Announcements

ATTENTION!

WE ARE STILL ACCEPTING NOMINATIONS FOR THE 2017-2018 NAFV BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

With any questions on the nomination process, please check our April, 2016 issue of the Federal Veterinarian, or email nafv@nafv.org.

+ BOD members will have an in person meeting early 2017 in the Washington, DC area.
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- US invests in nanotechnology for food safety Pg. 8
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GENERAL COUNSEL’S COLUMN
William G. Hughes, Esq.

This is the first in an intermittent series aimed at helping to avoid common problems in federal employment. As history has taught us, there are a number of problem areas that NAFV members may assume not to be problems—until they are. Everyone is advised to be conscious of potential problems, and take steps to avoid them before there are charges of misconduct. This information is not comprehensive, but only acts as a guide.

GOVERNMENT COMPUTERS AND EMAILS

The equipment provided, such as cell phones, laptops, and other electronics, are intended for official business. This does not mean matters only related to your official duties, but matters for which you are hired, with a few modifications. The prohibitions include social contacts between coworkers, and accessing websites for general information. There is some very limited use of the internet, phones and emails, permitted for certain limited family contacts, especially when in travel status, and websites such as news and weather, but check with your particular agency.

Use of government equipment to conduct personal business is not permitted. Federal employees have been removed for conducting sales or purchase of items and real estate. Social and business media (e.g., LinkedIn and Facebook) are not official business. There have also been a number of problems, which should be obvious, of accessing pornographic sites. This almost always leads to removal charges.

Dangerous areas in these controversial political and election times include expressing opinions, sending or forwarding articles, jokes and cartoons (however humorous), whether complimentary or critical. The penalty imposed by the Special Counsel of the MSPB for improper political activity is automatic removal. This is beyond your agency’s control.

Also very dangerous are what may be considered “politically incorrect” items. The First Amendment does not limit the rights of employers and employment to set workplace rules. There are limits to the right of free speech.

However, what is permitted as a result of NAFV’s official status as an Association of Supervisors and Managers in USDA and FDA, include developing agendas for official consultations and intra-management meetings, at any approved level, and organizing chapter meetings which include continuing education and official agency speakers.

No internal NAFV business is permitted, especially having to do with NAFV budgets or elections (this is an election year in NAFV).

When in doubt, check it out, and err on the side of caution rather than jeopardize your job.

-Bill Hughes

*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.
By Michael J Gilsdorf DVM

I was recently asked how federal veterinarians contribute economically to rural and urban communities. I posed this question to the NAFV Board of Directors and NAFV Coordinators. Here is what we identified:

Over the past half-century our society has changed and veterinary medicine and public health has reflected this change. As highlighted by Drs. Kent H. Hoblet, Andrew T. Maccabe, and Lawrence E. Heider in a special report they prepared, “urbanization and affluence have led to increased demands for companion animal veterinary medical care. At the same time, critical national needs in public health, food safety and security, animal health, and comparative medicine continue to increase at an alarming rate. These needs can most effectively be addressed by veterinarians with expertise in population health and public practice.

Veterinarians are a unique national resource, as they are the only health professionals trained in multispecies comparative medicine. As a result of this training, the veterinary profession is able to provide an extraordinary link between agricultural and human medicine. The uses made of this link have been extensive, with multiple benefits to society. In fact, public support for veterinary medical education has, as its historical basis, the profession’s relationship with food production and the control of zoonotic diseases.

Currently, approximately 20% (15,000) of all veterinarians in the United States are engaged in either private population-health practice with a significant food animal component or public practice in one of its various forms. Satisfying only current needs in population health and public practice will require more than 500 of the approximately 2,500 available new US graduates each year. If new graduates do not enter these fields, government, non-governmental organizations, industry, and agribusiness will employ either foreign trained veterinarians or non-veterinarians to fill their needs."

