

VpAC Vibrio Rule Development Meeting October 15, 2013

Attendees

In Person: Adam James, Austin Docter, Bill Dewey, Brandy Brush, Cari Franz-West, Caron DeNotta, David Fyfe, Dave Steele, Hilary Browning, Jan Jacobs, Jerrod Davis, Laura Wigand, Margaret Barrette, Mark Ballo, Miranda Ries, Randy Hatch, Rick Porso, Scott Grout, Steve Bloomfield, and Tom Bloomfield

Via tele-Conference: Jared Keefer, Kathleen Nisbet Moncy, Lisa Bishop, and Teri King

Purpose

The purpose of the Vibrio parahaemolyticus Advisory Committee (VpAC) is to work with the Department of Health to provide recommendations for consideration in future rule making regarding the Vibrio control plan set forth in WAC 246-282-006. The Department of Health will draft rule language that will be provided to the State Board of Health for review. The State Board of Health has the responsibility of approving any changes or modifications to the WAC, which may or may not include recommendations put forth by the committee.

Meeting Notes

Procedural:

- Main purpose of this meeting was to review the 2013 Vibrio season
- Scheduling next meeting in January, return focus to Vibrio rule revisions

Season Review:

- Review of: 2013 illnesses, closures and TTC reductions, environmental monitoring results, initial effort to compile illness and environmental monitoring data

General Discussion/Comments:

- Need to set benchmarks, need to set acceptable risk to move forward
 - o Not setting an acceptable risk is not the same as no tolerance for illness
 - o Food safety does not typically take an acceptable risk approach, unique to FDA's shellfish program
 - o Goal is to minimize risk and minimize illnesses, we won't prevent all illnesses
 - o Under reporting is an important piece to consider
 - o Do need a sense of how illnesses, consumption patterns, production and therefore risk have changed over time—beginning to collect this information, but can't have a benchmark without it
- Tiered approach is only one piece, need a multi-angled approach
- Vibrio management should not be set in stone, need to advance and adapt based on what we learn
 - o Should have authority to do so kept at the state level, not the national level
 - o Need to know how we fit with the FDA risk calculation, a sense of where we're at
- Want to be proactive rather than reactive
- We don't know the outcome of this approach and need to test it
 - o Need to keep drilling down, collecting data

- Should be on parallel tracks: what can we do voluntarily next season and what should a draft approach look like
- Test drive approach elements, test rule approach against the data we collected this season, see what works and what may not work
- Show what this approach could look like
- Draft an approach and be ready to revise it

Next Steps:

- DOH:
 - Schedule January meeting
 - Crunch numbers with FDA risk calculator
 - Contact growers associated with single source illnesses to compile complete case data
 - Begin developing a rough draft approach to present in January
 - Schedule a joint PCSGA and DOH meeting to discuss ISSC proposals
- Industry members:
 - Review ISSC proposals, provide input to PCSGA process
 - Encourage cooperation when Hilary approaches companies for information on harvest type and conditions associated with single source illnesses