UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ON MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

STANDING SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 2

Tuesday, November 16, 2004

The Subcommittee met in the Washington Room of the Hilton Old Town, 1767 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia, at 2:45, Dr. Joseph Harris, presiding.

DR. JOSEPH HARRIS Southwest Meat Association, Texas Chairman

MS. SANDRA ESKIN American Association of Retired Persons, MD

DR. LEE C. JAN Texas Department of Health

DR. DAVID CARPENTER Southern Illinois University

MS. DEANNA BALDWIN Maryland Department of Agriculture

DR. ISABEL ARRINGTON

Advisor

PROCEEDINGS

(3:00 p.m.)

DR. HARRIS: I guess we better get started, so I will call it to order and ask if there are any questions.

MS. ESKIN: I had asked the question about customer satisfaction, any sort of feedback that you do on any sort of system on an anecdotal basis, and then Dr. Masters followed up and said -- and I quess my understanding of her response later was we can do that kind of thing inhouse. There is another office -- is that correct? So, I certainly want to talk about It's all these questions, well, certainly give our perspective, perhaps even useful is for you all -- or someone else at FSIS -- to undertake a more representative sample of the trade associations, inspectors, etc. Do you all have any ideas, or when you first were established, or as you evolved, what your own expectations are of what the Center is supposed to do, you'd like it to do?

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, we do.

MS. ESKIN: Because that is certainly someplace to start. Your thought, again, is to sort

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	of measure that against what
2	DR. WENTHER: I have a pamphlet here that
3	you can have, that we hand out from the Center.
4	MS. ESKIN: Cool.
5	DR. ARRINGTON: I'd be happy to read it.
6	DR. HARRIS: Boy, it's got the functions,
7	missions and everything.
8	MS. ESKIN: I'm happy to read it. Is this
9	old, or is that your concern?
10	DR. ARRINGTON: Well, I just want to see,
11	since we reorganized.
12	MS. ESKIN: Does it matter?
13	DR. ARRINGTON: No, it doesn't matter that
14	much because most of the other stuff is but, for
15	example, we don't do import anymore.
16	DR. HARRIS: This probably isn't directly
17	related, but who does import now, because I get those
18	questions a lot, too?
19	DR. ARRINGTON: OIA. Our structure is not
20	like this.
21	MS. ESKIN: I'm happy to just read this,
22	just so we all can share it.
23	"The TSC serves as the Agency's center for

NEAL R. GROSS

technical assistance, advice, and guidance regarding implementation of national policies, the programs, systems, and procedures including implementation of HACCP.... The TSC also assists in the implementation of this strategy and serves as the feedback mechanism relating to changes and refinements in existing systems and procedures. "The TSC serves as a liaison and acts as a

"The TSC serves as a liaison and acts as a conduit to exchange information and provide guidance to a variety of groups, including FSIS inspection personnel and their supervisors, District Managers, other groups within the Agency", etc.

Okay, here is the mission statement. There are five points here. "The mission of the TSC is to provide prompt and consistent service to our customers by: Providing technical advice and guidance."

That would be a specific question -technical advice can be rather specific or rather
general. Is there an example that you can give us
that sort of characterizes that?

DR. ARRINGTON: On what technical advice is?
MS. ESKIN: Yes.

DR. ARRINGTON: Technical advice can range

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 1	
1	from is there a regulation that specifies the line
2	speed for sent in.
3	MS. ESKIN: And you can say, "Yes, it is,
4	it's regulation"
5	DR. ARRINGTON: No, there isn't. All we
6	have is guidance on that.
7	MS. ESKIN: And you can find that guidance
8	at
9	DR. ARRINGTON: We are trying to validate
10	this intervention that we want to use in our plants,
11	and we were going to take this many micro samples, so
12	we were going to do this for 30 days, and do you have
13	any information on that, or I've already done all
14	that, I want to send it to you and get your comments.
15	MS. ESKIN: And you say?
16	DR. ARRINGTON: We say, "Send it".
17	MS. ESKIN: They send it to you, right?
18	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes.
19	MS. ESKIN: "Correlating the execution of
20	inspection procedures and requirements." That sounds
21	like that's more directed to the inspectors who call.
22	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes.
23	MS. ESKIN: "Leading the implementation of
	NEAL R. GROSS

new and modified inspection programs and procedures."

Again, if there's a revised directive or --

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, and really the implementation part is an OFO function. When we were in OFO -- well, when we implemented HACCP, when this Agency implemented HACCP, they said there's only going to be written policy that comes from Policy Office. There is not going to be written policy from every field office that's out there, which is what we did with the regions. The regions would send out regional notices.

When we reorganized for HACCP implementation, they said there is one office that does written policy and speaks for the policy for the Agency, and that is OPPED.

So, when we were under field operations, we could never write anything because it wasn't a notice or a directive. So, most of our guidance was oral, or if somebody sent me an e-mail, I would write back and say, "Generally speaking, here is what it is", or "Yes, we specifically have a reg on that, the interpretation on that reg is you don't do this under any circumstances, or "it's okay to do this", or

"you've got an idea that might work, but I need to get more guidance on it, so let's send it up to Policy", or something like that.

So, now with us being under Policy, we can come closer to do the writing now. Now, the official clearances still, of course, are all through Headquarters, but we've already written one or two notices, the Tech Center wrote them. Now, it doesn't say the Tech Center wrote, but we actually --

MS. ESKIN: No, but the information --

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes.

MS. BALDWIN: With the phone calls -- it was mentioned a lot of your calls is because the inspector of a plant may be disagreeing on the interpretation and getting clarification. So, if an establishment calls you and asks a question and you just respond over the phone, then they go back to the inspector -- I mean, is there any way that you notify that District Office that that question has been asked, or -- you know, if they are not together on the --

DR. ARRINGTON: In the beginning of HACCP implementation, we did notify Districts of calls that we got. That gets to be a lot. It also gets to be the

District Manager -- so what, we got all these calls. What they really want to know is the significant ones. I mean, the run-of-the-mill thing -- you know, so what, somebody didn't know the line speed. Well, they're going to know it now, but so what, if somebody is doing some intervention that really is against the tolerance policy and could really make a precedent so that we have to eat, so to speak, because our tolerance policy -- or something just very significant -- well, everybody wants to know about that.

But what we do routinely is, particularly if we detect that either the plant or the inspector are in a position where there is a lot of disagreement. We actually say "we would like you to call us back together because the best situation would be if you will get the inspector in charge and call us back", or sometimes with the inspector in charge we'll say "have the plant" -- because often the inspector in charge will call and say "we're calling, we know the plant is going to call you next, we wanted to let you know" -- or I'll get it from the industry, well, "the IIC said they just called you guys and said the Tech Center said", and I don't think there's a real hard and fast

_

MS. ESKIN: I'm not sure, this may be out of date a bit because this specifically says "The TSC does not provide a forum for resolving disputes between inspection personnel and plant management".

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, what it means is we don't make the supervisory decision.

MS. ESKIN: Who would do that?

DR. ARRINGTON: In other words, you're hearing some technical information -- you're sitting there hearing the technical information on which way should I go. Your supervisor is going to say "go that way". The Tech Center --

MS. ESKIN: How should that be resolved?

DR. ARRINGTON: Ultimately, the District

DR. HARRIS: Through the Field Operations chain of command.

DR. ARRINGTON: Now, what we will do is, if we're hearing one side that really sounds wrong, incorrect, we actually will say, "Well, national policy is" -- you see, it's one of those that we can say that way, and we have told industry people before,

NEAL R. GROSS

Office.

"yes, you're right to appeal". Then they'll say,

"Well, they're just not going with that. You're

telling me this is the right way, and they're not

going with that". And we would actually say, "You do

have the right to appeal".

So, we handle them in various ways, but we

don't -- it's getting into the supervision and the

actual instruction. We do not instruct anyone in the

field.

MS. ESKIN: Do you do any sort of Q&A, or does some sort of Q&A document or documents come out of all of these many, many questions you get?

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, for BSE we did collect Q&As, and they did become a notice -- of Q&As for BSE.

I forget which notice number it is, but it came out, and those were ones that we collected at the Tech Center. We wrote the proposed answer to them. We sent it to Headquarters. They said, "Hmm, not quite that way; hmm, right on the money", and then finally was cleared and got in a notice.

DR. HARRIS: Early on in HACCP implementation, there were several sets of Q&As that came out as well. They were taking in the calls that

were coming in, kind of grouping them together and 1 2 saying "here are some of the big questions that have come in, and here's what the answers to those are". 3 4 DR. ARRINGTON: Yes. Now, what happened 5 with that was this incredible clearance procedure for 6 those --DR. HARRIS: Much more --8 DR. ARRINGTON: Oh, much more. And at that 9 point, it was almost like we were just not going to do It was ridiculous. I would say that has 10 anymore. 11 changed. My next question is, do you all 12 MS. ESKIN: feel that it's a useful access because that's one 13 thing we could suggest. 14 15 DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, I think it is. I think 16 I think we should do it more because it makes 17 us stay on -- what do you call it -- the top of our 18 game. You know, when you're doing something that's going somewhere, you look at it differently than "oh, 19 well" --20 And it certainly ensures a 21 HARRIS: 22 greater uniformity, where appropriate, and answers to 23 questions.

What we find a lot of time is a DR. JAN: plant will ask a question, and the answer may be A, B, C, and they just -- the plant just hears B, and they say "the Tech Center said B, but B is not complete". And then the inspector may ask the same question, may say it a little bit differently and the answer is A, The inspector may not hear B or may not like B, В, С. and he says, "Well, the Tech Center told me C", and so So, if you had you get the same answer. writing, or there's some way that you could assure that. And even if you have them together on the phone -- once it's -- if it's not written down, people don't remember, or they choose not to remember, and it makes it difficult, and you're getting the same question again and this "Ask Karen" type thing. If you develop a bank that you could have, "Ask Isabel" or something.

ARRINGTON: Or just "Ask the Tech DR. Center". You're just saying have a mechanism. Our Tech Center account is like that. If you send in a message to the Tech Center, you're going to get something back. Now, if you sent in this really long, drawn out one, then we might handle that differently than our usual one which some are

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	complicated, but they are usually you know, you
2	think of an e-mail being fairly short, and you can
3	MS. ESKIN: Pretty straightforward answer.
4	DR. ARRINGTON: because we try within 24
5	hours to have it back out again.
6	DR. JAN: If you could do it like a Google
7	type thing where you say if you have a database,
8	you can go to the database and you say something about
9	maybe it's sausage, and you can get a thousand hits
10	on that, but then you say "what do I want to know
11	about sausage", and you can narrow it down, and then
12	you can get a written answer consistently every time.
13	DR. ARRINGTON: We have an ISIS search
14	capability
15	DR. JAN: That just goes to the regulation
16	and
17	DR. ARRINGTON: Well, no, that's
18	MS. ESKIN: Like a Help Desk. You go to any
19	Web site, like for a program, you're doing something
20	online and you want to
21	DR. ARRINGTON: If we put it in the right
22	database, it's what is the most difficult thing to
23	do it I mean, you try this yourself if you answer

many phone calls. Somebody calls you and at some point you either have to write it down -- and if you write it down, then you've got to go put it in the computer. Or, you're sitting at the computer and you can't type fast enough. We get calls -- well, it's not like you get five a day, it varies, and you don't know which day is going to be a heavy day or a light day.

