fresh ground beef from 325,000 cows and 140,000 fed cattle per year. All types of products are made and rendered. Animal welfare focus is shifting to care in transportation and on the farm. They procure cattle from 35 states directly and as far west as Montana and Arizona. When the cow supply is down, health problems increase. Some producers sell direct (25%) but are not paid until USDA inspected. Most cattle are purchased by the plant individually at auction. QAPs are needed to improve what is sold to plants. It is a tough sell to producers who do not see a money incentive for following QAPs. Cargill has incentives to producer for ID or QAP includes a fed cattle- value added

programs. Cull dairy- some source verified but no system technology to communicate from producer to industry data systems for verification.

The nature of marketing system is difficult, so some producers at auctions gamble that the cattle will pass for edible products no matter what condition they are in. It ends up responsibility of FSIS to sort out diseased livestock instead of producers preventing problems.

What is important to Cargill Taylor Beef?

- Customer service
- Meeting our commitments
- Food safety
- Avoid pathogens or residues
- Product quality
- Grade, yield and boneless value
- Animal welfare
- Ambulatory and properly managed cattle
- Worker safety
- International market access

Cargill Taylor Beef has a good preference: strong, healthy, large, mobile, no oversize udders, and no condemnable conditions. The low value, no value leans are likely to be non-ambulatory, have poor legs, unattended health conditions, neurological problems, serious calving problems, or be ambulatory but over produced/undernourished and weak. The issue seems to be that in some areas “bad is becoming normal” as Dr. Temple Grandin says, and certain areas are accustomed to bad cows.

Producers can add value to cattle and we need to talk to practicing veterinarians more about hoof/leg care; nutrition; written culling strategy; better transition cow care to reduce residue problems; and biosecurity and pathogen awareness. Bovine leukosis is 50% of the condemned at Cargill Taylor resulting in lots of meat loss. Sanitation on farm should help prevent this and other pathogens.

Management strategies to add value:

- Prioritize hoof and leg care
- Close attention to nutrition
- Well planned culling and replacement strategy-written decision guidelines
- Improved transition cow care
- Bio-security: greater awareness of bovine leukosis virus (BLV) (50% of USDA condemnments) and reduce pathogens (*E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella newport* and DT104)
- Identification, traceability, records

Animal identification (ID) and traceability at auctions is poor. Radio frequency identification device (RFID) works well with ear tag buttons at Cargill Taylor. The United States Animal Health Association (USAHA) should support RFID, and tie in all current systems so they will work together. The National Farm Animal Identification Repository (FAIR) Program supports ID and has confidentiality. The plant can obtain herd mates and premise ID from FAIR so it can trace other related cattle.

Salmonella newport was a crisis at Cargill Taylor. The company now believes cattle should not be sent to slaughter if a serious public health pathogen is suspected.

Statistics on USDA retained cattle at Cargill Taylor:

- 284,675 total cows purchased in past year
- 4851 dead/down – Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) tested (1.70%)
- 44,310 cows retained for further inspection/testing (15.83%)
- 35,027 drug residue tests (12.52%)
- Approximately 1100 FAST positives, 600 confirmed positives, including 300 violations/year
- Getting lower in the Northeast due to surveillance
- 850 granulomas for tuberculosis (TB) tests
- Some pathology for further testing
- 5365 condemned for pathology (1.92%)
- Remainder inspected, trimmed and released

USDA condemned at Cargill Taylor Beef:

- 5365 condemned
- 2590 malignant lymphoma (BLV)
- 855 septicemia
- 578 miscellaneous degenerative and dropsical conditions
- 264 toxemia
- 257 peritonitis
- 251 pyemia-abscesses
- 132 other carcinomas
- 117 epithelioma-cancer eye

They are driving numbers down for residues. Producers sign a form that there are no violative residues, but there are still residues that could be prevented. Bovine Leukosis Virus condemned carcasses are their number one problem. There needs to be more on farm prevention. They experience a \$3 million labor and lost efficiency cost to industry due to condemnations and a \$4 million loss from cattle due to condemnments.

