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Comparing Characteristics of Sporadic and Outbreak-Associated Foodborne Illnesses, United States, 2004–2011

Abstract
Outbreak data have been used to estimate the proportion of illnesses attributable to different foods. Applying outbreak-based attribution estimates to nonoutbreak foodborne illnesses requires an assumption of similar exposure pathways for outbreak and sporadic illnesses. This assumption cannot be tested, but other comparisons can assess its veracity. Our study compares demographic, clinical, temporal, and geographic characteristics of outbreak and sporadic illnesses from Campylobacter, Escherichia coli O157, Listeria, and Salmonella bacteria ascertained by the Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet). Differences among FoodNet sites in outbreak and sporadic illnesses might reflect differences in surveillance practices. For Campylobacter, Listeria, and Escherichia coli O157, outbreak and sporadic illnesses are similar for severity, sex, and age. For Salmonella, outbreak and sporadic illnesses are similar for severity and sex. Nevertheless, the percentage of outbreak illnesses in the youngest age category was lower. Therefore, we do not reject the assumption that outbreak and sporadic illnesses are similar.

Authors: Eric D. Ebel, Michael S. Williams, Dana Cole, Curtis C. Travis, Karl C. Klontz, Neal J. Golden, and Robert M. Hoekstra

Number of outbreak cases versus sporadic cases and outbreak fraction, FoodNet data, United States, 2004–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Outbreak cases</th>
<th>Sporadic cases</th>
<th>Outbreak fraction, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campylobacter</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>42,744</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escherichia coli O157</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeria</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>50,690</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE RESOURCES:
NAFV is following these proposed congressional bills. Please take a few moments to read about them. Please express your comments to your congressman on these bills:
1. [http://tinyurl.com/zn4zj5s](http://tinyurl.com/zn4zj5s)
2. [http://tinyurl.com/gqgcq9tt](http://tinyurl.com/gqgcq9tt)
3. [http://tinyurl.com/zdskuqc](http://tinyurl.com/zdskuqc)

[https://www.usa.gov/elected-officials](https://www.usa.gov/elected-officials)
Recent NAFV Activities

By Michael J. Gilsdorf, DVM

I was fortunate to visit with federal veterinarians in Colorado at several different events recently. I attended a portion of the FSIS Denver District Frontline Supervisor (FLS) meeting and got to meet all the FLS’s, along with the District management staff and Dr. Keith Gilmore, the Executive Associate over Districts: Alameda, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, and Des Moines.

I was pleased to hear about issues they are involved with and I provided an overview of federal veterinary activities that NAFV is working on. These include recent proposed congressional bills that we are following and will be working with coalitions to take action on: to reduce the amount of paid leave that federal employees accrue by reducing within-grade step increases and takes away their “automatic” nature; to require most federal employees to contribute more to their retirement benefits; to require new federal hires and employees to pay more for their retirement benefits; to require federal employees to pay more of their health care costs under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; extend the probationary period for most new government hires from one year to three years; curtail the appeals process for employees who are fired; eliminate the FEHBP government contribution for retiree health benefits for new hires.

Sen. Heidi Heitkamp, N.D has introduced a bill called the Flexible Hiring and Improving Recruitment, Retention, and Education Act, which would increase agencies’ direct hiring authority, approve special pay rates for hard-to-fill positions and allow agencies to take geographic challenges into account when offering relocation and retention bonuses. We have requested a meeting with the Senator to learn more about her bill. See the Notice Section on the bottom of Pg 1 of the newsletter for info on how to contact your congressman to express your opinion on these bills.

I also met with Dr. Beckett and Dr. Francisco with the Colorado VS District office to discuss program activities in that office including “One Health” and tribal liaison efforts. I provided another update on NAFV activities to federal veterinarians located in Ft Collins. Participants included APHIS and Department of Interior/Fish and Wildlife Service (DOI/FWS) veterinarians. I learned that there are 15 veterinarians employed at the FWS. We plan to have an article on their duties in a future newsletter.

I discussed some of the current issues and recommendations we have gathered for our next consultation with APHIS and for our next Intra-Management meeting with FSIS. We are finalizing these issues now with our NAFV Coordinators. If you have issues of concern and recommendations, please let us know ASAP.