Federal veterinarians provide protection in food safety and public health. In fact, several key roles of veterinarians in the food production chain are statutorily mandated in Federal and State law. Expert oversight by veterinarians of animal health and well-being, and of food quality and safety, lowers each citizen’s costs for food and health care, and helps support livestock production practices that are both efficient and humane. Veterinarians also serve important roles in the regulation of animal interstate transport, international export and trade of animals and animal-derived products, and enrichment of the human-animal bond. Today, veterinarians, especially federal veterinarians, are a key group protecting U.S. citizens from spontaneous incursion of high-consequence foreign animal and zoonotic diseases, such as mad cow (BSE) and Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD), and bio-terror attacks. I am not aware of any official studies that comprehensively quantify these economic impacts.

As stated in The Economic Impact of Veterinary Medicine on the State of Missouri - A Report from the University of Missouri College of Veterinary Medicine and the

(Continued on Pg. 3, “EVP COLUMN”)
Missouri Veterinary Medical Association, “the economic wellbeing of ...agri-businesses is enhanced by the health and productivity of its animals. Improvements in these areas carry substantial economic benefits. Progressive animal health management provides a crucial method of managing risk in animal industries. Through research, regulation, and quality assurance programs in livestock production, veterinary medicine enhances the safety and quality of our food. Risks of drug residues or microbiological contaminations are thereby reduced.”

Here are ways that federal veterinarians contribute to lowering the economic burden for livestock producers and citizens:
1. Support state and federal disease control programs, which lowers production costs for producers and food costs for citizens
2. Conducting disease surveillance at auction markets, ports of entry, and at slaughter establishments (early detection)
3. Advising producers on how to properly use antimicrobial to address resistance concerns
4. Lowering economically significant livestock diseases so farmers can continue production employing people and feeding the community
5. Quality assurance of animal-derived food products purchased locally.
6. Attending school functions; promoting vet med and higher education; keeping schools/colleges operating
7. Serving as educators in local FFA and 4H and serving as mentors to young people
8. Serving as knowledge resources for locals to get first hand info on hot topics like Zika virus, bird flu, etc.
9. Ensuring effective and safe vaccines and biologicals are available to combat endemic animal and zoonotic diseases
10. Conducting disease or toxin investigations in animals and humans during an outbreak to limit the spread of the diseases/toxins
11. Conducting research to develop more effective animal and human health mitigations
12. Responding to major animal and public health events and catastrophes
13. Certifying animal and product exports to enhance markets that promote livestock and meat/poultry marketing opportunities in rural USA
14. Supervising livestock and poultry slaughter facilities which have a significant economic impact in rural America, where many of the largest facilities are located; some of these employ in excess of 2000 people and contribute millions to local and state tax rolls; they also contribute to community development, schools and other civic organizations; these establishments cannot operate without the 1000 or so FSIS federal veterinarians serving as USDA inspectors, supervisors and managers as well as animal disease, animal welfare, and food safety experts
15. FDA veterinarians assure medications are accurately labeled and efficacious and protect public health by setting scientifically based withdrawal times to protect the consumers of those livestock, poultry and egg products from food animal drug (including antibiotic) residues
16. Protecting global food security through disease prevention, detection and control, and reducing disease transmission risks keep farmers and consumers safe

**Expanded Geographic Distribution and Clinical Characteristics of Ehrlichia ewingii Infections, United States**

**Abstract**
Ehrlichiosis is a bacterial zoonosis, spread through the bites of infected ticks, that is most commonly caused in the United States by infection with the bacterium *Ehrlicia chaffeensis*. We retrospect-reviewed samples from an 18-month study of ehrlichiosis in the United States and found that *E. ewingii* was present in 10 (9.2%) of 109 case patients with ehrlichiosis, a higher rate of infection with this species than had previously been reported. Two patients resided in New Jersey and Indiana, where cases have not been reported. All patients with available case histories recovered. Our study suggests a higher prevalence and wider geographic distribution of *E. ewingii* in the United States than previous reports have indicated.

**Full Article:**
National Pork Board Applauds Efforts to Curb Antibiotic Resistance

Source: National Pork Board

DES MOINES, IOWA — April 4, 2016 — The National Pork Board is leading the conversation to combat antibiotic-resistant bacteria and applauds the action steps defined by the White House through the Presidential Advisory Council on Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria (PACCARB). The Pork Checkoff, funded directly by America’s 62,000 pig farmers, has defined a three-point antibiotic stewardship plan centered on research, pig farmer education and outreach to pork industry partners and consumers.