The other thing, we have an overhead announcement system. I mean, the other thing that we committed to doing was that you get a live person. You get very little voice mail, very little. So, when you call, you'll get on the overhead, and they'll say "There's call about slaughter", а it's about validation, it's about processing, it's about what is the reimbursement rate for overtime for FSIS? I mean, they range from a call on HACCP, well, what's a call on HACCP mean?

MS. ESKIN: What temperature do I have to cook my turkey at in order for it to be done.

DR. ARRINGTON: Right, it could be anything.

You hear that overhead, and the next thin you hear is
a second backup, somebody picked it up. And then you

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

may get third or fourth. So, we've told our staff when it gets to be third or fourth, they're supposed If somebody hasn't picked up by now, stop to pick up. what you're doing and pick up. And when you pick up, again, you don't know if it's about somebody that's got 100,000 pounds that's being retained, or -- you know, I was just wondering, I've been wondering for a long time, whatever happened on the esoteric policy on the esoteric thing -- which is a question to be asked, but -- you know, which one is weighing heavily. from our side, that's our challenge, but we do -- for example, we did collect questions on the RTE survey that went out, and we started collecting them as soon as it got put out there. And we had three people getting calls from the RTE survey -- sent them to Tim, Andy, and somebody else -- so they would take this call, and they would -- they did write them down. Each week they would put them together, we sent them to Headquarters, and they went on the Web at Headquarters. So, I'm thinking something like that on initiatives are not we can do that, but thinking if question we save every we get, particularly the ones that are repeated --

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ESKIN: Now, when you did the Q&A for BSE, you said it went out in a notice. So, for example, if somebody called you -- called into the Tech Center with a question that's answered on that notice, do you refer them to the notice? Do you substantively answer that question by referring them to the notice, and then telling them they can see the notice -- the notice is available, I assume, on the Web?

DR. ARRINGTON: We do all those things.

MS. ESKIN: Okay. So, it's definitely for you all to use as well as --

The ones that I personally DR. ARRINGTON: answer on BSE, I also said, "Well, the answer to that is", blah-blah, and I'd say, "I believe it's in the notice". In fact, I think it's in the so-and-so Now, I've noticed my staff officers notice. immediately say, "Oh, that's covered in Notice so-andso", and they've already clicked or brought down or they've already opened their notebook and said, "What's your question", and then they say, okay, that's" -- yes, we use it and we refer -- and we have a lot of our staff officers that do like to help

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

someone and say "get on the Web where I am at on the 1 2 Web, and let me show you or tell you where you can go to get that". 3 4 DR. HARRIS: We're accomplishing one of the 5 things that I wanted to accomplish, and that is for those of you that do not use the Tech Service Center 6 on a regular basis like some of the rest of us do, do 8 you have questions about how it operates currently? To answer he initial question, 9 DR. WENTHER: to get anything past anybody, you need it in writing. 10 And so at the Tech Center, I've had experience, 11 someone will call up for a question, and I say "I need 12 this in writing", so you're not in competition with 13 the inspector, you e-mail it back in to that direct 14 15 person, and he e-mails you back. But then you have 16 the question and the written response, so there is no 17 question about A, B or C, it's all right there. 18 DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, people do that. 19 DR. WENTHER: It's very helpful. 20 DR. HARRIS: E-mail communication is, far, in my opinion, the most effective means because 21 22 then, like I say, it's not arbitrary as to what the 23 question that was asked was. The person can see

exactly the way he phrased the question and how the response was exactly phrased.

DR. ARRINGTON: Right, but then we, being in the Tech Center, can look at those e-mails and go back to our staff officers and say, "You know, when you write an answer like that, it can be taken three different ways", or "you're too specific" --

MS. ESKIN: Or "is this what I think you mean because you say it this way, but I think what you're asking me is this".

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes. But we're still going to have mistakes. I mean, it's not -- but to have it written is the way -- then everybody can see --

DR. LOBETEIN: Just another comment to echo Jay's comments, having been out in a third position, as a former IIC, as an industry veterinarian, and now a technical person with an allied industry as organization, putting it in writing and copying everybody concerned, be it the District Manager, a supervisor, IIC, there is no problem then in getting a response, favorable or unfavorable, you have clarified, and generally it's been technical a interpretation, it's not a resolution of a dispute,

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

it's very helpful, and it has evolved considerably since it's inception. As far as I'm concerned, I love what it's evolved to. There are more field experienced personnel than were there previously, so they know what happens in any beef plant, or poultry plant -- my experience -- and I think they are well versed and they are more than happy to provide old MPI bulletins that may still be in existence that people have lost somewhere along the line, and I've found the staff to be very, very helpful.

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes. And I think every fall when we do have some staff members, they are not as helpful, but, really, the majority are. The majority are wanting to give as much as they can give.

DR. LOBETEIN: And they will retract -- after receiving some information and you may have either gone unapplauded, there may be another follow-up that says so-and-so wishes to clarify --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. LOBETEIN: -- we want to take that one back, we take that one back, and we want to send you another, this is in clarification. And I, for one, applaud TSC for their development, and I hope that we

NEAL R. GROSS

continue to develop more scenarios. 1 2 I was going to ask you, DR. HARRIS: TSC scenarios, 3 IKEorthose come 4 different --5 DR. ARRINGTON: We do the IKE scenarios. DR. HARRIS: I'll let Dr. Arrington tell you 6 7 -- Interactive Knowledge Exchange -- but she can tell 8 you more about what exactly that is. Can you explain what an IKE scenario is? 9 (Simultaneous discussion.) 10 11 DR. ARRINGTON: IKEs are to further explain or illustrate in a plant setting -- it's a scenario. 12 So, typically, it's in some plant scenario. 13 say something like "You're an IIC in a beef slaughter 14 15 plant that slaughters 2,000 a day" and does this and 16 does that, and they've got this many CPTs, and they've got that and they've got this. One day you walk in --17 18 DR. LOBETEIN: Being a critical thinker --(Laughter and simultaneous discussion.) 19 20 DR. ARRINGTON: -- and it says this and this 21 has happened, or you will observe that, that and that. 22 And then it says, as a critical thinker, what do you do next, what do you think about, and that it's safe 23

and sound, and then it goes, "Well, as a critical thinker, you ought to think about this and you ought to think about that, and you ought to do this". usually it will say "in this case, this is happens", and the reasons the person made this decision was because of this, this, and this. And sometimes we'll have a series, we'll have two or three -- like, I think when the 0157H7, the assessment, came out, we had two or three IKE scenarios, and it was to explain different parts of that directive. sometimes -- I mean, to be truthful, sometimes they do it to clarify policy. We'll find out that something is not clear from what's written, and rather than going back and saying "we've got to rewrite the notice and send it out again", we'll do an IKE scenario that says, "Look, this is the finer point of this".

DR. HARRIS: When I asked my question earlier today, I was thinking about the tonsil notice from a few weeks ago, where they put out the clarification on all the five types of tonsils, and that was one that seemed like maybe the Policy Office didn't give the Tech Center enough heads-up because for a few days there it was like "We'll have to get

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

back to you on that one".

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, we were trying to decide internally what we meant when we said "tonsils".

DR. HARRIS: Exactly.

DR. ARRINGTON: It's one of those things where, "Okay, we've got that covered. Next" -- I'm talking about when the interim rule is written. It's like, tonsils, okay, we took care of that, specified risk material, move on. And then for some reason, the shoe came off about "what do you mean by tonsil", "what does tonsil mean". And it was, I think, a situation where Ken Peterson -- he had a problem. There was a situation and he had to respond, and he said, "This is my first cut at it, this is how we're responding now, to be followed by a notice". And then when we've talked about it more, the notice -- I mean, there's tubal ones that are in certain anatomy books. So, we went back as an Agency, not so much a Tech Center, and looked at what literature is out there to support about the tonsils and so forth, and then we came up with a notice. And then we clarified that in an IKE even farther.

1	DR. HARRIS: I didn't mean to divert us off
2	down that road.
3	MS. ESKIN: The first question, again,
4	should the Tech Center continue to provide technical
5	assistance to establishments? Again, that's not
6	questioning whether the Tech Center should actually
7	still continue, it's just of the things that the Tech
8	Center does, is this something this particular task
9	something they should continue doing?
10	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, that's what I think.
11	First of all, let's just make sure we're all on the
12	same page. And when they say "establishment", they
13	mean "industry". We don't mean FSIS inspectors.
14	MS. ESKIN: Well, I guess the first question
15	is, of course "industry" sounds like it's very
16	supportive, they found it very useful, that's
17	obviously one group.
18	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, they find it very
19	useful.
20	DR. HARRIS: Quite frankly, it's the only
21	place that it's the only convenient place you can
22	call to get those answers. Some of us know
23	individuals throughout the Agency, and if the Tech

1	Center wasn't there, we'd know who to call and get an
2	answer.
3	MS. ESKIN: And you could call your trade
4	association, but they're not going to give you as
5	authoritative knowing the limitations because you
6	don't have a decisionmaker.
7	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes. The trade associations
8	call us, and usually they'll say, "We've got a plant,
9	or a plant, or a group of plants, we understand this
10	is what's happening in those plants. We'd like to
11	know from you"
12	DR. WENTHER: There's too much out there.
13	MS. ESKIN: Right. You need one place to
14	go.
15	DR. ARRINGTON: And we really
16	particularly, I think, the trade associations get more
17	involved when "we've got a plant in this district,
18	we've got a plant in that district, and there seems to
19	be some differences. Can you tell us national
20	policy".
21	MS. ESKIN: Can you give us an idea what
22	percentage of calls you get are from establishments as
23	opposed to your inspectors as opposed to other groups?

I mean, is it overwhelming plurality or majority?

DR. ARRINGTON: It's mostly plant inspectors. But I'm not even sure -- I don't know if we can determine that or not. I think we're just counting calls. I mean, we could do -- actually, we have some old materials. For about a two or three month period, we had every staff officer write down what subject matter they were getting calls on, and we could go back and access that, but I'm not sure we ever said was it industry or -- I would say they are pretty equal.

MS. ESKIN: I only ask that because you specifically asked the question. Obviously, you should see there are no other groups than for your inspectors. I mean, you're the Tech Center. Again, there's some sense here that --

DR. ARRINGTON: We're clearly in the middle, or at least that's really the way I see it. I mean, we really want to talk about national policy. We really -- we try to call them as we see them. We think a plant -- which is trying to get over on us because they don't want to comply with something, or whatever reason they don't want to, then we'll try to

push hard on the side of the inspector. On the other hand, if it sounds like the inspector is being over-regulatory, we'll push the other way.