I attended a work conference for the Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) veterinarians. One of their current efforts is updating the Animal Product manual especially for “Regulated Garbage”. The AQI veterinarians are Subject Matter Experts on imported animal products and that includes international garbage from airplanes and ships which can contain trans-boundary diseases and pests. They have two veterinarians who have joined the group in the past six months and will be advertising.

(Continued on Pg. 3, “EVP Column”)
Dr. B.T. Simms was born in Corvallis, OR to B.T. Simms, Sr. and Lillian Lalonde Simms on June 12, 1923. He moved to Auburn, AL, in 1937 and graduated from Auburn High School in 1941 where he was on the football team and was ranked as the top men’s singles tennis player in Alabama. He served stateside in the U.S. Army and then in the Merchant Marines. In 1947 he married his high school sweetheart, Mittie Jones, and they were married 66 years. He graduated from Auburn University with a Doctorate of Veterinary Medicine in 1950 and taught at Oklahoma State until 1952. He then moved to Pontotoc where he lived for 64 years. He had a veterinary practice for 14 years and then worked as an Inspector in Charge for the USDA until he retired.

"Doc" engaged in many community service activities. He served on the board of the Pontotoc Library, the Pontotoc Beautification Committee, and the Historical Society. He collected aluminum cans and donated the proceeds from the cans to a Christian youth program in Pontotoc County. He donated 750,000 can tabs to St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital in Memphis to fund chemo treatments for children. He also donated fish and funds to the New Hope Pentecostal Church and McDonald Methodist Church.

In 2006 the Senior Center building was named the B.T. Simms, Jr. Community Center. With the help of his fishing buddies, Doc furnished the bream for a monthly fish fry for 20 years at the Simms Center. He was also named the Mississippi Outstanding Senior of the Year in 1993 by the Joint Conference on Aging, and received the Mississippi Older American Award in 2009.

Note from Bill Hughes: I spent many great days with Tom, as B.T. was known, fishing in the ponds and lakes in Northern Mississippi. He always knew where and how to fish and counted every fish caught. I was able to take home an ice chest full of bream fillets each trip. He consulted with landowners and the Mississippi Department of Natural Resources on improving and managing fisheries.

Spending so much time in a small boat, I was able to know him well. He was a generous person, always willing to help out others. He was a strong proponent of NAFV and federal veterinarians, and he is missed by everyone with whom he crossed paths.

B.T. was named after his father who was also known as B.T. Simms. The senior Simms was the former Chief of Bureau of Animal Industry (BAI) for the United States Department of Agriculture. In 1949, Simms senior wrote an article on the activities of the BAI describing the important work of the Bureau at that time. He emphasized the work that veterinarians were doing and stated, “The Bureau of Animal Industry is constantly in need of more well-trained veterinary personnel.” He had a significant role in improving animal health programs in the BAI.
Background
Feral swine are the same species, Sus scrofa, as pigs that are found on farms. Feral swine are descendants of escaped or released pigs. Feral swine are called by many names including; wild boar, wild hog, razorback, piney woods rooter, and Russian or Eurasian boar. No matter the name they are a dangerous, destructive, invasive species.

History of feral swine in the Americas
Feral swine are not native to the Americas. They were first brought to the United States in the 1500s by early explorers and settlers as a source of food. Free-range livestock management practices and escapes from enclosures led to the first establishment of feral swine populations within the United States. In the 1900s, the Eurasian or Russian wild boar was introduced into parts of the United States for the purpose of sport hunting. Today, feral swine are a combination of escaped domestic pigs, Eurasian wild boars, and hybrids of the two.

Feral swine have been reported in at least 35 states. Their population is estimated at over 6 million and is rapidly expanding. Range expansion over the last few decades is due to a variety of factors including their adaptability to a variety of climates and conditions, translocation by humans, and a lack of natural predators.

Identification
Feral swine often look very similar to domestic hogs, but are generally thinner with thicker hides of coarse bristly hair and longer tusks. Because of their extensive crossbreeding, feral swine vary in color and coat pattern, including combinations of white, black, brown, and red. Feral swine should not be confused with the collared peccary (javelina), a native pig-like mammal of the American Southwest which is generally much smaller than feral swine (15-25 lbs.), and silver-grey to black in color with a defined lighter colored collar.

