

***Vibrio vulnificus* SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

March 10, 2004

A. Review completion of new work plan items assigned to the ISSC Executive Office.

- Review those work plan elements that were to have been completed since the July 2003 Vv subcommittee meeting. These items are as follows:

1. Review the efforts to assess the current PHT processing capacity throughout the United States (ISSC Executive Office).

Findings: The Executive Office has worked with the Gulf States to ascertain this information by each SSCA interviewing their firms. This information is complete for all states except FL. Florida's effort is 54% complete and will be fully completed over the next 3 months. Ken Moore presented the data compiled from the Gulf States to date. The data indicates that the PHT capacity goal of treating 25% of the shellstock produced in their states has been met.

Recommendations: The Executive Office shall complete the report when they receive the Florida data and send the results to the Vv subcommittee and Executive Board prior to the August 2004 meetings.

Conclusions: The source states have individually (sans Florida) and collectively met the PHT capacity goal of treating 25% of the shellstock produced in their state according to the results presented from the survey effort. There is excess capacity in these states that can be used to treat product from other Gulf States. The Vv subcommittee will further review these results at the August 2004 meeting.

2. Assure that the efforts of the FDA southeast regional office and CDC to create uniform criteria to count illnesses continue to be implemented by both agencies and that the number we are using to track disease reduction goals are the proper numbers. Dr. John Painter from CDC is working with Marc Glatzer in reviewing the current disease reporting protocol and how cases of disease are counted as shellfish borne *Vibrio vulnificus* infections. Additionally, discuss how CA actions are currently affecting disease counting and disease reduction goals and goal attainment.

Findings: Marc Glatzer, Southeast Regional Office FDA and John Painter CDC reported on their efforts to compare and reconcile any differences between the *Vibrio* illness databases maintained by FDA and CDC. They relayed to the committee that the effort to reconcile their databases is ongoing and that at this time they have most of the issues and differences between the databases worked out. Subsequent discussion centered on the reconciliation of the baseline data for illness reduction goal assessment. It was determined that these databases have not been reconciled for the baseline years of 1995-1999 and that this should be done to assure the baseline illness data is indeed correct.

Recommendations: A motion was made for the ISSC Executive Office to request the FDA and CDC to compare and reconcile any differences in the *Vibrio vulnificus* illness data for the years 1995-1999. The motion passed unanimously.

Conclusions: The ongoing efforts to reconcile the databases which include recent *Vibrio vulnificus* illness data have resulted in the illness data from 2001-2003 being confirmed as accurately representing all reported cases. The 1995-1999 baseline data *Vibrio vulnificus* illness data has not been compared and reconciled. This effort should take place in order to assure accurate comparison of illnesses after required *Vibrio vulnificus* illness controls are implemented.

3. Report on status of the letter that was approved as presented at the March 2003 Vv subcommittee meeting and was to be sent to the states to emphasize proper disease reporting.

Findings: The draft disease-reporting letter to be sent to the core reporting states was presented by Ken Moore. Discussion centered on the distribution of the letter. Additionally it was requested that if any changes to the letter were desired that they be submitted to the Executive Office no later than March 17th. The *Vibrio vulnificus* disease reporting form addendum will also go out with the letter to the core reporting states. How and to whom that form should be returned was discussed. The format and titling of the form was also discussed.

Recommendations: Send Vv reporting by States letter out with a March 17 deadline for comments; letter to be sent to State Health Agency Directors, State Shellfish Safety Officers, and State Epidemiologists of the core reporting states. Ken Moore, John Painter, and Marc Glatzer will work to determine to whom the survey form should be submitted. The heading of the form should be retitled to remove any reference to CDC along with the standard CDC *Vibrio vulnificus* reporting form

Conclusions: The letter will be completed after comments are received and sent out to the core reporting states. The letter will include the recommendations from the Vv subcommittee. This will be completed within the next 30 days.