Do you have any sense -- any of you all who use it -do you have any sense if there are groups out there
inside the Agency, outside the Agency, that don't want
the Tech Center to continue giving this advice to the
establishment? I'm just trying to figure out where
the question is coming from, if it's just a question
to ask at a point when you're evaluating --

DR. CARPENTER: My first question is if you don't, who will?

DR. JAN: I think that the only thing that anybody even questions is is this contributing to a --supporting the establishment is giving ammunition to have some -- be able to argue with the inspector, but as long as the information is consistent, I think the establishment is the place to go to get the answers. I mean, they can't always get it from the inspectors, they don't know the answers. There are a lot of things that are just -- I mean, every day there is a new day and there's something new, a new perspective, or a new way to look at something because it didn't happen

before, so it's good to have a source.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But to go to the next part of that question
-- and I don't know if the Technical Service Center
can do this -- but I think what would help both the
establishments as well as I would think FSIS but
certainly the state programs would be the Tech Center
to be a source for data and source of information that
can be used to support a HACCP plant, or to support a
decision made in a HACCP plant. I mean, there's only
so many HACCP plants and they are all very similar -they are not all the same, but they are very similar --

MS. ESKIN: Could you give an example?

Let's say an establishment DR. JAN: Yes. looks at dried beef -- make it dried beef -- and they want to take and say "One of the quidelines says that water activity may be" -- if you take that statement alone -- oh, here, it says right here that it may justification have, so this is my it's justification, but the Tech Center could gather data from others that have done the work -- for example, they've taken dried beef, sent it to a lab, had it inoculated and found out that at this water activity,

1	it is lethal and it this or above this one it is not -
2	- if they had that data rather than every plant doing
3	their own, they could go to the Tech Center as a
4	repository and say "Do you have any information that
5	could help me support that my dried beef water
6	activity is low enough"
7	MS. ESKIN: Do you get questions like that
8	now?
9	DR. ARRINGTON: We get questions on "Do you
10	have any data or do you know where we can get any
11	data".
12	MS. ESKIN: And the answer
13	DR. ARRINGTON: Sometimes the world, kind of
14	like the small plant, we may get it from the Outreach
15	staff, or we may say, "Yes, we're aware that Bruce
16	Tompkins has a study with the temperature thing, and,
17	yeah, we know where it is, we can give it to you, we
18	can give you a copy of it, or try your trade
19	association and they'll fax you a copy".
20	(Simultaneous discussion.)
21	DR. HARRIS: Most of us have it within
22	finger reach.
23	DR. JAN: That's coming from where we've had

plants -- and we've had plants, most small plants do it, and they say -- they show it to us, and then they say "That's my information, I don't want to share it with anybody else". And I don't know if they have that right to say that or not --

MS. ESKIN: Proprietary.

DR. JAN: I mean, it's not in our hands, we don't have the right to give it to them. If they could get it into your hands -- I don't know if there's a way to do that, but I would think that that's the --

DR. ARRINGTON: When we're talking about scientific studies, and they're always published, anybody can have this. When we're talking about actually in-plant, what data you have in your plant, I'm not sure that you can necessarily have it in another plant anyway.

I mean, the idea this is the kind of data you would need, we would say, "Yes, looks like to me that shows you're validated" --

DR. JAN: Well, what I'm getting at is, dried beef is dried beef, so if there's dried beef and it's got water activity of 0.7, and there are studies

that have been done in a lab by inoculating this dried beef that's 0.7 with x-amount of LM, for example, and then a week, or two, or three weeks later down the road, take a sample of that product again and find that there's a 1-log or 2-log reduction, then dried beef at .7 is dried beef at .7 water activity, doesn't matter --

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, they're still going to have to carry out that they made the measurement --

DR. JAN: Right, they measured that they -what I'm trying to say is that the plant would measure
the water activity, but they wouldn't have to do the
inoculation studies if they could get hold of those
inoculation studies.

DR. ARRINGTON: What I think I'm hearing from Headquarters is we are going to push in-plant validation. Now, that's just sort of something I think I'm hearing. You have to have the scientific study that somebody did the principal work, but you may have to have something in your plant that actually says under your exact conditions, when you do this and this and this and this, yes, you show that. So, we may need to clarify that.

MS. ESKIN: You're also saying that the study that you're referring to, again, is not necessarily from another plant as much as it would be available through a scientific journal or something like that. If it's plant data or if it's something that's proprietary and they give it to the Government, the Government cannot -- they can withhold it.

DR. JAN: Well, if the Government can say that's proprietary if it's not -- it's just saying dried beef. It's not saying how they made the dried beef, it's the end result if the water activity is .7 -- if the water activity is .7, or .69, or .72, or whatever that cutoff is -- if there's data out there -- I mean, we've had small plants that are making it day-by-day, and then you say, "Okay, you can say .7, but you're going to have to go" -- so they have to take their product, send it to a lab, pay the lab -- I mean, it's a tough business. And if that information is out there, then why does every plant have to do their own, if there can be a repository -- and I think the Tech Center would be that repository. Or another thing would be -- exactly what we're talking about -if there is a study done by a university on that,

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

rather than the plant trying to figure out go
through the operation and spend nights in the library
looking for it, couldn't they go to the Tech Center
and say "Can you tell me where I can find this
information?"
DR. ARRINGTON: Where do you draw the line
that I do a literature search for you.
DR. JAN: No, I'm not saying you do a
literature search, I'm saying if you gather that over
time, you're going to have those questions repeatedly
rather than once, and once you've had that, you can
have a source you can go to and say "Here's where it
is".
MS. ESKIN: They do it at least to some
degree now, meaning referring to relevant things that
you know what the issue is
DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, we do do it
DR. WENTHER: This is about three issues
here. First thing, let me just clarify, FSIS you
think is now going to encourage plants to bring in
live pathogens in their plants to make sure
DR. ARRINGTON: Well, not live pathogens
no, that part won't change, but the whole thing about

you've got to know that it works in your plant. 1 2 But I can't validate just it DR. WENTHER: kills listeria, if I don't bring listeria in my plant 3 4 to kill it. 5 DR. ARRINGTON: Well, plus, the E.coli ISRI assessment, we didn't say put in a 1-5-7, when we know 6 that there's not anything that directly correlates 8 with it that you can say, "Yes, that's absolutely an indicator organism", but yet people did do things 9 about their interventions to say, "Yes, 10 these likely to kill a 1-5-7 or at least reduce it". 11 don't think it's really different, it's just I don't 12 think we're backing off of that. 13 (Simultaneous discussion.) 14 15 DR. WENTHER: -- name of Mary Cutshall last 16 year sometime where we stated that these journal 17 articles that are out there that are publications that 18 are free knowledge, that is true. People can copy it themselves. FSIS cannot send that journal article out 19 there for free because it's --20 21 DR. ARRINGTON: Actually, we can. 22 (Simultaneous discussion.) 23 DR. ARRINGTON: We can give the citation.

DR. WENTHER: You can give the citation, but they still have to go to the university and get their own copy. And it's really confusing and it gets really bad because we've got EIAO out there helping people, but it's illegal what they're doing, just copying articles --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. HARRIS: That gets to be a whole complicated thing because if you refer -- you know, if one of the plants like you're talking about calls the Tech Center and you tell them, "Okay, here's the citation", you may as well tell them that a Zealand sheepherder in the mountains has the only living copy of that because them getting that journal article is not necessarily a menial task, it's something that can be a tall order for some farms that wouldn't have any idea of where to go to find the Journal of Food Protection. But I better get us back focused where we're headed here.

A couple of things I would like to do. As we go through with this, I think I'm hearing around the room, the first question, in and of itself, I think is very basic. And what I think has worked in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the past in some of our subcommittees is to assign different members of the group little sections of this to draft the language on. And I would volunteer to draft an opening statement basically describing our support in that "yes" for the first question. And I'll work on that and share with you. And then as we go through, we can talk about -- okay. Assuming that's a "yes" then, we need to make a list of and describe what are the changes and how they provide this assistance that can make it more effective. before we start talking about what changes need to be made, do I have a volunteer that would draft our response to that one? We have one. Deanna is going to do that.

As long as we're making assignments there -and we'll be talking about each of these questions as
we go through, but just so we'll know -- who will
volunteer to take on the assisting the Agency's "Other
constituent group" question? Okay. Sandra is going
to do that one.

And then, finally, in what new or enhanced ways can FSIS use the TSC to ensure that the Agency realizes the full benefits offered? David will work

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

on that one.

Okay. So we have some assignments. Now we can start talking about the content. And, basically, I'll take it on the first part -- in a little while we'll take a little break and just start drafting this stuff, but I will basically draft a short paragraph that says, you know, the committee was in consensus that obviously the Tech Center should continue to provide -- you know -- and then we're going to give suggestions on how they can do it better.

So, what are some changes then, let's focus on that one. Are changes needed, and what changes need to be made?

MS. ESKIN: I think developing more Q&A, you could put that suggestion in that answer. Again, it may not be appropriate, but Isabel mentioned every time there's a new initiative, it seems like that is an appropriate time to work towards that, that that would make the process better.

DR. ARRINGTON: And you mean to publish, not just develop --

(Simultaneous discussion and laughter.)

DR. HARRIS: Make them available.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. ESKIN: Publish for you all to use and for consumers or constituents to refer to.

DR. HARRIS: To touch on something that I think where Lee was headed with some of that a while ago, in my opinion, something that would be very useful, and the Technical Center seems to be the logical place at least to have the information, whether or not the Technical Center develops it, maybe that could be farmed out -- I don't want to say contracted because that starts implying too much -- but farmed out to other entities. For example -- and Lee's is one example, I want to use a different one because it's one that I think is fairly frequently discussed -- the use of lactic acid rinse on carcasses as a pathogen intervention.

We know that there are certain parameters that need to be followed for that to be effective. Ι don't know what all of them are, but concentration and there's temperature primarily are the two key components of that. If you get the scientific literature, scientific literature being literature, they basically -scientific if it's measurable, they measured it and they put it in their

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

article. The question frequently comes up, "Well, you haven't validated that you're achieving the same pressure in applying this that they used in the scientific article".

So then the question comes up, "Well, that wasn't an important parameter". Well, who knows it wasn't an important parameter? But, to me, it would be useful for certain common situations to have basically -- like we have with Appendix A and B -- if you follow these parameters, we consider that to be a validated process.

DR. ARRINGTON: Condition of use.