“Antibiotics are essential tools for veterinarians and farmers in raising healthy livestock and producing safe food,” said John Johnson, the National Pork Board’s chief operating officer. “We are pleased to see the administration acknowledge the very real changes occurring on farms across America in accordance with new federal guidance.”

Johnson specifically points to references in the PACCARB report that notes U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Guidance 209 and 213, which bring the use of medically important antimicrobial medicine under the direct supervision of veterinarians to be used only when necessary to ensure animal health. The report also defines the need to collect more, and better, data.

“Pig farmers embrace the new guidelines and are actively implementing them across the country,” Johnson said. “Strengthening veterinarian relationships, requiring a prescription or veterinary feed directive for the use of medically important antibiotics in water and feed, and prohibiting use of medically important antibiotics for anything other than treatment, control and disease prevention are major steps forward.”

Since 2000, the National Pork Board has invested more than $6 million to research and collect data on this issue. The Checkoff also has provided tools to pig farmers that are specifically addressed in the Council’s report. The pork industry’s current research is focused on priority areas that include alternative antibiotic technologies, the environmental fate of antibiotics, antibiotic-resistant bacteria and resistance genes and route of administration on the potential development of bacterial resistance.

Also, the National Pork Board is researching new ways to evaluate models and metrics for collecting data on antibiotic use in the U.S. pork industry. This investment in research, which is consistent with the focus of the Council, further underscores the pork industry’s commitment to enabling and implementing on-farm change.

In February, the National Pork Board convened the first meeting of its Blue Ribbon Panel on antibiotic stewardship. The third-party panel includes seven experts who have specific experience and knowledge in animal and human health antibiotic practices or in retail and foodservice consumer marketing. The panel’s focus is to provide objective, independent counsel on the National Pork Board’s research, education and communication priorities.

The Pork Checkoff also recently hosted Resistance: The Antibiotic Challenge. The dialogue, facilitated by The Atlantic Media Group, brought together key opinion leaders from human health, animal health, government, pharmaceutical, and retail and consumer groups to discuss the challenge of responsible antibiotic use in the 21st century. Representatives from the National Pork Board, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the American Public Health Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Veterinary Medical Association and other organizations shared what is being done to address antibiotic resistance concerns.

FORT COLLINS, CO CHAPTER MEETING
DATE: Wednesday, July 7, 2016 | TIME: 12:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Gray’s Peak B (1W10).
2150 Centre Ave, Bldg B, Fort Collins, CO, 80526.

"NAFV Meeting on Workforce Issues"
with any questions and RSVP please contact nafv@nafv.org
Persistent infection of calves with Bovine Viral Diarrhea Virus (BVD-PI) costs the beef cattle industry an estimated $1.5 to $2.5 billion every year.

That’s way more than most would hazard to guess, and for some logical reasons.

First, the prevalence of BVD-PI is low. It was only 0.12% among samples collected for the most recent beef cow study conducted by the National Health Monitoring Service. Within herds, prevalence in the study ranged from 0% to 16%.

As Bob Larson, DVM, put it to veterinarians at last week’s BVD Symposium hosted by the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association and the National Institute for Animal Agriculture, “Most beef herds are not infected, but most veterinary practices have several clients with persistently infected calves.” Larson is chair of food animal production medicine at Kansas State University.

Moreover, Derrell Peel, Extension livestock marketing specialist at Oklahoma State University, explained at the same symposium, “A lot of the losses associated with BVD probably aren’t recognized by producers.”

Without testing, there’s no way of knowing that BVD is the culprit in reduced or delayed conception rates, for instance.

Pregnancy rates of cow herds with PI calves present have been measured at 5% lower than cow herds with no PI calves present, according to Integrated BVD Control Programs for Beef Operations.

Plus, Peel points out BVD impacts are imbedded in industry data, everything from historic calf morbidity to historic calving percentages.