4. Coordinate the Vv work plan review in 2004 as required in Issue 00-201.

Findings: The *Vibrio vulnificus* work plan is to be reviewed this year. Ken Moore presented those items that are required to be reviewed in the coming year. The Executive Office will put together a framework that states each of the elements of illness reduction efforts that must be evaluated.

Recommendations: This framework should be sent to the *Vibrio vulnificus* subcommittee for the evaluation of work plan elements at the August subcommittee meeting.

Conclusions: The *Vibrio vulnificus* work plan review will take place at the 2004 August *Vibrio vulnificus* subcommittee meeting.

B. Continue to encourage industry-implemented post-harvest controls to reduce Vv levels. The Subcommittee is further charged to provide guidance to the states on incentives for PHT and measures of PHT capacity.

Principle points of discussion:

- Review current PHT practices and determine what incentives will be effective in increasing PHT capacity
- Review the list of recommended incentives for state to consider in their efforts to increase PHT capacity for further action as appropriate
- Labeling incentives
- Harvest classification

Findings: Issues of how post-harvest treated shellfish products should be handled were addressed. There are a number of issues surrounding Model Ordinance language that involves post harvest treated shellfish products. Kirk Wiles pointed out that there extensive communication needs to occur with receiving states concerning how post harvest products should be handled. Subsequent discussion centered around developing a matrix which would summarize all of the different types of shellfish, post harvest treated and otherwise, along with Model Ordinance requirements for processing and handling.

Recommendations: The subcommittee voted to appoint a work group to define “raw shellfish” and list all PHT methods contained within the Model Ordinance and to put this in an easily followed matrix format. Kirk Wiles suggested developing directives/guidelines to educate retailers about post harvest treated shellfish. A motion was made to develop guidance for retailers on how to handle post harvest treated shellfish. The recommended incentives for post harvest treatments should be reviewed after all of the post harvest treatment survey information is gathered. This information will provide some insight into what additional incentives if any the *Vibrio vulnificus* subcommittee can recommend to increase post harvest treatment capacity

Conclusions: The work group needs to develop a definition of raw shellfish and a matrix which list all PHT methods and processing and handling measures in the Model ordinance in time for issue submission at the 2005 Conference. The guidance for retailers on how to handle post harvest treated shellfish should be developed as soon as possible to eliminate the current confusion at the retail level.

C. Evaluate Year 2001 survey results and compare with Year 2003 or 2004 survey results to determine effectiveness in meeting the objectives of the Vv education effort: -- 40% increase in awareness of risk from Vv; -- 15% increase in at-risk consumers no longer eating raw oysters; -- minimize impacts to non-at-risk consumers.

Principle points of discussion

➤ Determine the effectiveness of the Vv education effort through comparison of the 2001 survey results with the 2004 survey results at the March 2005 Vv subcommittee meeting.

Findings: Tom Herrington presented raw oyster consumer survey results and gave a brief synopsis of the Vv education subcommittee deliberations and actions. The follow up consumer survey to evaluate the Vv education effort was discussed. The first survey was conducted in 2001/2002. The subsequent survey is designed to evaluate how effective the Vv education effort has been in changing behavior of at risk consumers. In reference to the efforts to obtain funding to do the follow up survey, Ken Moore advised grant funding for a follow up raw oyster consumer survey will be awarded. In preparation of receipt of the funds for the follow up survey, the Executive Office will prepare and distribute RFP for follow up survey. This follow up survey should be completed by the end of 2004. Michelle Bashin has agreed to furnish the Executive Office with list of firms to send the Request for Proposals (RFP). Dot Leonard commented that the follow up survey should give the committee a sense of the nature, breadth and scope of behavior change resulting from education.

Recommendations: The committee recommended that the follow up survey be used to evaluate the effectiveness of illness reduction strategies and to measure Vv control plan goals. This information will be used by the Vv subcommittee to determine what additional actions may be necessary to meet the *Vibrio vulnificus* management plan requirements. David Heil recommended the committee consider revamping goals if we are not meeting criteria.