DR. HARRIS: Yes. But I mean, if you apply lactic acid under these three conditions, or whatever conditions the scientific community agrees are most important, you don't need to have a stack of scientific articles to support that, that the Agency is okay with that. To me, that would be enormously beneficial to industry, particularly smaller plants that could have some issues like that -- again, just like they use Appendix A and B -- we don't want to get into how well these have been -- A, sometimes -- but those were published by the Agency to say "if you

1	follow these times, temperatures, and other
2	conditions, that's validated, you don't need any
3	additional supporting data". And I think that more
4	examples of that would be useful. I dont know how the
5	committee feels about it. And I think that's kind of
6	where you were headed with your discussion a while
7	ago.
8	DR. ARRINGTON: You're saying not for us to
9	develop them, but have them available to send out.
10	DR. HARRIS: Develop them if that's
11	appropriate, or oversee their development may be a
12	better term.
13	DR. JAN: You wouldn't actually have to do
14	the study or the science, but if you have that
15	knowledge
16	DR. ARRINGTON: Collate it.
17	DR. JAN: yeah, bring it together and
18	say, "Okay, this is the information", like he's
19	saying.
20	DR. HARRIS: For example back on the
21	lactic acid example that I was using, I don't know who
22	the guru on lactic acid is, but let's just say that
23	Gary Acuff at A&M has done a lot of work in that area,

1	and maybe you could get a guy like Gary Acuff and say,
2	"Okay, Gary, list the key parameters that a plant
3	should be using to make sure this is effective", and
4	he might give you a range of concentrations, a range
5	of temperature or application, or any other parameters
6	appropriate, and develop that into a short document
7	that a plant then, if they wanted to use lactic acid,
8	could follow.
9	DR. ARRINGTON: We've got a new technology
10	letter that explains the use of lactic acid
11	DR. HARRIS: Okay. I wasn't aware of it,
12	and I stay in pretty good contact.
13	DR. ARRINGTON: Well, maybe it is that we're
14	not tapping into that, the availability of it, but
15	MS. ESKIN: Have you all called and asked
16	and been told or is that just an example?
17	DR. HARRIS: That was just an example. I
18	haven't.
19	DR. ARRINGTON: It's a letter that's gone to
20	a plant that says your study if it came in for a
21	new technology application, they got an answer. It
22	was either, no, you can't do it anymore, or, yes, your
23	study shows for that purpose.

1	DR. JAN: But it's just for that plant,
2	right?
3	DR. ARRINGTON: But it's not just for that
4	plant.
5	DR. JAN: So you're saying that that's
6	available to everybody.
7	DR. ARRINGTON: Right, it's for that plant,
8	but if you take it and follow it, why are we going to
9	say that's brand new? We went through that whole
10	lactic acid what was it, 5 percent before this,
11	we had guidance that said like 2 1/2 percent IBT
12	did a whole big study that said, "Yes, 5 percent is
13	still not residual. No, you don't have to put it on
14	the label".
15	DR. HARRIS: And, again, that particular
16	example
17	DR. ARRINGTON: But it's us not giving that
18	information to you because that's a letter that
19	anybody can access.
20	MS. ESKIN: Well, that's the question
21	DR. ARRINGTON: That's what you're saying,
22	isn't it, because I'll tell you where I was coming
23	from. I was wondering if you were saying come up and

1	put all the information together because
2	MS. ESKIN: That's done already.
3	DR. ARRINGTON: Yeah, versus whatever is
4	done already, can you get a better compilation of it
5	so that when somebody asks, we have that and we can
6	DR. HARRIS: Those kinds of things I think
7	would be enormously useful.
8	DR. ARRINGTON: But you're not really saying
9	develop
10	DR. HARRIS: No, no, no, that's not what I'm
11	saying.
12	DR. ARRINGTON: It isn't so much think about
13	how you would say "Those plants will want to know
14	about versus" I can see this coming across our desk
15	we need to get this into our resources so that if
16	we're asked about it, we can pass that on.
17	DR. HARRIS: I guess my perception would be,
18	if I were to call the Tech Service Center tomorrow and
19	say, gosh, I'm a small guy and I'm trying to use
20	lactic acid as a pathogen intervention, would the Tech
21	Center refer me to that letter, or would they say,
22	"Well, you need to develop your own validation for
23	using that"?

1	DR. ARRINGTON: I actually think we'd say we
2	have some guidelines on that, we have some old
3	guidance on that. We probably would say, you know
4	and Mary Cutshall I think has something on it but
5	now that you've said it, I'm not sure we are using all
6	those new technology letters, and you can't it is
7	for that plant, but if you wanted to use that and you
8	knew what was in the letter, then I don't think the
9	letter says share.
10	DR. WENTHER: Well, why wait until somebody
11	asks.
12	DR. ARRINGTON: I'm going to check into that
13	somehow because I know if I were to get the same
14	request after having a letter that said, yes, somebody
15	went through a trial, the Headquarters agreed that
16	this trial is okay
17	MS. ESKIN: Why couldn't they just replicate
18	it?
19	DR. ARRINGTON: why couldn't they just
20	replicate it, and it would be a quicker turnaround and
21	the whole thing.
22	DR. WENTHER: Going back to when the generic
23	HACCP plans were invented, if you went and looked at

what CCP was identified for each HACCP plan in each position whereas your scientific documentation for choosing 41 degrees, and you guys had that electronically in a library, without having somebody to ask, and just had it all listed, that would be so useful to the small plants, it is unbelievable. That's all we do, it seems like, anymore.

DR. ARRINGTON: I'm hearing compilation of helpful resources.

DR. HARRIS: And, again, this is so useful. More and more and more, it's amazing we've gone this far, and there are still companies that have not had to really supply their validation. And the more EIAOs we get out there, the more and more companies are being asked for this information, and the more those kind of calls we're getting, they're like, gosh, I'm using -- I don't want to keep using lactic acid for an example -- but I'm using such-and-such and such-andsuch, and I think it works, but I need the validation. it And may so happen that they are absolutely following all the parameters that they need to be they just don't have following, of а сору the document.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	DR. ARRINGTON: Especially when they don't
2	have a copy of the document, but also I guess we don't
3	want it to become like "here's your sheet of paper,
4	you're fine".
5	MS. ESKIN: That's not your determination,
6	that's
7	(Simultaneous discussion.)
8	DR. ARRINGTON: as long as we gave them
9	some paper, you're taken care of, and then they find
10	out, oh, by the way, you have
11	DR. HARRIS: But the Agency has done that in
12	some other areas, they just pick and choose which
13	areas they decide that that's the way to go. Again,
14	harking back to Appendix B on stabilization. If I'm
15	following Appendix B, that's bulletproof no
16	inspector anywhere can question that.
17	DR. ARRINGTON: All you have to do is say
18	you're following it.
19	DR. HARRIS: It's sort of an inconsistency
20	on the Agency's part, not on the Tech Service Center's
21	part.
22	DR. CARPENTER: I've got an issue I can't
23	address a whole bunch of acronyms, but looking at all

1	the stuff we read over before we got here, if you look
2	at the Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods
3	and talking about redefining pasteurization and coming
4	up with hot rinse and irradiation and UV. As the data
5	are accumulated on the effects of this, whatever those
6	are, shouldn't that be over here? And I'm not sure
7	answering question No. 2 and question No. 4, 2 is for
8	establishments, 4 is for the Agency? I mean, it goes
9	both ways, won't it? Dr. Arrington? As those data
10	are accumulated, shouldn't it be incumbent upon you to
11	accrue those data in a consistent manner for the
12	establishment, and then to use it for the benefit of
13	the Agency?
14	DR. ARRINGTON: Well, we don't approve
15	anything.
16	DR. CARPENTER: Approve?
17	(Simultaneous discussion.)
18	DR. CARPENTER: I'm not talking about
19	approving, I said "accrue".
20	DR. ARRINGTON: Oh, accrue, I thought you
21	said "approve".
22	DR. CARPENTER: No, accrue. I mean, where
23	else would you do it?

DR. HARRIS: The Agency only disapproves, 1 2 they don't approve. 3 (Laughter.) 4 DR. ARRINGTON: Okay. I'm not sure what 5 you're saying. You're saying we should approve --DR. CARPENTER: The Committee 6 on Microbiological Criteria for Food is in here, it's 8 talking about the definition of pasteurization and 9 what are the methodologies that might satisfy that, and there's a half a dozen -- irradiation, UV, high 10 11 pressure -- but as the data are accrued for the effectiveness of each of those, shouldn't you be the 12 repository for the benefit of 13 Question establishment, and for the benefit of 4, the Agency. 14 15 If not you, who? I mean, Micro gets all these data, 16 what do they do with those data? 17 DR. ARRINGTON: Well, we're aware of studies 18 and information in general at the Tech Center 19 things that happen, of keeping up. But we have -- if there's been something new, if somebody calls us --20 What if one of Joe's members 21 DR. HARRIS: 22 calls and says, "To enhance food safety, I think if I

implemented one of these new technologies that the

1	Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Food is
2	working on, in order to enhance it, I think I want to
3	implement it. Can you give me advice on what the data
4	that have been accumulated say or don't say, or is it
5	in fact feasible?" I mean, not having your
6	information, would you say go to the library, copy a
7	bunch of articles?
8	DR. ARRINGTON: Well, when you have
9	something that people are wondering whether it's a new
10	technology or not, we've got that directive, I think
11	it is, that we go by about whether it's sanitary
12	condition, whether it's heat inspection, and there's
13	two other categories
14	MS. ESKIN: Doesn't it need to be approved,
15	though, before it's allowed to be used?
16	DR. ARRINGTON: It depends on what it is.
17	MS. ESKIN: I mean, if it's like irradiation
18	which is considered a food additive.
19	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, if it's a food
20	additive, then it's got to be approved by FDA. So
21	that is an approval process. I'm just saying when a
22	new technology exists especially criteria of
23	whether it's a new technology and when somebody

calls us, either the inspector or the industry, says, "I want to try this new equipment. I want to try this We'll say, "Have you -- does it do the new process". four things or not?" If it does the four things, one of the four things, then it has to qo new technology, it to be submitted to has the technology staff.

I'll give an example of processing of Those are considered new technology. go up to the staff in Washington. They often sent them to us and said "give us your comments on this proposal", we will give comments and send it back up to them and then they'll look at it, too, and then all together they'll send a letter to that company and say, "Yeah, go ahead and try your trial as long as" -or "go ahead" -- or "don't think this will fly", or usually they say collect your data and we'll look at it, and then they'll say this doesn't fly, or it does. I mean, I think they probably have more approvals than they do disapprovals. But we're involved in that, but we're involved in that through that staff. So, if later somebody calls in and says they want to use a certain kind of intervention for an on-line

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

reprocessing, we usually know that and we'll say, yeah, that's been tried.

I think on those -- I'm not sure if we're sending out the letters or we're saying talk to New Technology staff and they'll tell you. But where is the line between our responsibility to have up-to-date information and your responsibility as an industry to do the validation of -- and I'm talking about not the very small plant and maybe not the small, but definitely the large plants -- your responsibility to know enough about your process to be able to come up with a validation study.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. HARRIS: I was going to say, I don't like really -- and I'm probably guilty of doing it -- talking too much about small plants, but we all need to be living by the same rules, regardless of size.