Consider that the calving percentage of the U.S. cowherd declined an estimated 3% between 1986 and 2014, according to Peel. There are likely lots of reasons, including BVD-PI, but there’s no way to pinpoint it exactly.

That’s one reason calculating industry-wide economic impact is necessarily imprecise. Peel reviewed reams of scientific literature in order to offer the aforementioned calculation of economic losses.

“The important point is that it’s a big number,” Peel says—big enough for producers to pay attention to individually, and for the industry to try to corral.

Doing so comes with plenty of challenges, including which segment of the industry has economic motivation to reduce the infection. The only way to get a PI calf is from a cow that is transiently infected with BDV during gestation or from a cow that is persistently infected. Knock persistent infection in the head at the ranch and no one else has to worry. But testing and controlling, let alone eventual eradication, comes at a cost. Who would pay and what portion has never been determined.

For that matter, other than policies by various industry organizations along the lines of, “…we need to get a handle on this, starting with education,” I’m unaware of a specific industry-wide plan ever being presented. Hopefully, this symposium represents a move in that direction, which starts with determining the objectives and tactics of such a program.

In the meantime, Larson shared an invaluable resource for individual producers and their veterinarians considering their specific situation and goals relative to BVD management and control. It’s free and it’s called BVD Consult. You simply answer a string of questions, which leads to recommendations based on what’s known about preventing, managing and controlling BVD. The site is also a cache for some of the most pertinent BVD information currently available.

Original Article:
http://beefmagazine.com/blog/how-much-money-have-you-lost-bvd?NL=BEEF-02&Issue=BEEF-02_20160414_BEEF-02_300&sfvc4enews=42&cl=article_1&utm_rid=CPG02000000684396&utm_campaign=9242&utm_medium=email&elq2=e1cc6f69e10e45ca922df29b11997df4
"Animal Health Law" has been released

Source Pig333 | Thursday March 31, 2016


"Animal Health Law", that comes into force on the 20 April and will be applicable in 5 years, paves the way for a more efficient system to combat transmissible animal diseases.

Overall, the single, comprehensive new animal health law will support the EU livestock sector in its quest towards competitiveness and safe and smooth EU market of animals and of their products, leading to growth and jobs in this important sector: The huge quest towards competitiveness and safe and smooth health law will support the EU livestock sector in its permissible animal diseases.

Better early detection & control of animal diseases, including emerging diseases linked to climate change, will help to reduce the occurrence and effects of animal epidemics

There will be more flexibility to adjust rules to local circumstances, and to emerging issues such as climate and social change

- It sets out a better legal basis for monitoring animal pathogens resistant to antimicrobial agents supplementing existing rules and two other proposals currently being negotiated in the European Parliament and Council, on veterinary medicines and on medicated feed.

Regulation (EU) 2016/429 on transmissible animal diseases and amending and repealing certain acts in the area of animal health ("Animal Health Law")


FSIS, Almanza seeing out ‘modernization’ initiatives

By Tom Johnston, 4/6/2016

CHICAGO — Likening the remaining months of his tenure under the Obama Administration to the fourth quarter of a football game, Al Almanza said he and USDA’s Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) is focusing on advancing the agency’s efforts in modernizing its inspection protocols.

“Nothing new is going to start … we’re going to finish what we started,” said Almanza, the Deputy Under Secretary for Food Safety.

Addressing meat processors here at the North American Meat Institute’s (NAMI) annual outlook conference here, Almanza touted the effectiveness of the modernized poultry inspection system that focuses inspection activities at the end of the line in poultry plants to ensure overall process control.

Meanwhile, the agency continues to collect data from a pilot program testing how a similar system would work for pork processing facilities. Within “the next few months,” he said, the agency should have enough data to determine whether to expand the program beyond the five plants now participating in the pilot and issue a proposed rule.

“And while we do not have a HIMP pilot program for beef, we’re always looking for ways to modernize beef inspection as well,” Almanza added.