The cost of poor health - loss estimates/year

- \$2,949,660 labor and lost efficiency for 49,161 head of retained/down/dead stock
- 4851 (dead/down) + 5365 post mortem condemned = 10,216 head condemned
- 10,216 x \$400/head = \$4,086,400 estimated purchase price of condemned/dead
- 3,320,200 estimated pounds of meat lost to condemned/dead
- Many additional pounds lost on passed animals for injections sites, injuries, bruises

Some recommendations for this Committee to work on are:

- Upgrade veterinarian and producer practices that contribute to the spread of BLV and Johne's in dairy herds
- Disposal single use needles
- Disposal single use gloves/sleeves
- Newborn calf management
- Improved farm hygiene/sanitation
- Improved hoof/leg care for dairy cattle
- Nutrition management-plan
- Cull strategically, not as a last resort
- Improved focus on transition cow care
- Cargill Taylor Beef proactively supports producer education-BQA training-tours

Other recommendations:

- Change the focus for veterinary medical students
- Encourage meat plant food safety training and internships with FSIS
- Combine more politics with the science
- Consumer issue awareness
- Industry issue awareness
- Marketing preventative health care services/advice
- Veterinarians and state and federal agencies must reconsider which conditions should go to market.
- Is de-population advice in conflict with safe food production?
- Cargill Taylor Beef has the opportunity to work with Cornell veterinary medical students and discuss concerns.

BSE, Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD), Avian Influenza (AI) are big impacts on world economics, and they have a lot of attention. Routine health care issues have a significant regional impact and deserve more attention. Education and prevention are key factors. We need to change the focus of veterinary medicine education to more food safety concerns related to treatments; improve veterinary understanding of consumer perception; and market preventive health care to producers.

Veterinarians need to consider de-population decisions and what impact that might have on food safety.

Education and prevention locally are key: change one person at a time. We need to encourage more students to do internships with FSIS and industry in slaughter and processing plants.

The next speaker was Dr. Linda Detwiler, Adjunct Professor, University of Maryland, Food Safety Consultant, and her presentation was entitled "What Will Food Retailers Need from Food Animal Producers?" She stated that

producers need to be partners with retailers because they both are producing food. Should producers send something not safe to market? The retailers need to protect their brand and expect that safe food is being presented by producers to processors. "It takes years to build trust and minutes to lose it." 80% of pharmaceuticals have bovine components, thus they need healthy cattle at slaughter. Consumers expect retailers to make it safe, and when it's not, they become outraged.

Studies fall short that science will convince consumers to change perspective about food safety risks. The willingness to accept risk is a personal decision. Consumers have a dread factor that can affect perceptions about food or with areas that they are not familiar. "Policy based on sound science" is a statement that means different things to different people and groups. Science is a moving target that evolves and how interpreted. The issue is really the risk that someone is able to bear.

Retail can move policy changes fast and have a philosophy "fix it before it breaks."

What retailers need from producers are:

- Healthy animals at slaughter
- Animal disease detection prior to slaughter
- John's is big concern
- Good hygiene, good quality feed and traceability
- Phase out growth promoters- all major companies believe this
- Meet all regulatory requirements
- Animals free of abscesses, metal hazards, pesticides, residues
- Traceability to farm- very important
 - McDonalds is paying producers for ID for traceability to farm of origin
- Proper vet care
- Humane treatment, on-farm audits, transportation and slaughter

In the future there should be more food safety and QAP certification with incentives to report problems before they get into food. Audits of farms will take place especially for producers selling animals for products to sensitive populations (children, elderly, immuno-compromised, etc.). There will be more designated farms, cooperatives, and vertical management systems so the retailers will have more control of what is produced. Producers will accept more consumer concerns as their responsibility and make changes in production practices. If they retailers can't get what they need, they will pull out of the market and spec out to another firm or country. We may expect production agriculture to be more socially and environmentally savvy in the future than currently practiced.