DR. JAN: I agree. And I think -- I mean, regardless of size, they all have their responsibility, but I think what you're saying is the large plant, like IBP and the Armours or whoever out there, they've got the staff and the resources to do that research, but if that research has already been

done, and mom and pop, who are spending 12-hour days trying to get the product out and then at the end of that day they need to go and try to find the data, couldn't they call you and say, "This is what I'm trying to do, do you have any information or could you tell me where I could get it", rather than having them do all the research and all that kind of stuff. That's kind of where I'm going to, rather than --

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, just describe the difference between that and we actually get all the data ready for you -- here's your package --

DR. JAN: No, not that, but just the first place they could go at least to get pointed in the right direction on "where can I go" -- you're right, you don't have to worry about the big guys because they have their own Q/A and all their staff there that can -- that's their job.

DR. ARRINGTON: I was talking to IBP the other day, and actually they had gone to -- and this is the headquarters one -- they called out to the University of Nebraska and got them to work something for them.

DR. WENTHER: They can afford it.

NEAL R. GROSS

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. ARRINGTON: It was something they needed right away, and they got it.

DR. JAN: Some of the people that worked on -- not all of them, but they are a particular company and I don't even know if they are in business anymore -- but they took -- it was an older couple, and they took their retirement or Social Security checks to pay the salaries of the people that they hired to run their plant. I mean, that's the only way They weren't making enough they could pay them. money, and they were still wanting to do that. now you take them, and now they've got to take some money -- and I don't think that retirement check is going to be enough for the University of Nebraska or the University of Kansas or anybody else to do any kind of study for them. So they could call --

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, actually, this was just some technical information. They got some pictures of tonsils, which surprised me they didn't do it themselves, but they didn't. But, anyway --

DR. JAN: Anyway, that's where I was going with the problem.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. WENTHER: Part of the point of going to the University of Nebraska or a university is to get it outside the company, so they've got an accredited university doing it, so that may stand for a lot. That's where we get nervous, too, as to who approved these validated studies. I think one of the questions was, "Will you approve it" -- because one IIC comes in on Monday and the next new one comes in on Friday, is he going to approve it the same way, or think that the data is good enough, is it going to be acceptable?

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, especially anything that's close, go one way or the other. It must be very frustrating.

DR. HARRIS: What other ways in terms of improving effectiveness? I personally like the idea of somehow or other trying to capture some customer feedback, if you will -- maybe "customer" isn't the right term -- but most tech support that I deal with -- which I deal with frequently enough on computer issues -- most tech support has some means of getting that feedback, even if it's something as simple as at the end of the call them saying, "So, do you feel like we were able to help you with whatever you called

about today", or what are the thoughts on that?

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. ARRINGTON: I think that we've got new performance elements that are now tied to our mission statement of the Agency, and one of them that we have for the Tech Center Staff Officer on my staff Customer Service. And what they were told is, this is about your e-mails and your phone calls and how you package what you say, that you're relative to all that you are talking to. It's different when you are talking to a trade association versus a GS-7 that's on a break and is upset about something, or a District It's when somebody calls in that's really upset, that you don't get upset, too; that somebody just can't seem to understand something, that you're patient with them, that you get them off the phone when you've talked to them enough, and that's -part of that is did they get an answer or what they need. So that was -- I mean, I like --

DR. HARRIS: How specific does that recommendation from us need to be? Do we just need to recommend that the Agency explore mechanisms for doing that, or -- Dr. Masters indicated she wanted us to be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

pretty specific on that, I'm just not sure that I know enough about the Agency's internal mechanisms for that to be that specific.

DR. JAN: Well, one thing -- I don't know about the mechanisms needed, but one of the things that would be good to ask is did we give you the answer to the question you asked, because many times we'll send -- I'll send a question, and I get an answer, but it's not to the question that I asked. It may be around it, but it's not to the question I asked. And maybe it's Texas beef versus Oklahoma beef or something, but --

It really is also how --DR. ARRINGTON: say how great it is to put something writing, at the same time, if you don't write something properly, it can be interpreted in a way it wasn't meant to be said. And the other thing we know is, if I write you an e-mail, it could be all over the U.S. in a couple of days, or at least all over the region you live in, and it could be taken out of And I'm not saying we shouldn't -- all I'm context. saying is it takes longer to write a better e-mail about that, but that might be some way -- you're

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

saying, well, you didn't really answer my question. Sometimes I actually write stuff where it's like "read my lips", that's why I'm saying to you -- and I try to make it clear, if I can't actually say it, because some of these things are about practicalities. And I think that's one of the things that when people call the Tech Centers, we tend to give a more practical answer than if they call Headquarters. Headquarters They cannot do anything but say the has nothing. We can say, okay, being practical, what does policy. So when we put that in writing, though, this mean? we've got to be careful about how we do that. back to this thing about, hey, are we nitpicking here?

I had somebody call me about chlorine use, and it's 5ppm is what's allowed in water. Well, somebody had 5.2 parts, and they were asking this plant to come up with a study that showed that that chicken wasn't adulterated with chlorine. You would not believe it. I could not believe -- I said, "5.2?" They said, "Yeah, they were over, 5.2" -- you know, technically, they're over.

So, that's when I work with them to say -- because technically that's over 5, is that practical?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And in my mind, for myself, I was thinking, I'd like to be in front of a judge saying "it was 5.2, that's why we took their inspection away". So, you know, I talked about it, and what I put to them in writing was to kind of say "I can't tell you that you're wrong, but think about some things here". And so we get into some of those. And I know --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. JAN: That's a real problem, too, what you're saying.

I mean, if you push me to DR. ARRINGTON: the wall, I'm going to tell you, yeah, 5.2 is wrong, because I can't say it's right. On the other hand, if I was the supervisor of that person in the plant, I'd say, "Well, 5.2, that's not wrong" -- I mean, it's just 2 parts -- because the real data that talked about the safety of 5 really isn't 5, there isn't really strong studies that say it is. We just say, yeah, we think it's 5 because we never did anything about that. We don't really know. But I still think we should strive to do what you said, that you get material that say you answered my question. I think it should strive to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	DR. HARRIS: And I think that kind of
2	response is appreciated from industry to kind of
3	temper, for lack of a better term, that sometimes that
4	is most helpful to get that kind of response back from
5	the Tech Service Center.
6	DR. ARRINGTON: Right, because we are not in
7	the heat of it. We don't have to walk in the next day
8	and work with you, and the same way for the inspectors
9	you know what I'm saying.
10	Have you all thought anything about
11	correlation for us doing correlation, because I
12	hear that from industry, that we do more correlation.
13	DR. HARRIS: Oh, absolutely, and I'm
14	surprised it hasn't come up yet. I think, in general,
15	that you guys do a very good job of giving good sound
16	answers based on regulatory requirements. There is
17	still that perception out there still the reality,
18	to some extent or another, that you don't always
19	you can call and get different answers. Is that the
20	type of correlation you're talking about?
21	DR. ARRINGTON: No, it wasn't, but that call
22	and get different answers, I think that's

DR. HARRIS: That's an ongoing --

1	DR. ARRINGTON: But I think that's where
2	you're talking about on the customer feedback and how
3	do we know we've giving the right answer, even adding
4	on to every call, we'd say at the end of a call, "Did
5	you get what you want", whereas at the end of every e-
6	mail we say "If this doesn't answer your complete
7	question, please let us know". That gets at also the
8	consistency.
9	DR. HARRIS: And that's a challenge faced by
10	any entity that's got a team of people answering
11	questions, that's not unique to the Government or any
12	particular branch of government
13	MS. ESKIN: Customer service
14	DR. HARRIS: and consistency from one
15	representative to the next is a challenge.
16	DR. ARRINGTON: I guess that's what I'm
17	hearing you say then is
18	MS. BALDWIN: That's hard to put on a survey
19	and ask people, though, because it could be that
20	person spoke differently so they used different words
21	and it sounded like a different answer. It could
22	truly be two entirely different answers, but it could
23	be just the way it was stated that the person

2

2

listening understood it as a different answer.

DR. HARRIS: And maybe some of these things that we're talking about will indirectly address that, things like making more Q&As available. That would contribute to enhancing the consistency.

DR. ARRINGTON: Right. But the correlation I was talking about is actually going out to some kind of group or team, whether it's an inspector group, an industry group, or a combination group, and will actually do things like "Today we're going to talk to you about" -- and we go through the topic. We've had lots of experience in doing pathology correlation, but you can do that with anything. And we go to District offices and give talks. We'll say "We're going to give a talk on condensation", and we'll run through things about condensation, and then we'll open it up to questions and answers. So, we could do those on any topic.

I've just heard a lot of the industry groups say "we want correlation", and usually in pathology we do include plant management.

DR. LOBSTEIN: I think it helped two years ago when specifically correlation was done nationwide

for HIMP plants and poultry. Even though we didn't address specific pathology issues, which I thought coming to the meeting up here was what was going to be addressed and it's not what exactly happened in the field.

DR. ARRINGTON: Oh, it didn't?

DR. LOBSTEIN: Not specific pathology, it was generalizations. John Lendle (phonetic), Gary Parker -- I can't think of the third person --

DR. ARRINGTON: Tom?

No, it was actually somebody DR. LOBSTEIN: from A&M -- maybe it was Ralph Hinckleman (phonetic) -- the three of them went around the United States to the 20 HIMP plants. And while it was beneficial to resolve some of those other issues, it didn't specifically address pathology, the No. 1 category, which I think industry-wide -- I think I probably speak industry-wide that needs to be done still. to get one or two people to go from District to District and draw those in with industry members would be very beneficial still today.

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, we're supposed to have a place that if an industry asked the District Manager

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 to have correlation, then the District Manager can ask them to come out and do a correlation for us, and we 2 have done that for turkey. 3 4 DR. HARRIS: Just to clarify -- there's 5 nothing worse than sitting in a meeting with people talking in acronyms that you don't know. Do you guys 6 know what a HIMP plant is -- HACCP Based Inspection 8 Models Program -- not hemp as in hemp. 9 (Laughter and simultaneous discussion.) DR. CARPENTER: Well, the other look is the 10 correlation, and it sounds like conference calls. 11 DR. ARRINGTON: It's not. It's a term of 12 art that means just what Mark says. He went out -- he 13 just read the reg -- it says something about -- I 14 15 don't know what it says -- physiological change --16 DR. LOBSTEIN: Generalized systemic 17 conditions. DR. ARRINGTON: Yeah, that's what it says. 18 So, in his mind, he knows what that means. 19 20 (Simultaneous discussion.) Yes, but in his mind, he 21 DR. ARRINGTON: 22 knows why it doesn't. And if you ask him enough, he'd 23 probably be able to say "the reason is" blah, blah,

blan. Okay. You go out to, and you've read the same
Reg, and in your mind it's this. Okay. It turns out
that you're both right, but you're here and he's
there. You're not agreeing. Okay. I come out as the
National Correlator, and because we've decided in
policy what we're going to call you guys are like
this, I get you to move to here. I say, "No, what
you're calling in this case I would not call", that
doesn't quite fall in that category. Or I say to him,
"Boy, that is really", and by us going through it and
looking at it we usually look at real live
they're not live samples real samples we will
actually come up with afterwards that you two are
closer together and you're calling it closer,
therefore, you're not disagreeing. So, he's the
inspector and he's the plant, and you're no longer
upset because the inspectors are throwing them away.
I don't mean upset, it's not a matter of being upset.
It's where you're on the same playing field as all
the other plants out there. So, correlation is about
getting people on the same page.