Another facet of FSIS’s modernization efforts includes whole genome sequencing, a means by which, compared with its traditional pulsed field gel electrophoresis (PFGE), can far more thoroughly and accurately provide data to more definitively say whether the clinical isolate and the food isolate are the same. In doing so, sources of illness can be found sooner and the number of illnesses can be reduced, as explained by Purdue University associate professor Haley Oliver.

The agency, Almanza noted, included whole genome sequencing as part of its fiscal-year 2017 budget requests to advance analytics and expand lab analysis.

“The science is advancing so rapidly now that it’s worth paying attention to,” he said. “We’ve learned that by adopting these new and innovative advances, we will be able to strategically improve food safety. FSIS is experimenting with new ways to view and provide information in order to gain fresh insights into these issues and more effectively target potential sources and causes of illness. For example, we’ve identified testing gaps for product classes and pathogens . . . Using this approach, we will begin to fill in these gaps, and the agency will learn more about contamination and pathogen prevalence.”
A guide to carry-on items allowed through security

Source: Airlines.org

Solids, Liquids and Gels – Oh My!

Having trouble discerning what is and is not considered a liquid? Wonder if you can bring that sandwich with you through the security line? Air travel is fun and takes you to new places, but packing should not be as difficult as the Sunday Times crossword puzzle, so we pulled together this guide with some common items in question.

- **Deodorant**
  This one is a bit tricky because it depends on the type – solid (yes!), gel or spray (both must be less than 3.4 ounces to carry on).

- **Wine**
  Sorry, but unless that bottle of bubbly was purchased at Duty-Free, it has to go in your checked bag. Also note that even if you purchased it in Duty-Free, you’re not able to consume it on the flight.

- **Food**
  In general, solid food items can be carried on, but foods in liquid or gel form must follow the 3-1-1 rule. So you can bring your sandwich and chips, but not your jar of salsa.

- **Water**
  We all should know by now that a bottle of water is not permitted through security. You can, however, bring an empty bottle through and fill it up at a water fountain on the other side of security.

- **Pie**
  Pies and cakes are allowed in carry-ons but may be subject to additional screening. So if you’re traveling for the holidays and don’t want Aunt Bessie’s fruit cake yet again, volunteer to bring your dessert of choice.

- **Medical Liquids**
  Passengers are allowed to carry baby food or formula, breast milk, a prescription cream or other medical liquid in excess of the allowed 3.4 ounces.

- **Matches and Lighters (with fuel)**
  One book of safety matches or one standard lighter per passenger is allowed in the cabin. Matches are not allowed in checked baggage. Lighters are restricted to two and only if packaged according to the approved standards.

- **Self Defense Objects**
  All of these must be placed in checked baggage, with the exception of mace or pepper spray, which can be carried on in the form of one 4 oz. container.
World Veterinary Association Launches World’s Largest Veterinary Learning Platform

London, United Kingdom 2nd May 2016:
The World Veterinary Association (WVA) has launched the world’s largest veterinary continuing education platform for veterinarians in collaboration with the World Continuing Education Alliance (WCEA).

The launch comes following two years of research and development by the WVA in pursuit of its aim to promote international best practice and ensure veterinary professionals from around the world can learn about the most recent advances in veterinary medicine.

The online learning platform features hundreds of courses from some of the world's most prestigious veterinary institutions including accredited courses from Purdue University, Royal Veterinary College of London and the Veterinary Nurses Council of Australia.

Speaking on the development of the new continuing education platform, René Carlson, President of the WVA said: “This has been a major undertaking by the WVA and marks a significant advance for veterinary medicine. This platform will go a long way in helping veterinarians improve their skills and advance the veterinary profession globally.”

Veterinary professionals can access courses on their mobile phones, tablets or computer and keep track of their progress through the in-built education tracker which enables professionals to monitor what courses they have taken and review their accredited certifications.

The WVA represents around 500,000 veterinarians around the world through its member associations and is a broad global veterinary community that offers advocacy, support, and education with a variety of partners for focused global veterinary issues.

