

# VpAC Vibrio Rule Development Meeting

## July 29, 2013

### Attendees

*In Person:* Adam James, Bill Dewey, Brandy Brush, Cari Franz-West, Dave Steele, Jason Ragan, Jerrod Davis, Jesse DeLoach, Ken Weigardt, Laura Wigand, Margaret Barrette, Ned Therien, Rick Porso, Scott Grout, Steve Bloomfield and Tom Bloomfield

*Via tele-Conference:* Corinne Story, Mat Buldis, Nicolette Marsden-Haug, Randy Hatch, 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:

- Reviewed working agreements
- Will schedule next meeting for October
- Likely extending rule revision process an additional year (publish CR 102 fall 2014; hearing spring 2015; rule in place May 2015)

#### Risk Assessment Subcommittee Update:

- Discussed landings reporting to date
  - o Update on request for DFW landings data, many companies do not report to DFW, but may be able to glean some additional landing information from reports
- 2011 MO says "shall" consider landings data in risk assessment, may be able to require landings data with renewal
  - o Only statute would protect data from public disclosure
- Interagency discussion needed on ongoing licensing requirements: DOH, DFW, DNR, Ecology
  - o May need to engage Shellfish Initiative and Governor's office
- If there is an illness and no landings, can use a landing of 1
  - o Yes, have done this with the data but it seems to make an already messy picture more messy, more time is needed to look at the data we have collected
  - o Coastal data is pretty complete, mostly small companies that have not reported
- Need to continue to consider risk assessment by company as well
  - o May make sense to look at it by company in the moderate-high risk tiers to see if there are issues with harvest practices by company

#### Season Update/General Discussion:

- Need greater lab capacity, more sampling
  - o Consider partnering with universities to build capacity

- Also a funding issue, may be able to leverage resources by partnering, but still need to identify and acquire the funding
- Should also collect market ready sample, not just worst case, but samples representative of harvest practices
  - Some of this work is being done by PSI and FDA studies
  - Need to do a better job communicating study results
  - Need more information on what is working to inform the rule revision

#### Tiered Approach Discussion:

- First minute:
  - Scott: we need to hit the reset button, develop a controls subcommittee, the lab capacity is a thorn in the issue and we need to talk about the FDA conversation
  - Jessie: applauds the efforts and appreciates the opportunity to participate
  - Dave: the variations in properties and practices confuses what standards can look like/makes it hard to establish general standards, need more research and sampling on what is effective and what variables matter
  - Steve: not comfortable with whether this will success, we don't want to be here in two years, we need to decide if there is a problem and come up with a logical solution
  - Tom: ditto
  - Adam: should consider the bell curve of illnesses, I'm operating as high risk—no harvest when water temps are 60 F on an outgoing tide
  - Ken: echo Steve and Tom, I haven't seen anything that will address hand picking into tubs, you can't do it in 4 hours
  - Bill: the process is on the right track, we have more to learn through research though and need to work out the details, the process is still evolving and it is challenging with a moving goal post—which the FDA just moved again and could make this process irrelevant, I'm not sure of the solution
  - Jason: we need more info but it also seems like the more we know the more confusing it gets, we thought our methods were working but are seeing illnesses although we're doing the same thing as last year, we do need to be maxing out our sampling
  - Margaret: there was excitement about this approach at the CA workshop, but it may all be for naught with the FDA's moves, we need to continue to communicate, continue to have these forums and continue the dialogue
  - Corrine: these are difficult issues, everyone operates a bit differently but we need to be outcome based, data driven, and have a population based approach, we need good landings data
- Second minute:
  - Corrine: we need to keep working on the details
  - Bill: we need to keep risk by company on the table
  - Adam: Teri is involved in a project sprinkling oysters to keep them cool, we need to share research
  - Tom: our data to date suggests really low illness numbers, shouldn't make a mountain out of a mole hill
  - Steve: individual companies need to own up to responsibility, help gather data
  - Dave: agree with Tom, but when you look at the data per company per month it doesn't look so good, risk is much higher then, a tiered approach of some kind is a good idea, we should have stricter controls at higher risk

- Scott: need to look at data by growing area, by month, by company, the goal post is being moved, we need a tiered approach but should be a validated approach by company and we need more enforcement action

#### General Discussion:

- It is important for DOH to receive info/concerns from the industry, it helps us allocate limited resources
  - Last week DOH received information and followed up, it was helpful to hear of those concerns
  - Appreciate that DOH took action in a short timeframe and was responsive
- The FDA proposal is dramatic, even unsure of outcome it likely does mean a shift in the proposed direction
  - Will we need to repeat this process, will our work be derailed
    - What we know you know, the proposals are to continue to gather information and speak to Vibrio management, develop a better calculator, and be realistic
    - 1 hour to get to 50 F is a major goal post move
  - What is happening in WA is critical to the control plan, we're ahead of other states and great weight will come to what we're doing—we're the only state with this kind of data
  - Our work, data, evidence is likely to impact the national level
- Need more data
  - We need more information on the illnesses, the practices that surround them and the environmental parameters
- With 65 F water for three weeks it won't matter if you can cool in 1 hour, the initial load is high enough to cause illness
  - It is an ever moving target, what we do will never be enough
  - If there is a problem with the water, we can't fix it with post-harvest TTC
  - So if cooling in 1 hour doesn't work, we go to closure that is the logical next step
  - We need a risk assessment, closure is not an acceptable solution
  - Need to better understand the harvest practices and variability among sites
- There is a sense at the national level that we can have a one size fits all solution, we have that and it doesn't work, it doesn't take into account harvest methods, etc
- We need to gather our data more cohesively, we're further ahead than anyone else on analyzing this stuff
- We're struggling with how to harvest in the best way, what do you do when it is warm, low afternoon tides, what are the best practices
  - We always know these conditions will lead to illnesses, but we harvest
  - Need more direct and informative advisories from DOH
  - Also an issue of scale of production
- Debate between belief that Vibrio is in the water vs. a post-harvest handling issue, some situations are just going to lead to illness, need to decide what level is acceptable and decide what level is acceptable
  - We need a reduction in illnesses, tighter controls will reduce illness, we want to be ahead of the curve
  - Need to look at company x and company y, harvest practices, animal health
  - Illnesses will happen, but we want there to be less, no one wants to make people sick
- Need more information on the FDA studies
  - Research should be consistent with harvest practices
  - FDA study in WA is, need more info on the other studies and a timeline on results

- Should also look at other data sources and trends—example Eyes over Puget Sound
- We know hot weather, low mid-day tides are an issue, how does it go into rule, how do you enforce the rule
  - o We're doing a better job this year identifying conditions and situations that surround illnesses
  - o Need to remember that the illness data is not statistically robust, zero illnesses from an area is not necessarily accurate, underreporting is an important factor to consider
- We need a Vibrio clearinghouse, a one stop shop for publications, information, we need a way to share data and ideas, know about the illness info and environmental conditions, need to use social media
  - o Need a factsheet for growers on Vibrio—many growers don't know Vibrio stops growing at 50 F, should share information on Vibrio growth and behavior
  - o There is a difference between bad practices and best management practices, need to let folks know when their behavior is riskier than necessary

Next Steps:

- DOH:
  - o Schedule October meeting
  - o Send DJ Mccoubrey's email address: [DorothyJean.Mccoubrey@fda.hhs.gov](mailto:DorothyJean.Mccoubrey@fda.hhs.gov)
  - o Organize a teleconference with FDA about the ISSC proposals
- Dave to re-request data (provided by year) from DFW, revise to reflect landings report information (ex. remove gallons), and submit to DOH for inclusion in risk assessment