Conclusions: The committee will await the survey results before considering additional actions associated with the educational requirements of Proposal 00-201.

D. Compile and review data on rates of illness.

Principle points of discussion

- The Vv illness data analysis work group (Members: Jennifer Tebaldi, Chair; Susan Wilson; Angela Ruple; Mark Glatzer; Al Rainosek and John Painter) shall present the Vv illness data with a focus upon the progress in attaining Vv illness reduction goals.
- Evaluate effect of CA regulation on our ability to evaluate success of the Vv Risk Management Plan.
- Determine if the compilation effort is satisfactory.

Findings: Jennifer Tebaldi distributed data on illness reduction for the year 2003. The illness reduction rate as calculated by Jennifer using the data she had available was 25%. Marc Glatzer advised of an update to the *Vibrio vulnificus* illness data for Florida that increased the number of cases from 9 to 10 and reduced the illnesses for Louisiana from 0 to 1. Al Rainosek recalculated the illness reduction rate for 2003 from Jennifer's table using the revised data as agreed upon by John Painter and Marc

Glatzer. The illness reduction rate for 2003 from the 95/99 baseline was then reported to be 22.8%. Source states important if harvesting restrictions have to be imposed.

The effect of the California Regulation on ability to evaluate success of Vv illness reduction plan was discussed. Don Kraemer suggested asking California for history of information and leaving California in for calculating statistics. It was discussed that it was necessary to calculate data nationwide and report at August 2004 Executive Board meeting (update with 2003 data; reconciled 95/99 baseline comparing all separately; core states to all states; and core minus California). In order to accomplish this calculation and determine the affect of the California regulation it was suggested that information concerning the quantity of Gulf shellstock imported into the state of California before and after the ban should be ascertained.

Recommendations: It was recommended that John Painter and Marc Glatzer report at the August 2004 Executive Board meeting concerning the reconciliation of the baseline data. Jennifer Tebaldi was asked to calculate data nationwide and report at August 2004 Executive Board meeting (update with 2003 data; reconciled 95/99 baseline comparing all separately; core states to all states; and core minus California). It was recommended that Ken Moore coordinate with California and find out how much shellstock was coming to California May 1 through September 30 each year before the ban and after the ban and report to the Executive Board at the August 2004 meeting.

Conclusions: The Vv illness data analysis workgroup report was submitted and accepted with changes suggested from Al Rainosek, Marc Glatzer and John Painter. The report is as follows:

YEAR	CA	FL	LA	TX	Total	Illness Rate
1995	7	9	4	1	21	0.306
1996	6	5	3	8	22	0.316
1997	2	5	1	6	14	0.198
1998	2	13	8	1	24	0.335
1999	7	12	1	6	26	0.358
2000	7	5	1	9	22	0.291
2001	7	11	5	7	30	0.391
2002	6	5	1	5	17	0.218
2003	1	9	0	6	16	0.202
2004						#DIV/0!
2005						#DIV/0!
2006						#DIV/0!
2007						#DIV/0!
2008						#DIV/0!
2009						#DIV/0!
2010						#DIV/0!

incomplete info

1995 - 1999			2005 - 2006			2007 - 2008		
Pop. Avg.	70,637,188		Pop. Avg.	0		Pop. Avg.		
Illness Avg.	21.4		Illness Avg.	0		Illness Avg.		
Illness Rate	0.303		Illness Rate	#DIV/0!		Illness Rate		
Baseline	0.303	per mil	Goal	0.182	per mil	Goal		
			40% reduction			60% reduction		

Vv issue as passed by ISSC

There is a problem with numbers reported from 1999. Original Vv issue had 27 illnesses for 1999. Database contains 26 illnesses. Decision is needed for which number to use and how to document decision.