Dr Sam Holland, State Veterinarian, South Dakota, next presented "A State Program for Slaughter Cattle Certification." Implementing Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) in 1996 has not had a significant ripple effect to the point of procurement. However, a branded certified program was determined to be a good plan for the state that would enhance exporting quality cattle to feedlots. For verification of age, quality, welfare, safety, etc., a third party system is needed for integrity of the program.

An advisory group was formed first for the South Dakota branded, verified product that provides a seal of confidence. Producers must be state licensed, and cattle born and raised and processed in South Dakota. RFID is required. Processors must be licensed by the state. A specific manual is used by processors and they must collect data and report carcass information back to producers. Training and annual continuing education is required for all participants. At least 10% of producers are audited annually. Each processor is audited yearly. Currently there are 5 processors licensed. There are 1800 trained producers and 750 currently maintain certification. This HACCP-like approach includes a recognized symbol of confidence, verifiable comprehensive program with records and training. The producers must have a Veterinary Client Patient Relationship (VCPR) for the third party verification and a critical management plan.

To get the vast majority of producers involved in QAPs or certified programs, there needs to be incentives or disincentives. Verification has more benefits at market to some buyers, but there is very little packer incentive for producers. There is also little incentive from regulatory agencies to encourage animal production food safety. FSIS has provided some funding for this State program development.

USAHA and regulatory agencies need to recommend these programs as good practices and announce to public what is expected of producers. Regulatory agencies could provide some uniform, basic on-farm food safety principles that would be helpful. Perhaps this Committee could revisit the draft USAHA uniform preharvest food safety draft practices previously developed. Third party verification is essential. However, participation seems to

be dwindling in verified QAPs with food safety included. Food safety and verified QAPs are an example of a good thing and it needs to be promoted widely.

Dr. Bob Smith, Chair Cattle Health and Well Being Committee, National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA) discussed the industry QAP perspective. The BQA programs included:

- Residue avoidance
- Quality management
 - injection sites
 - bruising
 - timely marketing
 - parasite control
 - genetic selection
- Cattle care and handling

Currently work is being done on a trucker question and answers program.

Farm and ranch audits: Are they necessary? Effective? Logistics? Voluntary?

Pros: validation of management practices, increased consumer confidence, attractive to some export markets.

Cons: over 1 million beef producers and the question how can they all be covered by auditors? About 28% have 49 or less cattle. How many auditors would that take and at what cost?

The average income is \$23,000-25,000 gross income for typical cow/calf farm. Small farms do not always equate to better welfare. To see how the operation actually cares for cattle year round would be very difficult. So, would auditing be effective or "feel good?" Are there workable interventions that can be used after the audit? Research so far indicates that there are no microbial foodborne hazard interventions for producers.

The industry approach is:

- Develop Care and Handling Guidelines
- Industry – wide training and education
- Develop checklist for producers

The BQA has a producer checklist on BQA points, and many educational publications that are delivered throughout state programs. The BQA show producers problems in cattle that they can prevent. The beef industry follows-up on signs of neglect or abuse as a commitment of that industry. Most large beef producers and feedlots utilize health and nutrition consultants. Can a practicing veterinarian serve as an auditor? They are well trained and this role is similar to what accredited veterinarians do.

The BQA Advisory Board consists of state coordinators, beef and dairy producers, veterinarians, nutritionists, beef council representatives, extension specialists, etc. who come together annually for information updates and planning. There has been a significant reduction of residues and injection site damage as a result of BQA education.

It is critical to have owner-manager buy-in to make BQA programs work. We must ensure new employee training, refresher training, and overall training and education programs, not just audits. Animal ID is coming and marketing programs will capture the advantages of source/process verification.

Are there incentives for the BQA? Niche markets and price premiums could be incentives for BQA. Government will not subsidize QAPs. Marketing programs can capture the advantages of source/process verification.

Summary: the BQA has a good track record for voluntary, educational programs working.