Adult feral swine weigh between 75 and 250 pounds on average, but some can get twice as large. This invasive species can reach 3 feet in height and 5 feet in length. Males (boars) are larger than females (sows).

Feral swine can breed year-round and can have up to two litters of 4 to 12 piglets per year. Since they become sexually mature at 6 to 8 months of age, feral swine populations have the potential to double in size in four months, which is why population management is so important.

Feral swine generally travel in family groups, called sounders, composed of two or more adult sows and their young. Sounders can vary in size, including a few individuals to as many as 30 members. Adult boars usually live alone or in bachelor groups, only joining a sounder to breed.

Damage
Feral swine cause major damage to property, agriculture (crops and livestock), native species and ecosystems, and cultural and historic resources. In fact, this invasive species costs the United States an estimated $1.5 billion each year in damages and control costs. Feral swine also threaten the health of people, wildlife, pets, and other domestic animals. As feral swine populations continue to expand across the country, these damages, costs, and risks will only keep rising.

Control
USDA, APHIS, Wildlife Services (WS) wildlife biologists and field specialists reduce feral swine damage by providing technical assistance to landowners and landmanagers or conducting direct operational management activities to eliminate or alleviate the damage, upon request.

The most successful feral swine damage management strategies employ a diversity of tactics in a comprehensive, integrated approach. Nonlethal management techniques can be effective for limiting disease transmission, crop damage, and livestock loss. How-
however, lethal techniques may be a more effective means for limiting population growth and achieving long-term suppression of damage. APHIS has developed the following objectives with regard to feral swine damage management:

- Stabilize and eventually reduce the range and size of feral swine populations in the United States and territories in accordance with management objectives of states, territories and tribes.
- Further develop cooperative partnerships with other pertinent federal, state, territorial, tribal, and local agencies, and private organizations working to reduce impacts of feral swine to agriculture, natural resources, property, animal health, and human health.
- Expand feral swine management programs nationwide to protect agriculture, natural resources, property, animal health, and human health.
- Monitor feral swine for pathogens that affect domestic swine, other livestock, and human health.
- Develop and improve tools and methods to manage feral swine populations, including field tests to assess the efficacy for reducing risks to agriculture, natural resources, property, animal health, and human health.
- Develop predictive models for population expansion and economic impacts of feral swine, along with risk analyses to agriculture, animal health, and human health.
- Develop outreach materials and activities to educate the public about feral swine damage and related activities to prevent or reduce damage.
- Coordinate with Canada and Mexico to establish a collaborative plan to address the feral swine threat along the common borders, including monitoring, research and operational responses as appropriate.

_original article can be found at: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/resources/pests-diseases/feral-swine/sa-fs-history

---

**GENERAL COUNSEL’S COLUMN**

William G. Hughes, Esq.

The Hatch Act: Caution on Political activity

This is the second in an intermittent series aimed at helping to avoid common problems in federal employment. Because of this being an election year, I have been asked to expound further on the implications of the 1939 Hatch Act, more accurately called “An Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities”.

The previous column addressed briefly problems with improper political activity in official communications such as emails, the internet, and other communications. In that column it was pointed out that allegations of Hatch Act violations are not handled by employing agencies, but by the Office of Special Counsel of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and that the automatic penalty is removal unless extremely extenuating circumstances are proven, a difficult proposition. Then the penalty is reduced to a thirty day suspension. There is no other option.

A proper explanation of the restrictions and permissible activities would be very lengthy and complicated, so everyone is urged to Google Hatch Act and to click on Wikipedia. That provides an excellent explanation and overview.

Keep in mind that there is no room for errors. Agency ethics officers can also be requested to provide an opinion if something is not clear.

If you would like some more information on the Hatch Act, you can start by checking: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hatch_Act_of_1939
Effect of Simulated Sanitizer Carryover on Recovery of Salmonella from Broiler Carcass Rinsates

Source: The National Center for Biotechnology Information
Authors: Gamble GR, Berrang ME, Buhr RJ, Hinton A Jr, Bourassa DV, Johnston JJ, Ingram KD, Adams ES, Feldner PW