DR. LOBSTEIN: You've just touched on it, the subjectivity over time in that interpretation

NEAL R. GROSS

broadens that spectrum and --

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. ARRINGTON: It's a normal human tendency to just drift. And if you don't come back and give people feedback -- and the reason we can give the feedback is we are the technical experts and that's what we do, is think about this kind of stuff. I've done a lot of pathology correlation because that used to be my job in Washington. Usually what I found happened is it gets to the point where you couldn't communicate anymore. Often it was a communication problem, but it would also sometimes be a lack of technical knowledge that they either had forgotten what they knew, or they just never did know it. And once you would say that, they'd go, "Oh, okay, now I see", now they're communicating again and now they're back on the page. But it's just the normal drifting -- that the only way you bring it back is by having this third party -- because I don't really care if you win or you win. I really am trying to get at what's I've heard that feedback a lot the national policy. from industry, that we could have it define pathology topics, and the plant management usually on is involved if we go onsite.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. HARRIS: I think expanding the efforts
2	on correlation activities will be excellent, and maybe
3	making District Districts probably are very aware
4	of that tool. I don't know how aware industry is that
5	they might could gather together a group within a
6	District or whatever, and request the correlation. I
7	would love to see it on I mean, it's been done a
8	lot on zero tolerance in pathology.
9	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, we do a lot on zero
10	tolerance. We did it in a lamb plant last year.
11	DR. HARRIS: There might be some
12	opportunities in processing inspection, I'm not aware
13	of any correlations going on in processing inspection.
14	There may be, I'm not aware of it.
15	DR. ARRINGTON: No, they are more about LM
16	sampling or things like that.
17	DR. HARRIS: So I'd like to see personally
18	more correlation activities whenever the opportunities
19	arise.
20	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, but the thing I'm
21	always hearing is I mean, I'm putting words in your
22	mouth, I know but are you differentiating between
23	industry initiated versus inspection initiated?

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	DR. HARRIS: I'm not really differentiating.
2	I guess what I'm saying is that both entities need to
3	be involved and be present whenever possible, I don't
4	care who initiates it.
5	MS. BALDWIN: What would be wrong with
6	having it be routine to do those?
7	DR. ARRINGTON: We're not doing them
8	routinely. You're saying formalized.
9	MS. BALDWIN: Yes. I mean, instead of
10	waiting until there's a problem and somebody
11	requesting it.
12	DR. LOBSTEIN: You've read Draft 7 of HIMP,
13	apparently.
14	DR. WENTHER: A lot of these correlations is
15	there is sometimes documentation that is created so
16	that when you leave, it doesn't
17	DR. ARRINGTON: Usually what we do is we'll
18	have some kind of correlation notes when we come, and
19	we'll usually run through a PowerPoint or some kind of
20	a handout, and we'll have stuff like we'll have
21	something written down. And then as I'm talking about
22	it some more, if you're a good note taker, you'll say,
23	"Yes, she said this and she said that", and then

that's just your notes. And then it's reinforced with doing the actual wet lab, but usually you have some correlation notes.

DR. WENTHER: I look at the small meat

lockers with roaming inspectors, if they get there for an inspection and then -- pictures speak louder than anything. I think of the grading cards. You stick the prime up there next to the beef card and say, "Okay, it's prime, there's your grading card", you need some kind of correlation --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. HARRIS: Moving ahead, we're going to quickly run out of time here, and I just don't want us to neglect the rest of the questions here. I want to be sure we get some things on paper and we can add to them once we get them on paper.

Other constituent groups, we haven't talked about them at all. What are the subcommittee's thoughts on other constituent groups -- specifically States, consumers, and academia?

MS. ESKIN: I just had a couple I actually drafted --

DR. HARRIS: Good, that's what I wanted.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. ESKIN: Before I read it, I'm happy to share. States are probably very much in the same situation as the Federal -- the inspectors. You've got the regulators and the regulated, and they obviously have the closest interest in technical information that you provide. But, again, you want to make it available to any interested party -- consumer group, academia, whatever.

I mean, here's what I wrote initially: effectively assist these order to more other constituent groups in their use of the Technical Service Center, the Agency should first assess whether these groups are aware of the existence of the Tech Center and, in turn, whether these other groups even know that the Technical Center is available to them and, if they do use it, who uses it -- do some sort of initial assessment for these other groups. I got the sense from our discussion earlier that industry clearly knows it's out there, obviously the inspectors do, but I wonder if other groups do.

And then I say, then based on that assessment, the Agency should survey these groups to determine the type of questions they would ask the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 center as well as their views on how to best publicize 2 the availability. DR. HARRIS: Let me ask you a question, 3 4 though, because this is a question in my mind. 5 not sure that it is necessarily a given that the Technical Service Center should be in the business of 6 communicating with consumers directly. 8 MS. Well, that's the ESKIN: central 9 question. 10 DR. HARRIS: There may be a different 11 component of the Agency that is better suited to doing that, that is more in turn with communicating with 12 13 consumers. There's a poultry hotline. 14 DR. ARRINGTON: 15 MS. ESKIN: There's a consumer who wants to 16 know what temperature to cook their turkey at, and then there's a consumer like myself who is a consumer 17 18 safety advocate, and I'm filing comments or I want to respond to a directive and I do have a 19 specific 20 question. Aqain, the question is how all the establishments find out about the Tech Center? 21 22 do because it's publicized in appropriate channels. 23 And I'm wondering if other groups that would want to

1	ask technical questions know that it exists. Can they
2	go to the Web site and see that, yes, here is a little
3	link that says if you have a technical question,
4	here's where you go, and that it's out there. And,
5	again, are there ways to make it assuming, yes,
6	that there are other groups besides the States, the
7	Federal regulators and inspectors, and the companies -
8	-
9	DR. ARRINGTON: I'm trying to think if you
10	went to the FSIS Web site and had never been there
11	before, you would go to that Search button, most
12	likely, if you knew nothing about it. And if you went
13	to that Search button, what would you ask?
14	MS. ESKIN: Again, it depends. I'm looking
15	for the most recent version of the recall directive
16	DR. ARRINGTON: Recall directive.
17	MS. ESKIN: And I might get to the Web page
18	that has all the directives
19	DR. ARRINGTON: a bunch of directives,
20	but one of them would be
21	MS. ESKIN: But I may have a specific
22	question, and, yes, but if it's a rule, you can go
23	back to the Federal Register Notice because there's a

1	contact person or, chances are, somebody at the Agency
2	has a fact sheet I mean, if you've done this at
3	all, there are ways to figure this out.
4	DR. ARRINGTON: I think there are ways and
5	then you'd know about the Tech Center.
6	MS. ESKIN: Would I? I can't remember the
7	times that I've searched the Web site and remember
8	having on the bottom "If you have a technical
9	question, please contact go to this link".
10	DR. ARRINGTON: Because it's in almost every
11	directive.
12	DR. HARRIS: To me, that might be more of
13	(Simultaneous discussion.)
14	DR. WENTHER: Most Web sites have like a
15	template where they put the material in the middle. I
16	don't know why you couldn't have a box in the section
17	on the right or left-hand column of those Web sites
18	that are already there at an unspecified territory for
19	their own Web site, and always have
20	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, a little box. For
21	someone that doesn't know anything about it, I'm not
22	sure you could just
23	DR. HARRIS: I will say this about the Web

1	site. One of the things in the new design and,
2	believe me, I've been a critic but one thing that I
3	do like is the little section on the side that says
4	"I'm looking for information for constituents, for
5	consumers, or for" I don't remember what the other
6	one is.
7	MS. ESKIN: But you know what, that's one
8	way to do it, but sometimes you have to figure out
9	that, in fact, the question I may have may not be a
10	consumer question because I don't want to know how
11	many hours I have to keep something in the
12	refrigerator.
13	DR. ARRINGTON: The Meat and Poultry Hotline
14	does refer questions, and they'll actually answer it.
15	DR. HARRIS: And do you send people the
16	other way?
17	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes.
18	DR. HARRIS: I mean, if you got a call from
19	somebody that said "How long do I need to bake the
20	turkey?"
21	DR. ARRINGTON: We'll send them to the Meat
22	and Poultry Hotline.
23	MS. ESKIN: Again, the basic thrust in this

answer is you really can't -- the best way to determine ways to help other groups use the Center is to determine do they even know it exists, and for those that do, how do they use it, what kind of questions, and try to improve it, like we just suggested here, survey to some degree what are some of the ways you could better publicize it.

DR. ARRINGTON: And at the same time, is -just for example, the Meat and Poultry Hotline, though
-- is that the appropriate group to talk to if you're
a consumer?

MS. ESKIN: Depends on your question.

DR. ARRINGTON: Depends on your question. That's why you have to come back and say for these kinds of questions consumers need to know about because they may have a question and they are not going to really get their answers through the Meat and Poultry Hotline.

MS. ESKIN: You're distinguishing between an individual consumer who wants advice on their actual food handling/preparation practices as opposed to someone from a consumer group who is doing research on this policy, or academia, or something, they would

NEAL R. GROSS

want to go to a more technical --

DR. HARRIS: They want to know what the regulations require regarding ${\tt X}$.

MS. ESKIN: Especially because maybe this -it's supposed to be one of your functions as a
clearinghouse to direct people, what happens is you
want to avoid, as you said, making five phone calls
and maybe get to the right person. If they are
directed to you all immediately, it's just two phone
calls, not five or six, to get to the right person.

DR. ARRINGTON: And anything that's technically related, it's no different for us to answer that -- I mean, that's not additional work for us to do. But if we were going to just, for example, start handling all the calls on how to cook turkey, we're going to have to do work to even have that information --

DR. HARRIS: I've got a quick question about how this question is phrased just in general. It says "other constituent groups including". I've always sort of been of the impression that the Agency considered constituent groups really to be primarily the regulators and the regulated. If you received a

constituent update, that's who the target audience 1 2 would appear to be, are those two groups. The ARRINGTON: requlated and 3 DR. 4 regulators. 5 MS. ESKIN: More broadly, stakeholders. I mean, I'm just thinking the DR. HARRIS: 6 Agency has a publication called Constituent Alert. 8 DR. ARRINGTON: If the question was just 9 sort of thrown out and we say "other" just in case there is some kind of other, or whether it was more 10 specifically tell us what the other is, I don't really 11 know. 12 (Simultaneous discussion.) 13 DR. WENTHER: I don't know if the Technical 14 15 Center is prepared for this because if you put that 16 stuff out available for the general public to call up, 17 the influx of calls is going to go up there and you're 18 going to lose the people that actually need to know, the regulated or the regulators. 19 Yes. That's why I say you 20 DR. ARRINGTON: want the Meat and Poultry Hotline, we don't want to 21 22 answer how to do preparation --

DR. HARRIS: How do we differentiate, that's

my question.