Baseline 95-99
0.306/million

Goal 05/06
0.184/million

Goal 07/08
0.122/million

2003 ISSC - decision to adjust baseline for 26 illnesses in 1999. Numbers above reflect updated baselines.

E. Evaluate the effectiveness of illness reduction efforts which will be conducted collectively at the end of the 5th year – 12/31/06.

Principle points of discussion

- Semi - annual evaluation of illness reduction efforts

Findings: The total Vv illness reduction efforts represented by core reporting states illnesses including California have resulted in a 22.8% decrease in oyster related Vv illness. The question was posed as to the need for additional efforts to be implemented prior to the end of the fifth year (2006) other than the existing controls and education efforts. The discussion centered on the current Vv education effort. With funding of the Gulf & South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation for Vv education efforts, the question of how these efforts will affect ISSC education efforts was presented. Additionally, discussion included the affect of the funding switch from ISSC to the Gulf & South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation will have upon our education efforts. Ken Moore gave history of obtaining funding (NOAA; Sea Grant) and how those funds are now distributed between ISSC and the Gulf & South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation.

Recommendations: A motion was made by Bill Kramer to Request the ISSC Executive Board contact all known entities involved Vv education efforts to coordinate their efforts with those of the ISSC. The motion was seconded by Susan Parachini; motion passed by voice vote.

Conclusions: Recognizing that the number of entities involved in Vv education has expanded, it is critical that these efforts be coordinated in some fashion toward the attainment of the goals within the *Vibrio vulnificus* Management Plan. The ISSC should play a role in assuring that there is minimal duplication effort to maximize the effectiveness of the limited resources devoted to these efforts.

F. Evaluate the requirements in Section .04C to determine if changes in controls are necessary to achieve targeted illness reduction goals.

Principle points of discussion

- Semi - annual evaluation of controls in place to achieve illness reduction goals

Findings: Jennifer Tebaldi suggested that the ISSC pursue surveying states to see what illness monitoring efforts they use, what they have seen happen, and look at where to provide information. The Subcommittee discussed how this could be accomplished and what elements should be considered in gathering this information from the states. Discussion arose concerning the use of environmental data to predict Vv levels in shellfish would be of public health concern. It was suggested that firms in Texas now request environmental data from SSCA's to make decisions about harvesting and shipping shellfish in order to minimize risks from *Vibrio* infections. This environmental information may be useful to the industry as a voluntary control to minimize *Vibrio* illness.

Recommendations: A motion was made by Jennifer Tebaldi to request the ISSC appoint a work group to develop and explore environmental data reporting possibilities (salinity, water temperature, vibrio levels, etc.) from states to the industry and others upon request. The motion was seconded by Mike Hickey; motion passed by voice vote.

A motion was made by John Painter to request the ISSC to encourage Vv monitoring so that states can share this information with the shellfish industry – specifically those who harvest directly and others who request this information. The motion was seconded by Spencer Garrett; motion passed by voice vote.

It was recommended that Ken Moore share copies of the core states education plans that identified what controls are already in place.

Conclusions: The collection of Vv and corresponding environmental data can be a useful decision making tool for harvesters to minimize Vv illness risks. This data provides a useful voluntary control to minimize Vv shellfish borne illness.

G. Review the current ISSC effort to establish a profile for sensory characteristics for raw oysters.

Principle points of discussion

- This profile is to be used to evaluate the marketability of PHT shellfish products

Findings: Ken Moore reported on the current efforts by Steve Otwell and his co-investigators on performing the sensory characteristics study. A question came up concerning the inclusion of both oysters and sensory panelist from all regions of the country. It was pointed out that including oysters from both the Northwest and the Northeast are important to completing a comprehensive study the results of which can be used nationwide in marketing Post harvest treated shellfish products.