Abstract
Numerous antimicrobial chemicals are currently utilized as processing aids with the aim of reducing pathogenic bacteria on processed poultry carcasses. Carryover of active sanitizer to a carcass rinse solution intended for recovery of viable pathogenic bacteria by regulatory agencies may cause false-negative results. This study was conducted to document the potential carryover effect of five sanitizing chemicals commonly used as poultry processing aids for broilers in a postchill dip. The effect of postdip drip time on the volume of sanitizer solution carryover was first determined by regression of data obtained from 10 carcasses. The five sanitizer solutions were diluted with buffered peptone water at 0-, 1-, and 5-min drip time equivalent volumes as determined by the regression analysis. These solutions were then spiked to 10(5) CFU/ml with a mixture of five nalidixic acid-resistant Salmonella enterica serovars, stored at 4°C for 24 h, and finally enumerated by plate count on brilliant green sulfa agar containing nalidixic acid. At the 0- and 1-min drip time equivalents, no Salmonella recovery was observed in three of the five sanitizers studied. At the 5-min drip time equivalent, one of these sanitizers still exhibited significant (P ≤ 0.05) bactericidal activity. These findings potentially indicate that the currently utilized protocol for the recovery of Salmonella bacteria from postchill sanitizer interventions may lead to false-negative results due to sanitizer carryover into the carcass rinsate.

The Honorable Thomas J. Vilsack
Secretary of Agriculture
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Dear Secretary Vilsack,

We write today to ask for an update of what steps the Department is taking to ensure its pathogen testing protocols adequately protect public health. We are concerned that recent scientific findings suggest some processing techniques may interfere with or invalidate pathogen testing results.

A recent article published by the Agricultural Research Service entitled, “Effect of Simulated Sanitizer Carryover on Recovery of Salmonella from Broiler Carcass Rinsates,” suggests the agency’s testing procedures for Salmonella may be affected by the use of chemicals by processing plants. The article found that three antimicrobial sanitizers commonly used to reduce pathogens on poultry carcasses may cause false-negative results. According to the article, one of the compounds continued to skew test results even after it was allowed to drain for a full five minutes before testing. Given the diversity of processing plants and pathogen testing locations, this research suggests the Department’s Salmonella testing results may be underestimating the presence of this pathogen.

Testing for Salmonella plays a critical role in the Department’s inspection program, the new poultry pathogen standards for which we advocated, and the Department’s Salmonella Action Plan. Therefore it is our view the Department must work to ensure that the use of chemical sprays and dips do not create false negative test results in order to protect the safety of the food supply and the public’s health.

Given these issues, we would ask the Department to respond to the following questions:

1. What actions does the Department plan to take in response to the recent findings by the Agricultural Research Service? How does the Department plan to ensure that its pathogen testing procedures ensure that results are accurate and consistent across all processing plants?
2. How many poultry processing facilities currently use one of the three chemicals identified in the article as potentially causing false negatives?
3. It is our understanding that Agricultural Research Services will begin using a new testing solution that the agency believes will prevent false negative readings. How effective is this new solution in preventing false negatives under the ARS study conditions?
4. How will the Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) verify that the new buffering solution adequately addresses the potential for false negative results?

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Kirsten Gillibrand and Dianne Feinstein, United States Senators;
and Rosa L. DeLauro and Louise M. Slaughter, Members of Congress
By Kerry Grens | January 1, 2015

We’ve all been eating food enhanced by the genome-editing tool for years.

Two years ago, a genome-editing tool referred to as CRISPR (clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats) burst onto the scene and swept through laboratories faster than you can say “adaptive immunity.”

But life scientists weren’t the first to get hip to CRISPR’s potential. For nearly a decade, cheese and yogurt makers have been relying on CRISPR to produce starter cultures that are better able to fend off bacteriophage attacks. “It’s a very efficient way to get rid of viruses for bacteria,” says Martin Kullen, the global R&D technology leader of Health and Protection at DuPont Nutrition & Health.

“CRISPR’s been an important part of our solution to avoid food waste.”

In the early 2000s, Philippe Horvath and Rodolphe Barrangou of Danisco (later acquired by DuPont) and their colleagues were first introduced to CRISPR while sequencing *Streptococcus thermophilus*, a workhorse of yogurt and cheese production. As his group sequenced different strains of the bacteria, they began to realize that CRISPR might be related to phage infection and subsequent immune defense. “That was an eye-opening moment when we first thought of the link between CRISPR sequencing content and phage resistance,” says Barrangou, who joined the faculty of North Carolina State University in 2013.