The continuing education platform is currently free to join, you can find out more information at the WVA’s website: [http://www.vetce.education/](http://www.vetce.education/)

Contact:
John Skitt
Director of Engagement
[john.skitt@wcea.education](mailto:john.skitt@wcea.education)

---

Source: *GlobalMeatNews*,

The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) has announced plans to pump millions into researching ways nanotechnology can be used to improve food safety.

In total, 11 universities in the US will receive a share of the $5.2m pledged by the USDA to develop new ways of uncovering foodborne pathogens – and thus improving overall food safety throughout the US supply chain.

Some of the ideas touted by the universities include using nanotechnology to develop advanced poultry vaccines.

The funds will be made through the USDA’s Agriculture and Food Research Initiative – a grants programme established to support advancements in agricultural science.

**Improve resiliency**

“In the seven years since the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative was established, the program has led to true innovations and groundbreaking discoveries in agriculture to combat childhood obesity, improve and sustain rural economic growth, address water availability issues, increase food production, find new sources of energy, mitigate the impacts of climate variability and enhance resiliency of our food systems, and ensure food safety,” said agriculture secretary Tom Vilsack.

“Nanoscale science, engineering, and technology are key pieces of our investment in innovation to ensure an adequate and safe food supply for a growing global population. The President’s 2017 Budget calls for full funding of the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative, so that USDA can continue to support important projects like these.”

One of the recipients of the research grant, Auburn University in Alabama, has said it plans to improve pathogen monitoring throughout the food supply chain by creating a user-friendly system that can detect multiple foodborne pathogens simultaneously.

The University of Wisconsin has planned to develop nanoparticle-based poultry vaccines to stem emerging poultry diseases.
What is already known about this topic?
The incidence of infections transmitted commonly by food has remained largely unchanged for many years. Multifaceted approaches involving public health, regulatory agencies, industry, and consumers are required to reduce the incidence.

What is added by this report?
Compared with average incidence in 2012–2014, in 2015, the incidence of Cryptosporidium and non-O157 STEC infections was higher and might, in part, be caused by the use of culture-independent diagnostic tests (CIDTs), which more than doubled during the comparison period.

What are the implications for public health practice?
Some information about the bacteria causing infections, such as subtype and antimicrobial susceptibility, can only be obtained if a CIDT-positive specimen is also cultured. Increasing use of CIDTs affects the interpretation of public health surveillance data and the ability to monitor progress towards prevention efforts. Currently, reflex culturing of specimens with positive CIDT reports should be considered for bacterial pathogens to obtain isolates needed for public health practice. In the long term, expedited research and development are needed to create methods to detect the genetic sequences of pathogens directly and rapidly from stool specimens, which could also benefit clinical and public health practice because subtype, resistance profile, and other features can be obtained from the genetic sequence.
When it comes to food safety, we have to rely on the companies who manufacture and distribute food to ensure that the food we buy is safe. In fact, most consumers give little thought to the safety of their food. That is why food safety is a priority for the Justice Department. Our role in protecting consumer safety is at its apex when consumers can least protect themselves.

There’s no question that the overwhelming majority of food produced and consumed in the United States is safe. America’s incidence of foodborne illness is below the average in other developed countries and it continues to drop. That said, foodborne illness still imposes a significant public health burden on the American people. About 48 million Americans, or one out of every six people, get sick each year from food. For many of those people, the problem isn’t just a stomach ache. It can cause life-long chronic diseases, like arthritis and kidney failure. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimate that 3,000 people die each year from foodborne illness and 128,000 people are hospitalized.

One of the government’s highest obligations is to protect citizens when they cannot protect themselves. That is what the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FDCA) and other food safety laws are designed to do. That is why the CDC, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Department of Agriculture (USDA) continue to do groundbreaking work to identify the causes that contribute to foodborne illness and to promote conditions that minimize them. And it is why the Justice Department works closely with our federal agency partners to ensure that our enforcement efforts are making a positive difference to food safety and quality. We rely on their technical expertise, their investigative support and their deep knowledge of the industries they regulate as keys to building cases.

Against that backdrop, I want to describe some of the enforcement tools that the Justice Department uses to help ensure the safety of the food supply. And I want to focus on the FDCA.