Recommendations: When the sensory characteristics study is complete the results will be presented to the Vv Subcommittee and Executive Board. It was recommended by Bill Dewey and Lori Howell that the ISSC Executive Director contact the principal investigator of the sensory characteristics study and assure that shellfish from the Northwest and Northeast be included in the study.

Conclusions: The sensory characteristics study will be modified to address the sensory characteristics of post harvest treated oysters from all areas of the country. These results will be reported to the Vv subcommittee and the Executive Board.

H. Review the efforts to obtain information from the states on the number of harvest vessels with refrigeration on board and the capacity of these vessels to add refrigeration.

Principle points of discussion

- Discuss available information to evaluate existing and potential refrigeration capacity aboard harvest vessels.
- Discuss the current capacity in the harvest fleet to provide on board refrigeration
- Determine if there is potential weight load and space capacity on board these vessels to add refrigeration.

Findings: The PHT Survey data is complete for all Gulf States except Florida which will finish collecting their survey information this spring. The Executive Office is compiling this survey information and will advise and report information to the Vv subcommittee and Executive Board once compiled.

Recommendations: Spencer Garrett recommended that the data be compiled and analyzed and at that time the Vv subcommittee should determine future action.

Conclusions: The refrigeration capacity onboard harvest vessels and the capacity to dockside ice harvested shellfish are important potential elements of post harvest treatment. This information should be obtained if it can be collected in a meaningful way.

I. Review the need to make changes to the current contents and recent additions to Chapter 16, Post-Harvest Treatment, in the Model Ordinance.

Principle points of discussion

➤ Review the progress to date on changes to the elements in Chapter 16 of the Model Ordinance to determine the appropriateness of controls for post harvest treatment.

Findings: The Subcommittee discussed the necessity to review the Model Ordinance for processes and activities that involve Post Harvest Treatments. Subsequent discussion centered on adding control elements into the Model Ordinance. The Model Ordinance should be modified to harmonize the post harvest treatments included in the Model Ordinance.

Recommendations: The issue of organizing Chapter 16 elements should be addressed by the workgroup to be appointed to review the post harvest treatment elements in the Model Ordinance. It was recommended that the evaluation of current contents and recent additions to Chapter 16 be assigned to this workgroup.

Conclusions: There are a number of post harvest treatment elements in the Model Ordinance that may not be addressed in a clear, concise, and consistent with risk. With all of the changes involving post harvest processes it is time to organize all of these elements into an easily referenced and organized section in the Model Ordinance. This should be done as soon as possible to facilitate the effort to achieve the *Vibrio vulnificus* management plan goals.

J. Review the current Post Harvest Treatment Vv levels in the Model Ordinance.

Principle points of discussion

➤ Continue to review the appropriateness of the minimum MPN level of Vv allowable for shellfish with labeling claims.

Findings: The Validation/Verification Work Group presented their work in developing a sampling scheme for verification for post harvest treatment processes. This effort included work by Al Rainosek and Bob Blodgett. This effort involved considerable development of new concepts and frameworks not otherwise developed in the food science arena. The sampling scheme was developed to minimize the likelihood of a process yielding post harvest treated products with Vv levels higher than 100 MPN without detection. Al Rainosek explained that the sampling scheme was designed to identify processes that run 100 MPN *Vibrio vulnificus*, requiring revalidation.

Recommendations: Lori Howell moved the Vv Subcommittee recommend to the VMC adoption of the Interim Sampling Scheme for Process Verification, as recommended by the Validation/Verification Work Group, as interim criteria. The motion was seconded by Bill Dewey; and the motion passed with voice vote. The Interim Sampling Scheme for Process Verification is as follows:

INTERIM SAMPLING SCHEME FOR PROCESS VERIFICATION*

- **Analytical methodology used for verification should be the method(s) recommended for validation.**
- **Microbiological testing for processed samples will be by a single dilution, five-tube MPN, inoculating with 0.01g of shellfish per tube.**