Within a couple of years the team concluded that CRISPR sequences indeed confer phage resistance (Science, 315:1709-12, 2007). The bacterial genome integrates a sequence of the viral genome, called a spacer, upon infection; that sequence later serves as a guide for destroying any matching DNA, so that subsequent viral infections are fended off. Bacteria use this system naturally, but the scientists wanted to harness it to immunize cultures.

Essentially the dairy culture developers expose select bacteria to particular viruses and collect the bacterial strains that manage to survive attack. Such an approach—challenging a bacterial population with phages and selecting for resistant cells—is nothing new. But DuPont’s spin on it is to identify whether the bacteria have acquired new CRISPR spacers.

After isolating those “CRISPRized” cells, the food scientists grow up a new culture and repeat, challenging the resistant strains over and over again with phage to increase the breadth of the CRISPR-encoded resistance. Already, DuPont has 6,000 phages in its collection to immunize bacteria.

In 2012 DuPont announced the first commercial application of CRISPR-enhanced cultures for making pizza cheese.

There are a number of other ways to create phage-resistant strains. For instance, isolating naturally occurring bacterial mutants that prevent phages from binding to cell surface receptors is a particularly robust approach. We haven’t seen any phages that can overcome this resistance.

It’s important to note that all the genetic modification to generate phage resistance is done by good old-fashion biology, and not by recombinant DNA technology. Barrangou calls the CRISPR-enhanced dairy cultures “non-GMO genetically modified organisms.” It’s not a lack of know-how or even of desire—customizing bacterial genomes could really ramp up immunity or provide any number of desirable traits in crops or livestock—but rather a general public distaste for GMO that keeps CRISPR, in the genome-editing sense, off the plate in the food sciences.

(edited for length)

Reprinted with permission of The Scientist. The original article appeared in the January 2015 issue and can be accessed online at http://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/41676/title/There’s-CRISPR-in-Your-Yogurt/
Claude E. Barton, DVM
Nashville, TN

Age 87, born December 4, 1928, to Nancy Ruth and Claud Barton in Andalusia, AL, passed from this earthly life on May 14, 2016. He was affectionately known by many nicknames, including Bart, Dad, Papaw, Poppy, Doc, Dude, and Uncle Ellry. His most important description was Christian, trusting in Jesus Christ as his Savior, and serving Him as an active member of Hillcrest United Methodist Church for over 50 years. He is survived by his loving wife of 63 years, Barbara Ann Johnson Barton; daughters, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews.

After graduating from Auburn University in 1952, Dr. Barton served in the U.S. Air Force until 1955, including a year in Germany during the Korean War, and served in the Air Force Reserves and Air National Guard until 1988. The majority of his career in veterinary medicine was dedicated to the eradication of brucellosis from domestic livestock. During the course of his career with the USDA, he traveled to over a dozen countries to conduct training seminars in establishing Brucellosis Eradication Programs.

As an epidemiologist Claude helped eradicate brucellosis from Tennessee and then in the entire country by conducting numerous brucellosis state reviews throughout the nation (and in other countries). In 1989, he helped implement the Rapid Completion Plan for brucellosis. In 1997, he helped implement the Brucellosis Emergency Action Plan which emphasized affected herd depopulation. Tennessee was recognized brucellosis-free on February 28, 1997. He retired from USDA/APHIS/VS in 1999.

There were 42 states recognized as brucellosis-free at that time. Claude was a good friend and mentor to most all the brucellosis epidemiologists in the United States over the past several decades. He also served as the leader of the National Brucellosis Eradication Program for several years in the 90’s prior to his retirement and was affectionately referred to as the ‘Brucellosis Czar’. Claude was an excellent speaker and author/editor. He authored many brucellosis articles and training courses.

Have you moved recently? Perhaps you’ve changed jobs, or email addresses?
Make sure you keep your NAFV account up to date. With any changes or updated, please contact mbarros@nafv.org!
July 1, 2016

I have taken time to review some of the achievements of the National Association of Federal Veterinarians (NAFV) and I think they are doing a great job. Even though Dr. Michael Gilsdorf (EVP) says more still remains to be done, I think they have already achieved much for the Federal Veterinarian. I want to seize this opportunity to appreciate them for these hard-earned achievements.