MS. ESKIN: If you go to the Web site now -again, it depends on which thing you choose to click
on. If you ever ask for just general information, my
recollection is it always sends you to the Meat and
Poultry Hotline, and that's not a policy related
issue. I mean, for someone like myself, either -- I
happen to have a key contact list so I sort of figured
out perhaps subject matter, or I start at the
Administrator's office and I work down.

DR. HARRIS: Do it under organizational --

DR. ARRINGTON: That's more a technical policy --

MS. ESKIN: A distinction needs to be clearly made between questions related to food handling and preparation, and questions related to Agency policy, and other technical information.

DR. ARRINGTON: And then put that on the Web site so it comes up and everybody can see it, so then you would leave it to the person to say "is this a policy question or" --

MS. ESKIN: So the key would be to work with the Web site -- I mean, there are consumer materials,

NEAL R. GROSS

consumer education materials that are put out, and I think all of them that go to food handling and preparation -- so you wouldn't necessarily want to refer people to the Technical Center under that scenario.

DR. ARRINGTON: No, that would be additional work that would take away from --

MS. ESKIN: And you don't want to do that.

DR. HARRIS: And somehow you've got to differentiate what that person is after, are they really after a policy question or are they after the basic food handling question.

DR. ARRINGTON: Right, either they have to do it -- it's best if they do it and do it accurately. So, if you word it, that would help them.

MS. BALDWIN: We need to clarify that on the Web site because any dissatisfaction I've heard about the Tech Center, it has been from someone who thought that they were going to resolve the dispute with an inspector, so maybe that appeals policy you were referring to, maybe if you have that on there, if that's what you're calling about or contacting about, that you should do this.

1	DR. ARRINGTON: You need to talk to your
2	District
3	MS. ESKIN: Some sort of boilerplate, we're
4	there to provide you assistance. If you have a
5	specific dispute, that is handled by
6	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, because when I think
7	all of us that have been there I think everybody
8	knows this but word it forever
9	MS. ESKIN: But this is the first time this
10	person calls it, they have no clue
11	DR. ARRINGTON: I know, it's just our own
12	we're too much into it.
13	MS. BALDWIN: We get calls because I'm at
14	the Maryland Department of Agriculture, and sometimes
15	we'll get people within our State calling us, "Can you
16	help me with this, I don't know what to do, I'm so
17	uptight about this, I think they're wrong"
18	DR. ARRINGTON: Oh, you mean about the
19	Federal inspection.
20	MS. BALDWIN: Yes, and I wasn't aware of
21	that appeal process.
21	that appeal process. DR. ARRINGTON: It's in the regs, you have

1	establishment.
2	DR. HARRIS: You don't have to remind them
3	of that, they know.
4	DR. ARRINGTON: They do. They're just
5	trying to
6	(Simultaneous discussion.)
7	DR. ARRINGTON: It's all in how you appeal.
8	DR. HARRIS: They learn. They learn what to
9	appeal and what not to appeal.
10	DR. ARRINGTON: We do have a policy now at
11	the Tech Center that if we think something is offbase
12	by an inspector, particularly if they say to us, "I'm
13	going to do this anyway", or "my supervisor said I've
14	got to do it this way and you're telling me it's
15	another way", then we do go to the District and say,
16	"For your information, this is what we heard on the
17	call and just want to let you know"
18	DR. HARRIS: That's interesting. I suspect
19	that comes up regularly, if not frequently.
20	DR. ARRINGTON: Yes. And I think it used to
21	come up even more about "Well, my District says to do
22	this".

Any

one

LOBSTEIN:

DR.

23

in

District

particular?

(Laughter.)

DR. ARRINGTON: No.

DR. HARRIS: Let's don't go there.

DR. ARRINGTON: It depends on the topic. It's poultry, it's --

DR. WENTHER: This may be monotonous, but we've talked about data all day today, and instead of coming back in four years after this Administration, should the data be started to be collected on who uses the Tech Center, just basics -- we have plants, we have inspectors, we have consumers -- I mean, just simple notes so that these people answering the phone calls can say "I got this many phone calls today and out of these 20, here's how it broke down", so we have that gauge to come back in four years and say this is why the Tech Center is important, so we don't have to revisit this issue.

DR. ARRINGTON: Right.

DR. HARRIS: Maybe that is, again, one of the recommendations under how do we make it better, is to begin to develop some sort of a picture of who are the callers.

MS. ESKIN: It's both who and what they're 1 2 asking. DR. HARRIS: Exactly. 3 4 MS. ESKIN: Maybe a technical question, a 5 policy question. DR. ARRINGTON: Okay, so otherwise it would 6 be interpreted how may calls on zero tolerance do we 8 have --9 (Simultaneous discussion.) DR. HARRIS: I don't think you'd want to 10 keep that level of detail, I certainly wouldn't think, 11 but it might be useful to think how many questions are 12 about HACCP, how many are about SSOPs, how many are 13 about humane handling -- or maybe that's too specific 14 15 even. 16 DR. ARRINGTON: I think that's too specific. 17 I think that that needs to be done on some interval, 18 those specifics. I think it particularly needs to be 19 done on new initiatives so that you can see how the volume of calls increases with the new initiative. 20 The last question down there --21 DR. HARRIS: we never really talked much about it, but in my mind 22 it's real similar to the second part of the first 23

question -- in what new or enhanced ways can FSIS use the Technical Service Center? I guess that's almost more asking what could the Tech Center be doing now that it's not currently doing whereas I guess the first one was more how could they do what they're doing better. Any input on that?

DR. CARPENTER: What are the resources that are unique to the Tech Center that do not exist anyplace else in FSIS?

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, in my opinion, what is unique about the Tech Center from the rest of the that we have a critical mass of staff is officers -- and I mean we have a large enough number that we can do many different things at once. given week, I've got somebody out doing -- and I have several people out on the road, either for their own training or speaking at a District office, or going to a seminar type meeting or an interagency meeting, then inhouse I will have people working on the Tech Center account, answering telephone calls, developing directives and notice meaning that they are giving comment, or looking up information for the background for a paper -- for example, Headquarters was writing a

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

paper to replace the public health paper on animal
disease that was written this last year, several
people on my staff worked parts of that paper, and
that meant they were getting journal articles and
books and they were taking information from that and
writing it up, to going out taking pictures to be used
for like, we went out and took pictures of the
teeth so we could put them up on the Web site, went
out and took some more tonsil pictures recently. We
went out and collected heads to practice taking we
have Residue Standing Committee for the residue
that's something no one said we run the whole
residue program for the United States, as far as the
operation site, so that includes keeping a database of
all the residue violators and working up a case for
each one of those, and writing letters of violation to
violators, and then sharing that with FDA, and then
FDA comes back to us to add to our case it's the
whole residue program is run out of the Tech Center.

DR. CARPENTER: By residue, you mean like antibiotics?

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, antibiotics mostly, and any other drugs or pesticides -- I mean, it's a huge

NEAL R. GROSS

deal. Every day we take the samples that go into the
labs, and they run what the residue lab does, and it's
fax'd to us and we make disposition of this market
that's based on what the residue level is, and then we
talk to the IIC, and they decide what to do with them.
But every day we have to have one or two staff
officers that does residue. We have one that will do
exports, because we do export specifically. Anyway,
to come back to it, I think it's a critical mass of
people that know the field as well as knowing the
regulations and the policies very well. And they are
a combination of being scientific and practical, and
there's a critical mass. There's a large enough
number we have two or three people that have spent
each about 20 weeks this past year out on the road
teaching FRSE, which is the training program for the
food inspectors that we said we'd have every food
inspector trained. You've heard that in some meeting
somewhere. That typically is a three-week course.
We've had three people that they've each spent between
20 and 26 weeks out on the road. They are not working
at my place, but we have enough people that we can
shift the work around. It's not unusual to start a

NEAL R. GROSS

project with one person, they've got to go do something else, we take them off that, we put somebody else in their place. It's hopping. Plus if somebody sends in something, we want to know if it's validation looks good, or we've got a contamination incident, we've got lubricant oil that's spilled into a chiller, or we've got rinse water that's dripped into the chiller, or we're in Texas and it rained a lot and now we have roof water dripping on beef carcasses. Well, nobody had ever seen that one before. And those kinds are like ASAP address this, it's not like, okay, put it in the file and next week we'll get to it.

DR. LOBSTEIN: Those are still technical resources that deal with the most ambiguous queries that we see?

DR. ARRINGTON: Right, they need to go to somebody above the level of the plant and the District office. It would be us or it would be somebody in Headquarters. And we often will consult with Headquarters, or liaison with -- if we really think this is a big micro and we need a microbiologist opinion, then we'll contact to locate a microbiologist that then will -- we never really meet together, we

meet by phone all the time, but we'll have some calls and we'll say, "What do you think about this", and discuss it, and then we might go back to the District, and the science side will say the science of this, and we'll say, "yeah, and from a regulatory perspective it would support if we did this regulatory action", and then finally the District Manager will say, "Okay, I agree, I'm going to take this regulatory action". And that's when we're all working together as a group.

So we have people that have Ph.D.s, not very many of those, but we have a lot of food technologists and we have a lot of DCMs. And most of the people that come to the Tech Center are the people that are pretty talented, people who pretty much want to move ahead, and they like to be an expert, and that's part of the reason they come there because they become an expert, and we really see a difference -- we'll have somebody come from a District, and at first they are still doing what the District said, and will over time, over about three months time -- we actually have a learning curve here, and they'll answer e-notes, we'll say, no, don't answer them that way, that's what you do in the District. You are now national, you've

got to look at this from a national perspective. We've got four or five now that are just exceptional, fast, smart, can write, handle themselves.

DR. WENTHER: You call them experts, and oftentimes they send them to my office because they need a process of authority to look at all their data.

Now, when you qualify them as experts, shouldn't their opinion override most -- I mean --

DR. ARRINGTON: Not the process authorities, process authorities are real authorities.

What's the definition of a DR. WENTHER: process authority that would really truly define -that's got a Ph.D., they're a anybody authority even though they've never been in a plant is a debatable issue. But if you call them an expert, I would say they are an expert on the issues of BSE, so if they said this is the way it is and they printed out an e-mail, shouldn't that be gospel as this is what the Tech Center says, so he's an expert? No. Issue closed. But it never seems to be Here it is. because that's where I ask the question who authority, who is right, who is --

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, we understand. It

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

comes back to the part about we can't instruct them.