1. **TESTING IS TO BE CONDUCTED MONTHLY.**
2. **FIRST STAGE (SCREENING) TESTING:**
 - A. **5 tubes are tested.**
 - B. **If 2 or fewer tubes test positive, that month passes and no further testing is necessary for that month.**
 - C. **If 3 or more tubes test positive, go to 3 below.**
3. **SECOND STAGE (CONFIRMATORY) TESTING:**
 - A. **5 more tubes are tested.**
 - B. **If 1 or fewer tubes test positive that month passes and no further testing is necessary for that month.**
 - C. **If 2 or more tubes test positive go to 4 below.**

[Note: Sufficient oysters, from the same lot, shall be collected to conduct 1st and 2nd stage testing.]

4. **PROCESS REVALIDATION IS REQUIRED WHEN 3 OUT OF 3 OR 4 OR 5 CONSECUTIVE MONTHS FAIL.**
5. **EXCEPTION TO THE ABOVE:**
CATASTROPHIC FAILURE: IF ALL TUBES IN THE FIRST STAGE TEST POSITIVE (5 OUT OF 5), AND ALL TUBES IN THE SECOND STAGE TEST POSITIVE (5 OUT OF 5), REVALIDATION IS REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF TESTING RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS MONTHS.

[Note: In the event of verification failure, as described in 4 and 5 above, the labeling claim can no longer be used until the PHT is revalidated successfully. The processor shall follow the corrective action(s) found in their PHT HACCP Plan.]

PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS OF THIS SAMPLING SCHEME

CONCENTRATION (MPN/G)	PROBABILITY REVALIDATION IS REQUIRED
20	0.000
30	0.004
40	0.047
50	0.206
60	0.478
80	0.899
100	0.992

Sampling scheme developed by Dr. Robert Blodgett of the FDA.

***This protocol is to be used for PHT PROCESS VERIFICATION, not product lot verification.**

Conclusions:

The Validation/Verification Work Group will continue working on validation/verification issues and report at August 2004 meeting.

K. Review status of approved methods for Vv detection.

Principle points of discussion

➤ Overview of status of current methods

Reviewed approved method for Vv detection

Findings: The issue of the Executive Board's approval of the gene probe methodology

As an interim method for Vv detection and enumeration was discussed. A letter was received from the Northeast Lab Evaluation officers that disagreed with the Executive Board decision. The Chairman appointed a work group of individuals from around the country including lab personnel, researchers, FDA and SSCA personnel to examine the issue of the validity of *Vibrio vulnificus* detection methodologies. This work group has provided valuable insights regarding the history of gene probe technology.

Recommendations: It was recommended that the workgroup continue their deliberations and make any necessary recommendations to the Vv subcommittee at the August 2004 meeting.

Conclusions: The issue surrounding approved methodologies for *Vibrio* detection needs to be addressed. Those methodologies, proven to be valid should be incorporated as ISSC approved methodologies in accordance with Procedure 16 of the Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures. The Executive Board acknowledged that a procedure XVI review is not necessary for methods approved by AOAC or included in the FDA BAM.

PROPOSED AGENDA FOR 3/10/04 *Vibrio vulnificus* SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

March 10, 2004

1:00 P.M. - CALL TO ORDER

1:01 P.M. - ROLL CALL - DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

1:05 P.M.- TOPICS AND POINTS OF DISCUSSION

Note: Time frames are meant to focus discussion to the point of motion making. If, at the end of the discussion time, the committee is not at this point a motion should be made to continue discussion at a future time based upon issue submission deadlines.