Looking through the list of achievements, one item particularly captured my attention (item 22.d); NAFV’s input towards the wildlife/zoo veterinary medicine act. Even though I work for FSIS now, I served as a Zoo-Veterinarian in the past and have some experience with a few zoo veterinarians at UC Davis. I am also aware that there are federal zoo veterinarians working for the Smithsonian at the National Zoo in Washington, DC. I worked briefly at the Micke Grove Zoo in Lodi, California. I found out that a graduate veterinarian is expected to go through a 3-year residency program before they can be allowed to practice zoo medicine; yet their salary is not much different and sometimes less than that of a companion animal practitioner. I am not working in wildlife now, but I know a couple of zoo veterinarians around the world have lost their lives while on the job. I strongly support any dialogue that is geared towards better compensation for these wildlife veterinarians as well as federal veterinarians. This will not only be beneficial to the zoo veterinarian, but will also help in preventing the extinction of certain species.

When renowned animal behaviorist, Dr. Sophia Ying of UC Davis died in September 2014, unverified sources thought that the highest rate of suicide in the U.S. was recorded in the veterinary profession. Dr. Gilsdorf said that NAFV is looking into “wellness” issues for federal veterinarians. This is an area of interest to me.

I am also interested in the drive for new membership within our area. If all federal veterinarians took the time to read through the achievements of the NAFV, they would realize the importance of being a member and strengthening the Association’s efforts. I was discussing some of these achievements with a veterinary colleague recently and even though he has been with the federal government longer than I, he was surprised and unaware of the past accomplishments and the issues that NAFV is working on now.

Dr. Suh Niba
SPHV/USDA-FSIS
Alameda District

Pictured: Dr. Michael Gilsdorf (L), and Dr. Suh Niba (R)

The NAFV has also worked hard to realize better compensation for federal veterinarians. One of the issues that came up during the last NAFV chapter meeting in Modesto was the locality pay which Californians in the Valley area are requesting. As a chapter, we are all writing our congress members requesting that they support locality pay for the valley.

---

INFORM: Secure Beef Supply Plan and Website

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service sent this bulletin at 07/01/2016 10:28 AM EDT

The Center for Food Security and Public Health at Iowa State University (ISU) is excited to share the new www.securebeef.org website and other available resources. USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) provided funding for this project. APHIS and ISU encourage you to explore the new website and check back in as new information will be added over time.

The SBS Plan is a science- and risk-based plan, intended to:
1. maintain business continuity for the beef industry in the event of a foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) outbreak in the United States,
2. minimize disease spread, and
3. provide a continuous supply of beef products to consumers.

Components of the plan include biosecurity, surveillance, data management, managed movement, and management of infected premises. The SBS plan is a voluntary plan—developed together by industry, state and federal animal health officials, and Iowa State and Kansas State universities.
FSIS and the AVMA Need the NAFV

By Dr. Larry Davis, FSIS, Current NAFV President-Elect

If anyone has received an e-mail from NAFV Executive Vice President, Dr. Michael Gilsdorf, you know his signature has the following statement: “NAFV is an effective advocate for member veterinarians in federal service. NAFV emphasizes professionalism and expertise in federal service and promotes continuing education, teamwork, and a standard of excellence. NAFV is the recognized representative organization for veterinarians employed by the federal government. If you are a federal veterinarian and are not a member, you should be. Join NAFV.” Not only does the NAFV advocate for “you” on Capitol Hill and at the Administration level, but also supports the image of service provided by federal veterinarians within the AVMA.

In January 2015, the AVMA was getting ready to release its GUIDELINES FOR THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF LIVESTOCK. Executive Vice President, Michael Gilsdorf, realized that the NAFV had not been solicited by the AVMA to contribute a voting member from FSIS on the “Panel on Humane Slaughter” to help draft the guidelines to ensure that regulatory information was accurate, and the efforts of FSIS veterinarians were accurately described. President Elect, Dr. Larry Davis, formed a team of veterinarians to review the draft. Team members consisted of Dr. William James, former Executive Associate of Regulatory Operations, Dr. Sallee Dixon, former Humane Handling Enforcement Coordinator, Dr. Lucy Anthenill, former Humane Handling Enforcement Coordinator, Dr. Ashley Etue, former District Veterinary Medical Specialist, and Dr. Larry Davis, former Humane Handling Enforcement Coordinator. The veterinarians on the NAFV review team had significant concerns with the draft document. The team felt the draft document contained significant technical inaccuracies and unfairly maligned all federal employees working for FSIS, and as federal veterinarians we needed to step in to set the record straight. At NAFV’s urging that it would not be good for the public to see two veterinary associations arguing over the GUIDELINES, the AVMA agreed by allowing NAFV to present its edits to the draft. Our extensive changes required the release of the GUIDELINES FOR THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF LIVESTOCK to be delayed by a year.