All we can say is, as the national policy disseminators, here is the national policy.

DR. WENTHER: That there is no policy.

DR. ARRINGTON: If there is no policy, we either should go get policy or we should say this is what we know about the policy.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. CARPENTER: So you're in a situation -to answer this question 4, about all the individuals
within the Agency to deal with, that there are ways
that you can help them further that are not being
tapped into now -- the question says new enhanced ways
to exercise -- I mean, you talked about technical
consultations and -- what all --

DR. ARRINGTON: I think correlation is enhancing the Q&A thing you were talking about, saying go ahead and get more of those, collect more Q&As and get them published. Maybe on every new initiative there should come some Q&As out of it, and some initiatives going to be this long, some initiatives are going to be this long.

DR. CARPENTER: Is there something the TSC

NEAL R. GROSS

1	can do that it is not doing now.
2	DR. ARRINGTON: Is there something?
3	DR. CARPENTER: Is there something that you
4	would recommend that could be done that is not being
5	done right now for Q&A formally?
6	(Simultaneous discussion.)
7	DR. HARRIS: The Chair will exercise its
8	duty. Those of you who are composing answers,
9	obviously Sandra is typing her answer in, so she's
10	pretty good to go. How about the others, have you got
11	yours ready to go, David?
12	DR. CARPENTER: Well, I was just getting
13	input
14	DR. ARRINGTON: He asked about what is new.
15	There also is out at the Technical Service Center,
16	the whole staff, the review staff, the appeal staff is
17	there. There are also four OPH they are
18	epidemiologists
19	(Simultaneous discussion.)
20	DR. ARRINGTON: They are epidemiologists
21	that investigate food-borne outbreaks for FSIS. They
22	were recently centralized to those people are
23	there. WE are on the same floor and the floor below

1	us. That would be something that would be enhanced or
2	new, if there's any way that we can cooperate or share
3	or anything like that. He's asking whether I knew of
4	anything
5	DR. CARPENTER: The question is what
6	enhancements can FSIS use
7	DR. ARRINGTON: I didn't know if he knew
8	those people were out there. We used to have FSIS
9	meetings, technical meetings on different topics, and
10	a lot of times we would do that with industry, and
11	sometimes it would just be our meeting.
12	DR. HARRIS: Hosting technical conferences,
13	I absolutely think that's appropriate. Let's dont'
14	concern ourselves too much, we can throw out any sort
15	of possibility if we think it's a legitimate thing.
16	We can always ask them to become a dispute resolution
17	center.
18	DR. ARRINGTON: You can ask.
19	(Laughter and simultaneous discussion.)
20	DR. ARRINGTON: I also have wondered with
21	being in policy, whether we are more able to say what
22	policy is. I think you were touching on that before
23	about the authority thing, and that would be more of a

re-education. Yes, the District Managers do make regulatory decisions, they ultimately are responsible. At the same time, when we were Field Operations, we really were separate from that chain of command. As policy, though, it should be articulated -- maybe that's it -- it should be articulated more strongly that now being part policy, we know the policy, and not so much that we instruct them, but, yes, they know the policy, and therefore -- that's on us to be accurate.

DR. HARRIS: I tried to touch on that a little bit during my questions earlier in the general session. Since you are now a component of policy, obviously no directive, no notice, nothing comes out of the Agency that's policy that doesn't come out of Policy Office.

DR. ARRINGTON: Right.

DR. HARRIS: I think it's inexcusable that you guys should ever be surprised when a notice comes out and people start calling you. If you're part of the Office of Policy, you should know before it hits the street -- and I think in most cases, you do.

DR. ARRINGTON: We do in most cases, but

NEAL R. GROSS

there are times --

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. HARRIS: There are times, and to me, should never happen. You should never subjected to getting phone calls and questions about policy that you haven't already been made pretty darn aware of what the Agency's position is, and maybe that's an area -- I don't know if we address that in new ways or in how to improve, but I just think that's terrible that you guys would have to get a call from somebody like me that says, okay, what's going on, I just got a copy of this notice over the Internet, and you go, well, we don't really know yet, we'll have to The Agency should have it's act get back to you. together before it issues policy.

DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, we should.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. ARRINGTON: I can tell you entirely at the Tech Center we have it all come to one person, and that needs to be changed because really what we should do is -- when it's published, it should go to every Tech Center employee because there are some number of them that are there at 6:00 a.m., and the ones that are there at 6:00 a.m. are always checking their e-

1	mail first thing, and that could be fixed
2	DR. HARRIS: It should go to every Tech
3	Center employee the day before it gets published, or
4	something, so that the Tech Center should have access
5	to a policy before the rest of us.
6	DR. ARRINGTON: It should at least go out
7	the same time as that e-mail, and the way we're doing
8	it right now, we're having it come to one person who
9	then distributes it.
10	DR. HARRIS: Well, we need to address that
11	as a recommendation as well because
12	DR. ARRINGTON: Well, it's not only if
13	they're off that day, it's what time they get in, and
14	it's just the whole deal.
15	DR. JAN: They need to know ahead because
16	there may be questions somebody has to make a decision
17	on.
18	DR. HARRIS: I think you should most of the
19	time have the opportunity for input.
20	DR. ARRINGTON: We do. A lot of times, we
21	don't always know what's going to publish. I know on
22	the tonsil notice because we were putting on our Web
23	site the pictures of the tongues and the tonsils, and

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I was involved in that notice myself because it was a high priority thing, and we actually had e-mail correspondence, and I actually got a call that said we can post it tonight or tomorrow morning. I said just to be safe, post it tomorrow morning. We'll post our pictures this afternoon, and then that way as soon as somebody gets it in the morning and they go to our Web site, the pictures will be there because I knew there would be glitches about getting those pictures -- but we can do that.

DR. HARRIS: Well, what killed us on that one was the memo went out before the notice did, and we all got the memo, as did the inspectors, and so plants started getting asked about that by their inspector, then they called me and said what's the deal on these tonsils. I called you guys and you're like, there's supposed to be a notice coming out, we'll have to get back to you when the notice comes out.

DR. ARRINGTON: That's what we were told.

And there was a notice, and it was pretty quick.

Well, from the time we actually wrote it, it was 24 hours, but I think the thought process was three or

NEAL R. GROSS

four days before that.

DR. WENTHER: Remember when it hit the Tech Center, the wheels kind of fell off the wagon right then, but then you guys recuperated and -- it seemed like you separated out who was going to get the phone calls, so it was limited as far as different answers or consistency. That doesn't happen on a regular basis.

DR. ARRINGTON: We try to -- on anything that we think there's going to be a lot of question, particularly if we think the policy is going to evolve. We knew with BSE it was going to evolve, we knew it was day-by-day. We'll say these many people answer the questions until we can correlate with everybody. Perhaps it's something we should do more regularly on more issues.

DR. HARRIS: Where we're headed is we're trying to get the draft answers all typed in, and then what I want to do is read them one at a time for everybody, and then we'll talk about tweaking. So that's what we're about right now. We're scheduled to be done at 5:30, and I hate meetings that run late, so we're going to try to get done by 5:30.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. LOBSTEIN: For Dr. Carpenter, he's got
2	new and enhanced opportunities, just a point you might
3	want to put in, or at least from the industry
4	standpoint, an enhanced method, if the Tech Center has
5	scheduled correlations I don't care, red meat,
6	poultry regionalized them and did it on a regular
7	basis to allow not every PHV not every public
8	health veterinarian is going to have the opportunity
9	to go to each one obviously, they can't all go at
10	once but I think if it's scheduled, at least
11	speaking from one industry side, if it's scheduled, I
12	can assure you there will be representatives from
13	industry there, and I would think and hope that the
14	Agency got as many public health veterinarians as
15	could warrant during the time frame to attend each one
16	as well. So, if both are done on a regular basis, red
17	meat and poultry, I think that would be a great
18	opportunity. Of course, it involves travel for your
19	folks.

DR. ARRINGTON: What do you want to do it, about on a quarterly interval, have one per quarter?

DR. LOBSTEIN: Whatever would fit in your schedule. Again, I think if you held them, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

20

21

22

you would get participation, as was evidenced in the FSRE training put on a couple weeks ago, not very much publicity, and 125 people came, and if they had gotten a little more publicity, I think they would have been overwhelmed. (Simultaneous discussion.) DR. HARRIS: Innovative ways for conducting correlation may be very valuable. DR. ARRINGTON: Maybe that's what we need do because --MS. ESKIN: That's a good idea. DR. Right WENTHER: now they're going through a learning process through the Webcast, and make sure you guys don't set it off on the basement floor --(Simultaneous discussion.) DR. ARRINGTON: Yes, something like that. The problem with conference calls -- it just helps if you can see it -- if you can be interactive, that's really -- when you go to a correlation, that's what you get out of it, it's that interaction. MS. ESKIN: Going out to smaller areas,

small plants, whatever, are you going to have a

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	facility close enough by they could conveniently
2	DR. WENTHER: You could do this at a Tech
3	Center.
4	MS. ESKIN: If it's close enough.
5	DR. ARRINGTON: Some we could.
6	DR. WENTHER: Go to a university lab and
7	really do it there.
8	DR. ARRINGTON: I think Lincoln is the
9	closest we could go to.
10	DR. HARRIS: The technology to conduct
11	Webcasts is really advancing quickly, and it's not
12	nearly as complicated as it used to be, and doesn't
13	require nearly the resources that it used to.
14	DR. ARRINGTON: The Agency reorganized all
15	the IT under one they're all together, they're not
16	by program areas, and so we have four people at the
17	Tech Center that are IT people, and Cliff is their
18	boss. I was usually asked today how things were
19	going, and those people are doing great. And they're
20	very innovative, two of them are really sharp.
21	DR. WENTHER: I don't want to take away from
22	their jobs, but right now they're outside contracting
23	to a company that sets it all up, and they're very

helpful.

DR. ARRINGTON: Well, maybe out there they could do it because they're not as busy as the ones in here -- not to say they're not working out there, they are, but it's just different being in Omaha versus D.C.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. HARRIS: Some things it's going to work better for than others, and pathology I wouldn't think would work real well because you need to almost be able to see and feel, almost literally touch.

DR. ARRINGTON: I'm glad you guys are typing.

MS. BALDWIN: I can't read my handwriting anymore.

DR. HARRIS: That's why I passed around the computer.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. HARRIS: Isabel, I know that we have a lot of constructive criticism and everything, but while we're talking here, I will say that I think most people I talk to think the Tech Center is one of the best things the Agency has ever done. Everything has

NEAL R. GROSS

its flaws, but overall it has been a very valuable tool, I believe, and most of the people I talk to tell me that.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. HARRIS: Okay, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 6:02 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

8

6

9

10