[T]he FDCA is a special tool designed to address the unique interests at stake in the production of food and medicine. It provides for criminal penalties and civil relief against those who introduce adulterated foods into interstate commerce. Under the FDCA, a food is considered adulterated if, among other things, it is contaminated with a substance that may make someone sick or if it was prepared, packed, or held under unsanitary conditions. So when the Justice Department – in concert with our FDA colleagues – decides to bring a food safety case under the FDCA, one of the decisions that we have to make is whether to use our civil authority or our criminal authority. This decision is based primarily on our answer to two questions: First, what do the facts and evidence show? And second, which enforcement tool is most appropriate in that particular case to ensure the safety of our food supply?

To give an example, we have had success with civil enforcement in cases involving the administration of drugs – and antibiotics in particular – to animals intended for human consumption. To take one example, we recently obtained a consent decree against a dairy farm in Vermont that was selling livestock for slaughter and human consumption even though unsafe drug residues were present in the meat. This type of behavior not only poses a health risk to those who consume the meat, but specifically with respect to antibiotics, it jeopardizes broader public health by giving rise to antibiotic resistant bacteria. In this particular case, the defendants are now subject to heightened FDA oversight and they cannot operate until they implement certain safeguards and the FDA confirms that they have come into compliance with the
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When we decide that criminal
prosecution under the FDCA is
warranted, we then choose between
two types of criminal charges: mis-
demeanor and felony. Congress has
made the prohibition on introduc-
ing adulterated food into interstate
commerce a strict liability offense,
meaning that a company or individ-
ual violates the law and can face
misdemeanor charges whether or
not it intended to distribute adulter-
ated food.

So, for example, the department
brought charges under the FDCA
against the owners of a cantaloupe
distributor in Colorado. When the
distributor decided to install a new
system for washing their can-
aloupes, they adopted a system that
was meant for washing potatoes
and elected not to use a chlorine
spray to kill certain bacteria. Their
decision caused an outbreak of Lis-
teria that resulted in the deaths of
33 people. The defendants pled
guilty to misdemeanor charges and
were sentenced to probation, six
months of home detention, and a
fine.

In some cases, the facts are so
egregious that it is appropriate for
the Justice Department to bring the
full force of the law to bear. When
we can show an intent to defraud or
to mislead consumers or the FDA,
a defendant can face felony charg-
es.

Many of you are probably aware
of the criminal trial and convictions
of two former officials of and one
food broker for the Peanut Corpo-
ation of America, or PCA. One of
the defendants was the former own-
er and President of PCA. PCA
products were tied to a salmonella
outbreak that, according to the
CDC, led to over 700 reported in-
fecations and nine deaths. Using epi-
demiological projections, the CDC
estimates that more than 22,000
individuals may have been affected
by salmonella.

The Justice Department’s focus
on food safety and our recent suc-
cessful prosecutions – some of
which I have mentioned here today
– have accomplished a great
deal. The cases that we bring help
create conditions that ensure the
safety of the food supply. They cre-
ate incentives for good behavior
and they deter misconduct. They
empower those within an organiza-
tion who see unsafe practices to
speak out. They help to educate the
industry and to support the great
work that the FDA, the USDA and
others are doing. In short, aggres-
sive enforcement of the FDCA and
other food safety laws helps to en-
sure that making safe food is not
only the best ethical and moral de-
cision, but also the best business
decision.

We are committed to continuing
to vigorously prosecute food safety
cases. We also look forward to
continuing to support your work
and I hope you will let us know if
there is anything that the Justice
Department can do to help you pro-
tect consumers, so that Americans
can have the utmost confidence in
the safety of the food that they eat.

PEORIA— Dr. Jorge J. Rodriguez, 79, of Peoria
passed away at 8:48 p.m. Monday March 28, 2016,
at his residence.

Dr. Rodriguez was born on Sept. 25, 1956, in Ha-
vana, Cuba, to the late Diego Rodriguez and Carmen
Estavez de Estinoz. He spent most of his youth in
Holguin, Cuba. He is survived by his loving wife of
twenty years, Nikki M. Vulgaris. He is also survived
by one daughter, one son, three grandsons, three
great-granddaughters, and four brothers.