The draft stated that the “Panel on Humane Slaughter” developed the Guidelines for use by members of the veterinary profession who carry out or oversee the humane slaughter of hoofstock, poultry, rabbits, alligators, and fish. The NAFV reminded the AVMA that members of the veterinary profession who are employed by FSIS and state agencies will follow the statutes, regulations, and FSIS policies associated with the humane handling and slaughter of livestock in federal and state plants; therefore, these guidelines were not developed for FSIS and State agency veterinarians as we will follow FSIS statutes and regulations. The draft not only co-mingled regulatory history with the personal experiences of experts on the panel, it also co-mingled regulatory requirements with best practices by industry to the point that it was confusing to the reader as to what were actually regulatory requirements and what were best practices recommended by this new AVMA guidance. NAFV was concerned that the new AVMA guidelines would encourage its members to not follow the statutes. In some instances, the new AVMA guidance appeared to be a “soapbox” for complaints that poorly described FSIS methodology. It was apparent that some members of the “Panel on Humane Slaughter” did not like how FSIS handles humane handling violations. I am happy to report that after the NAFV review team submitted their comments to the “Panel on Humane Slaughter”, many changes were made to the GUIDELINES FOR THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF LIVESTOCK. The NAFV review team has found the changes acceptable.

NAFV is the organization that actively advocates for the “Federal Veterinarian” whether it is in the headquarters of federal agencies, AVMA headquarters, or other outside entities. We need to continue to make our voices heard. This can only be accomplished through active membership by all federal veterinarians joining NAFV, and volunteerism within the vast number of AVMA councils. We need to help ourselves by becoming more active and advocating for ourselves, and proudly proclaim: “Federal Veterinarians Protect and Improve Public and Animal Health and Welfare”.

We are still accepting nominations for the NAFV Unsung Veterinary Excellence Award.

Nomination form can be found on our website under the Awards Section.

With any questions, please contact nafv@nafv.org.

Nominations are due 09/01/2016.
Dr. James Edwin Pearson, 82, died Sunday, April 3, 2016, in Des Moines, IA following an extended battle with Alzheimer’s. He leaves his wife of 42 years, Patricia Pearson; his children, Sharon Litchfield, Mark Pearson and Beth Coronelli; step children, Cindy Horn, Dave Johnson and Amy Keng; as well as 14 grandchildren, and 11 great-grandchildren.

Born in Springville, he was the son of Ralph and Bertha Pearson. Dr. Pearson attended Iowa State University. After graduating with a degree in agriculture, he joined the U.S. Air Force and served as a navigator and radar intercept officer flying in jet fighters. He later became involved in the Iowa National Guard, where he served until 1984, retiring as a lieutenant colonel.

After his early service in the military, he returned to his family farm for a short time before attending Iowa State, where he graduated with a degree in veterinary medicine, and later went on to earn a master’s degree. After graduation, he worked in a veterinary practice in Fort Madison for several years. In 1968, Dr. Pearson started his federal career as a research virologist at the National Animal Disease Center in Ames.

He then went on to serve for three decades at the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s National Veterinary Services Laboratory (NVSL), also in Ames. In 1970, he became head of the avian, equine and ovine viruses section. He worked there until 1987, when he was named chief of the Diagnostic Virology Laboratory. He served as the director of NVSL from the mid to late-1990s. After retiring, he and his wife, Pat, moved to Paris, where he worked with World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), which focuses on the research, surveillance and control of animal diseases around the world. He headed the OIE Scientific and Technical Department and served as vice president of the OIE Standards Commission.