1. Review completion of new work plan items assigned to the ISSC Executive Office. – 60 minutes

- Review those work plan elements that were to have been completed since the July 2003 Vv subcommittee meeting. These items are as follows:
 1. Review the efforts to assess the current PHT processing capacity throughout the United States (ISSC Executive Office).
 2. Assure that the efforts of the FDA southeast regional office and CDC to create uniform criteria to count illnesses continue to be implemented by both agencies and that the number we are using to track disease reduction are the proper numbers. Dr. John Painter from CDC is working with Marc Glatzer in reviewing the current disease reporting protocol and how cases of disease are counted as shellfish borne *Vibrio vulnificus* infections. Additionally, discuss how CA actions are currently affecting disease counting and disease reduction goals and goal attainment.
 3. Report on status of the letter that was approved as presented at the March 2003 Vv subcommittee meeting and was to be sent to the states to emphasize proper disease reporting.
 4. Coordinate the Vv work plan review in 2004 as required in Issue 00-201.

*Vv subcommittee to review any additional comments on efforts necessary to complete work plan elements

2. Continue to encourage industry-implemented post-harvest controls to reduce Vv levels. The Subcommittee is further charged to provide guidance to the states on incentives for PHT and measures of PHT capacity. - 45 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Review current PHT practices and determine what incentives will be effective in increasing PHT capacity
- Review the list of recommended incentives for state to consider in their efforts to increase PHT capacity for further action as appropriate
 - Labeling incentives
 - Harvest classification

3. Evaluate Year 2001 survey results and compare with Year 2003 or 2004 survey results to determine effectiveness in meeting the objectives of the Vv education effort: -- 40% increase in awareness of risk from Vv; -- 15% increase in at-risk consumers no longer eating raw oysters; -- minimize impacts to non-at-risk consumers. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Determine the effectiveness of the Vv education effort through comparison of the 2001 survey results with the 2004 survey results at the March 2005 Vv subcommittee meeting.

BREAK

4. Compile and review data on rates of illness. - 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- The Vv illness data analysis work group (Members: Jennifer Tebaldi, Chair; Susan Wilson; Angela Ruple; Mark Glatzer; Al Rainosek and Dr. John Painter) shall present the Vv illness data with a focus upon the progress attained toward the Vv illness reduction goals.
- Evaluate effect of CA regulation on our ability to evaluate success of Vv illness reduction plan
- Determine if the compilation effort is satisfactory.

5. Evaluate the effectiveness of illness reduction efforts which will be conducted collectively at the end of the 5th year – 12/31/06. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Semi - annual evaluation of illness reduction efforts

March 11, 2004

8:00 A.M. - CALL TO ORDER

8:01 A.M. - ROLL CALL - DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

8:05 A.M.- TOPICS AND POINTS OF DISCUSSION

Note: Time frames are meant to focus discussion to the point of motion making. If, at the end of the discussion time, the committee is not at this point a motion should be made to continue discussion at a future time based upon issue submission deadlines.

6. Evaluate the requirements in Section .04C to determine if changes in controls are necessary to achieve targeted illness reduction goals. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Semi - annual evaluation of controls in place to achieve illness reduction goals

7. Review the current ISSC effort to establish a profile for sensory characteristics for raw oysters. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- This profile is to be will be use to evaluate the marketability of PHT shellfish products

8. Review the efforts to obtain information from the states on the number of harvest vessels with refrigeration on board and the capacity of these vessels to add refrigeration. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Discuss available information to evaluate existing and potential refrigeration capacity aboard harvest vessels.
- Discuss the current capacity in the harvest fleet to provide on board refrigeration
- Determine if there is potential weight load and space capacity on board these vessels to add refrigeration.

9. Review the need to make changes to the current contents and recent additions to Chapter 16, Post-Harvest Treatment, in the Model Ordinance. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Review the progress to date on changes to the elements in Chapter 16 of the Model Ordinance to determine the appropriateness of controls for post harvest treatment.

10. Review the current Post Harvest Treatment Vv levels in the Model Ordinance. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Continue to review the appropriateness of the minimum MPN level of Vv allowable for shellfish with labeling claims.

11. Review status of approved methods for Vv detection. – 30 minutes

Principle points of discussion

- Overview of status of current methods