He was preceded in death by one brother, Robert,
and one granddaughter, Zoie Ellenburg.

Dr. Rodriguez emigrated to the U.S. from Cuba
in 1961. Having his doctorate in veterinary medicine
from the University of Havana, he was able to estab-
lish a lifelong career of 36 years with the USDA.
Jorge was an avid sportsman who enjoyed fishing,
hunting, bowling, and boating. He was an avid gol-
fier who achieved his hole in one, who loved to travel,
and was naturally artistic. He was an acclaimed chef
by his friends
and family.

Jorge loved mu-
sic, literature,
and the arts. He
will be remem-
bered as an im-
mensely com-
passionate, kind
and generous
man, never knowing a stranger. Jorge was a a mem-
er of All Saints Greek Orthodox Church.

Dr. Rodriguez had been a member of the NAFV
since October, 1967. He retired from FSIS in Janu-
ary 2002. We encourage all members to make a
small donation in his honor to the NAFV Memorial
Scholarship Fund – which grants scholarships to vet-
erinary students. A check can be sent to the NAFV
National Office with a note containing the intended
use.
**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. Charles Piper, Resignation, Pelican Rapids, MN, 03/28/2016
- Dr. Aimee Kephart, Resignation, Moore Haven, FL, 03/19/2016
- Dr. Maqbool Qureshi, Retirement, Yaphank, NY, 03/03/2016

**USDA APHIS Members**
- Dr. Grant Wease, Retirement, El Paso, TX, 04/15/2016
- Dr. Arnold Gertonson, Retirement, Fort Collins, CO, 02/29/2016
- Dr. Arach Wilson, Retirement, Ames, IA, 04/15/2016
- Dr. Lisa Rochette, Promotion, Raleigh, NC, 03/20/2016

**Welcome New Members**
- Dr. Katherine Starzel, GS-12, CA ‘10, Riverview Fl (Recommended by Dr. Sam Keyes)
- Dr. Vernon Evans, FSIS, GS-12, MS ‘88, Purvis, MS
- Dr. Caitlyn Switzer, FSIS, GS-12, EDI ‘13, Charlotte, NC
- Dr. Marilyn Brownlow, FSIS, GS-12, TUS ‘02, Jackson, MS (Recommended by Dr. Robert Kennedy)
- Dr. Clinton Green, FSIS, GS-12, MS ‘00, Richton, MS (Recommended by Dr. Kyle Sombke)
- Dr. Randell Walling, FSIS, GS-12, WSU ‘14, Wilderville, OR (Recommended by Dr. Michael Mikhail)
- Dr. Ashley Gauze, FSIS, GS-12, ROS ‘13, GS-12, Fayetteville, NC
- Dr. Jessica Coote, APHIS-VS, GS-11, LVO ‘15, Los Angeles CA
- Dr. James Boucher, APHIS-VS, GS-11, OKU ‘99, Del Rio, TX (Recommended by Dr. Shaun Dunn)
- Dr. Kari Coulson, APHIS-VS, GS-13, GA ‘14, Raleigh. NC
- Dr. Courtney Harral Jernigan, FSIS, GS-12, MO ‘09, Fayetteville, AR (Recommended by Dr. Doug Fulnechek)
- Dr. Harvey Kent, FSIS, GS-11, LSU ‘05, Norfolk, VA (Recommended by Dr. Megan Bennet)
- Dr. Oriana Beemer, APHIS-VS, GS-12, CSU ‘14, Riverdale, MD
- Dr. Edward Surgeon, FSIS, GS-13, TUS ‘91, Cummings, GA
- Dr. Debbie Cox, APHIS, GS-14, LSU ‘78, Greenbelt, MD
- Dr. Sarah Speth, HHS, GS-13, MSU ‘07, Berwyn Heights, MD

**Returned Checks**
NAFV charges $10.00 for checks returned for insufficient funds

**Email Changes of Address to:**
mbarros@nafv.org