Dr. Pearson was truly committed and immersed himself in his work to safeguard animals against disease. With his focus on diagnosing diseases, he provided support for the Department of Agriculture’s and international animal health efforts. He was widely recognized for his work, including as a world’s foremost authority on the diagnosis of the bird virus, Newcastle. He was recognized with 11 USDA awards, was presented the E.P. pope Award for Excellence by the American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, and was a recipient of the Iowa State University College of Veterinary Medicine Stange Award for Meritorious Service, the college’s highest honor for alumni. He also co-authored more than 115 publications.

Dr. Pearson was active in the Ames community and enjoyed leisure time with family and friends at Lake Panorama in Panora. He was a longtime member of the Ames Kiwanis Club and, with his wife, was active at Collegiate United Methodist Church.

Dr. Pearson became an active member of the NAFV in 1970. He continued to be a member throughout his career in the USDA, and then became an Associate member upon retirement. He eventually reached Honorary Member status. NAFV members are encouraged to make a donation to the NAFV Memorial Scholarship fund in honor of Dr. Pearson. With any questions, please contact nafv@nafv.org.

Note by Dr. Gilsdorf: Dr. Pearson was a good friend to many people in Veterinary Services. I worked with him at the National Veterinary Services Laboratory in Ames Iowa (NVSL) when I was the Head of Animal Resources there in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s. I also worked with him on the avian influenza outbreak in 1983 and when he was stationed in Europe in the late 1980’s. He, his wife and I spent time together in Europe when I was there on a detail assignment. He was a very pleasant person and I enjoyed working with him. He was very knowledgeable and practical. He was a credit to the veterinary profession.

ERRATUM: Member Obituary - Dr. Jorge Rodriguez
Federal Veterinarian, Pg. 11, Vol. 73 Number 5/6, May/June, 2015

Originally published - “Dr. Rodriguez was born on Sept. 25, 1956, in Havana, Cuba, to the late Diego Rodriguez and Carmen Estravez de Estinoz.”

Correction submitted by Dr. Jorge Pereira - “Dr. Rodriguez was born Sept. 25, 1936, not 1956”

NAFV would like to thank Dr. Pereira for submitting this correction, and we encourage our members to send in any questions, comments, and corrections about our publication to wjames@nafv.org.
Veterinary Happenings

Notify NAFV of Promotions, Reassignments, Transfers, Awards, Retirements, etc. for members not listed in the “Veterinary Happenings” column so they may be included in a future issue. The following information was received by NAFV.

USDA FSIS Members
Dr. Kara Butterfield, GS-12, Promotion, KS, 06/26/2016
Dr. Claude Hebron, GS-12, Resignation, MI, 06/11/2016
Dr. Doug Fulnechek, GS-12, Retirement, AR, 06/25/2016
Dr. Mohanbhai Patel, GS-12, Retirement, MI, 06/03/2016
Dr. Jeffrey Shepherd, GS-12, Promotion, CA, 06/12/2016

USDA APHIS Members
Dr. Dean Goeldner, GS-14, Retirement, Riverdale, MD 06/30/2016
Dr. Peter Kirsten, GS-13, Retirement, Holland, MI, 06/25/2016
Dr. Kerry McHenry, GS-13, Promotion, Indianapolis, IN, 06/26/2016
Dr. Brianna Schur, GS-13, Promotion, Salem, OR, 07/10/2016

Welcome New Members
Dr. Brooke Henderson, FSIS, GS-12, AUB ‘05, Clayton, AL (Recommended by Larry Davis)
Dr. Maura Gibson, APHIS, GS-12, LSU ‘04, Ontario, CA
Dr. Thomas J. Arnold, FSIS, GS-11, ISU ‘13, Sauk Centre, MN
Dr. Stephen Miller, FSIS, GS-12, LSU ‘95, Huntingburg, IN (Recommended by Emily Tolle)
Dr. Maria Romano, APHIS, GS-11, VT ‘16, Alexandria, VA (Recommended by Mark Teachman)
Dr. Paul Whippo, APHIS, GS-14, NCU ‘88, Carlisle, PA (Recommended by Cheryl Berthoud)
Dr. David Miller, APHIS, GS-11, WIS ‘92, Loveland, CO
Dr. Stacie Sturdivant, FSIS, GS-12, TUS ‘12, Philadelphia, MS
Dr. Subin Varghese, FSIS, GS-12, MSU ‘08, Waco, TX
Dr. Debra Klages, FSIS, GS-13, OSU ‘05, Bountiful, UT