

Risk Assessment Subcommittee Meeting May 2, 2013

Attendees

In Person: Austin Docter, Bill Dewey, Brandy Brush, Cari Franz-West, Darrell Moudry, Dave Steele, David Fyfe, Laura Wigand, Miranda Ries, Steve Bloomfield, Tom Bloomfield, Vicki Bouvier

Via tele-Conference: Ken Weigardt, Margaret Barrette, Mat Buldis

Purpose

The Risk Assessment Subcommittee met to address the following issues:

1. Check in on landings reporting to date
2. Update on risk calculations
3. Determine next steps

Meeting Notes

Landings reporting:

- Reviewed list of SSs and SPs that have not submitted data
- Updates on phone calls
- Removed SSs and SPs that do not harvest oysters in Vp control months
 - o Need to track these so know who still needs to report
- Committee members need to keep making calls and follow-up

Risk Calculation:

- Weighting multi-source illnesses:
 - o Weighted as a percent total, split evenly across implicated growing areas
 - Selected method due to time/effort trade-off and more accurate representation of risk than counting one illness for each growing area implicated
 - o More ideal to weight based on historical association/association with single-source illnesses
 - Challenging due to time and effort involved
 - Still issues with inaccurate representation
 - o Should also track by single and multi-source illness separate from each other- so there is not an implied illness from an area based solely on multi-source connections.
- Growing area vs. company
 - o Interest in individual company risk assessments by growing area
 - Independent risk assessment by company leading to exemption from closure/risk controls (if no risk associated with company)
 - Ex. If company has conducted an independent risk assessment by a qualified individual and met certain criteria, can be exempted from harvest closure
 - Need good numbers and a qualified statistician to crunch the numbers
 - Must be based on historic risk, what if illness occurs
 - o Close

- Closure dependent on intended harvest for season, so calculate maximum acceptable risk/season, if exceed that acceptable risk, closed
- Burden on small businesses?
 - Should be low, DOH would provide the formula and the illness data, company could calculate their risk easily
 - Optional exemption, not required for business (just required if operator wants to stay open during closure)
- Tiered approach for all companies operating in Vp control months and all growing areas, available exemption specific to company risk assessment
 - Acceptable risk would need to be determined, current tiered approach does not set acceptable risk
 - 1 in 100,000 is an annual state-wide risk, can't also be a per company per month per growing area risk or risk much higher, need to scale acceptable risk down to company level
 - No national guidance on setting acceptable risk level
 - Need to address Vp as a water issue and as a handling issue and then come up with appropriate solutions

Next Steps:

- Not ready for a rule change, need to start with voluntary compliance
 - Track illnesses that would have been prevented had the area been closed due to tiered controls
 - Need to continue to meet over the summer
- DOH to:
 - Provide landings update and revised landings reporting list
- Subcommittee to:
 - Continue to encourage landings reporting
 - Figure out what happens WHEN 😊 we do get the landings data-What are we going to do with it?