Dr. Ernest Hovingh, Extension Veterinarian, Penn State University presented the Dairy Quality Assurance (DQA) programs. He explained that milk product quality and residue safety have been monitored by states for many years and the milk products marketed are good and safe. Producers know that they are being regulated and checked, so they comply with regulations. There are many non-regulatory DQA programs that include animal health, milk and meat quality and safety. One issue currently being discussed is offering Continuing Education credits for veterinarians who attend DQA meetings. The Northeast has a Regional Dairy Quality Management Association (RDQMA), and they meet regularly to update educational modules and promote dairy QAPs. They have some USDA, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) research funding to do epidemiological studies of infectious and zoonotic diseases on dairies. They are taking and saving samples for retrospective studies of manure, blood, milk and environment. We need to demonstrate that the DQA improves profitability of the farm. Currently a HACCP-like risk assessment approach is being taken by the RDQMA program and they are developing core best management practices. Animal welfare audits are available, but many producers are not taking advantage of this. Uptake by industry for DQA is not as great as hoped. Animal/personnel/environmental health is interrelated and should be part of a QA, and veterinarians need to be part of this. Auditing could be

mandated by purchaser, but this is not happening yet. We must validate QAPs with science. Veterinarians could be one level of auditors, but there should be another level of auditors for certain brand requirements. QAP should have mandatory continuing education (CE) for implementers and auditors. Who will grant QAP certification? Extension personnel, private industry and government might possibly grant QAP certification. Veterinary awareness of DQAs needs to be improved and this can be done at meetings and in veterinary colleges. Animal ID is coming and it needs to be compatible with the currently available technology, and this will foster a keener sense of responsibility.

Dr. Liz Wagstrom, Assistant Vice President for Science and Technology, National Pork Board (NPB), discussed Level III Pork Quality Assurance (PQA). This is the only level that currently exists. All packing plants write in HACCP plan so that residues are not reasonably likely to occur because they purchase from producers and 4-Hers who are PQA certified. At first it was primarily an on-farm residue avoidance program, and today cull sows/boars are still a problem with residue and physical hazards. There are 10 Good Production Practices (GPP), but these might change in next revision. There must be a herd health program with valid VCPR. For pathogens, toxoplasma and Trichina programs are an example of on-farm control. Denmark is reevaluating their farm to table program and are now emphasizing more a table to stable approach and where are the best options for success and least cost. The PQA agrees with this and is also adding responsible antimicrobial use to the PQA. Currently there is an FSIS grant supporting a study of whether or not there are valid and practical microbiological interventions that should be added to PQA. The NPB believes that the level of bacteria on farm is not directly related to pathogens on the product. Dr. Wagstrom stated that QAP assessment is a better term than audit because in assessment there are educational opportunities that are not available with auditing. They believe that they may need to do random audit of a certain percent of producers on PQA to determine if they are following the guidelines. PQA certified is market access for producers. Veterinarians are in a unique position to become assessors. It requires experience. However, veterinarians probably should have experience in PQA to maintain assessor status. QAPs needs to be producer driven, and not by government regulations. ID and trace back are animal health issues and not food safety.

Dr. Jim Logan, private veterinary practitioner, representing the American Sheep Industry (ASI) spoke to the committee on the Sheep Quality Assurance Program (SQAP). He stated that approximately 70% of sheep are raised by 30% of the sheep producers, and vice versa. There are 48 trainers, 21 reviewers and 378 producers that have been trained at least to Level 1 of the SQAP. A herd health plan should be an integral part of an SQAP. There needs to be monitoring for compliance in:

- Farm flocks
- Ranch/range herds
- Feedlots
- Traders/dealer

To some extent, the demands of consumers and packers already make it mandatory. Until financial incentive and market value balance with added workload, producer participation will be limited. The food animal practitioner may be accepted as a third party auditor depending on training, uniformity and consistency of reviews/inspections. Shortage of food animal veterinarians is a concern. The following may be elements of QAPs and food safety:

- Mandatory continuing education
- Status may be granted by ASI, state regulatory agency, industry, or USDA.
- Mandatory renewal of QA status should be required to maintain certification
- Mandatory identification for traceability

A panel discussion of the QAP presenters followed Dr. Logan's presentation, and they entertained questions from the audience. In general, the producer organizations believe that industry-driven, voluntary QAPs are the best approach to animal production food safety. Veterinarians and other livestock experts should play a role in assessing QAPs by providing education for humane care, animal health and food safety. Auditing was seen by Dr. Wagstrom as more of a check list activity with less opportunity for producer education. A Committee member, Dr. Dale Boyle, expressed his opinion that ISO 9000 auditors do discuss issues with the client and opportunities to agree on how to achieve performance standards.

Chair Glauer re-read the mission statement and it was moved, seconded and passed to change "risk assessment" to "risk analysis:"

The purpose of the Committee on Food Safety is to serve as a focal point for consideration of issues within the USAHA, recommend food safety policies and promote resolutions that will better protect the

health and welfare of the consuming public, and to be active in all areas of risk ~~assessment~~ analysis associated with food safety issues concerning food product of mammalian and avian origin.

The Committee reviewed their 2004 Resolutions and the agency responses to these resolutions. The Committee reaffirmed Resolutions 9, 11 and 20 from 2004 and forward them to the Committee on Nominations and Resolutions.

Dr. Lyle Vogal, American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) reported that USDA and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) were moving to implement 2004 Resolution 20.

The Committee accepted as information Resolution 22 (2004) from the Committee on Foreign and Emerging Diseases.

John Adams reported that the Animal Agriculture Coalition (AAC) has been tracking CAFHSE program. Current appropriations have been reduced to one half of what the president proposed. It was moved, seconded and passed for a new resolution to expand the USDA research programs know as Collaboration in Animal Health, Food Safety and Epidemiology (CAFHSE). The resolution will be forwarded to the Committee on Nominations and Resolutions for approval by the general membership.

Dr. Robert Kahrs presented a proposed resolution supporting the Global Initiatives in Veterinary Education being sponsored by the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC). It was moved, seconded and passed to forward this resolution to the Committee on Nominations and Resolutions.

Consensus Statement

The 2005 Food Safety Committee meeting objective was an attempt to determine what a five-year forecast for food safety on the farm might look like. Over the past ten plus years beef, dairy, pork and sheep industries have developed QAP. However, these on-farm QAPs have not been widely accepted by livestock production. The committee explored the question; do current QAP meet the expectations of processors and retailers?

Quality assurance programs are principally programs of herd health, biosecurity, genetic selection, well being and record keeping. These programs are principally intended to reduce blemishes and residues and not to imply the reduction of livestock microbial loads that could be incriminated in food-borne outbreaks, with the exception of the Trichina Reduction Plan and Egg Quality Assurance Plans. Currently, the food safety inspection system of (HACCP) are plant based. In the future, processors may require some assurances that producers have instituted intervention measures prior to delivery as part of their HACCP plan. Licensed, accredited veterinarians may provide assessments of these intervention strategies. The market place has not supported these programs by providing any incentives to the producer. Presentations from the processor and retailer perspective revealed that processors and retailers may expect a safe wholesome product without additional cost. However, without some economic incentives there will be continued reluctance on the part of the producer to implement QAP. Quality assurance programs should include a systems approach to identify and prevent potential problems in food production that may affect public health. If these intervention programs are not adopted at the producer level, the processor and retailer may implement such systems to protect their investments. These programs may be market driven by processors and retailers based on the need to maintain consumer confidence even if it is only a perception of confidence. It was recommended that the committee report capture the essence of the presenters for the food safety proceedings. As specific interventions are recommended by experts in the future and incorporated in industry QAPs, the Committee on Food Safety could subsequently consider recommendations to support such programs to improve animal production and food safety. The intersection of food safety and food defense from an animal health, QAP and farm to table integrative perspective is an emerging issue that the committee may consider for next year's program.