

## Michigan Creates a Network to Rapidly Deliver Medications and Supplies

Innovative programs at the state level can become models for other states to follow.



In 2004, the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) created the Michigan Emergency Drug Delivery and Resource

Utilization Network (MEDDRUN) to bridge the gap between available medical resources through caches of medications, such as nerve agent antidotes and supplies pre-deployed around the state. These caches are strategically placed within immediate reach of helicopters and ground transportation for the rapid delivery of supplies to hospitals and other health care facilities during a disaster.

By approaching this project using multi-disciplinary planning that included emergency management, law enforcement, public health, health care, and emergency medical services, MDCH created an innovative network. MEDDRUN received national recognition from the ASH Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, receiving second place out of a pool of

other innovative, homeland security-based programs. By drawing on resources from both the cooperative agreement and the HHS hospital preparedness program, MDCH promoted collaboration and coordination at all levels of government and the private sector to protect Michigan residents.

**According to the Michigan Department of Community Health, the cooperative agreement is valuable because** it has been critical to facilitate all public health and health care related activities. Significant upgrades to a previously deteriorating public health infrastructure have benefited the public's health in many ways. Funding also has enhanced Michigan's state and local ability to respond to non-bioterrorism related emergencies, such as influenza vaccine shortages and disease outbreaks.

## Snapshot of Public Health Preparedness

Below are activities conducted by Michigan in the area of public health preparedness. They support CDC preparedness goals in the areas of detection and reporting, control, and improvement; crosscutting activities help prepare for all stages of an event. These data are not comprehensive and do not cover all preparedness activities.

### Disease Detection and Investigation

The sooner public health professionals can detect diseases or other health threats and investigate their causes and effects in the community, the more quickly they can minimize population exposure.

Detect & Report	Could receive and investigate urgent disease reports 24/7/365 <sup>1</sup>	Yes
	- Primary method for receiving urgent disease reports* <sup>2</sup>	Telephone
	Linked state and local health personnel to share information about disease outbreaks across state lines (through the CDC <i>Epi-X</i> system) <sup>3</sup>	Yes
	Conducted year-round surveillance for seasonal influenza <sup>4</sup>	Yes

\*Telephone, fax, and electronic reporting are all viable options for urgent disease reporting, as long as the public health department has someone assigned to receive the reports 24/7/365.

<sup>1</sup> CDC, DSLR; 2005; <sup>2</sup> CDC, DSLR; 2006; <sup>3</sup> CDC, *Epi-X*; 2007; <sup>4</sup> HHS, OIG; 2007



# Michigan



## Public Health Laboratories

Public health laboratories test and confirm agents that can threaten health. For example, advanced DNA “fingerprinting” techniques and subsequent reporting to the CDC database (PulseNet) are critical to recognize nationwide outbreaks from bacteria that can cause severe illness, such as *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Listeria monocytogenes*.

Detect & Report	Number of Michigan laboratories in the Laboratory Response Network <sup>1</sup>	9
	Rapidly identified <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7 using advanced DNA “fingerprinting” techniques (PFGE): <sup>2</sup>	
	- Number of samples received (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	33
	- Percentage of test results submitted to CDC database (PulseNet) within 4 days	100%
	Rapidly identified <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> using advanced DNA “fingerprinting” techniques (PFGE): <sup>2</sup>	
	- Number of samples received (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	5
	- Percentage of test results submitted to CDC database (PulseNet) within 4 days	100%
	Had a laboratory information management system that could create, send, and receive messages <sup>3</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes
	- System complied with CDC information technology standards (PHIN) <sup>3</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	No
Had a rapid method to send urgent messages to frontline laboratories that perform initial screening of clinical specimens <sup>3</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes	
Crosscutting	Conducted bioterrorism exercise that met CDC criteria <sup>4</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	No
	Conducted exercise to test chemical readiness that met CDC criteria <sup>4</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes

<sup>1</sup> CDC, DBPR; 2007; <sup>2</sup> CDC, DSLR; 2007; <sup>3</sup> APHL, Public Health Laboratory Issues in Brief: Bioterrorism Capacity; May 2007; <sup>4</sup> CDC, DSLR; 2006

## Response

Planning provides a framework for how a public health department will respond during an emergency. The plans can be tested through external reviews, exercises, and real events. After-action reports assess what worked well during an exercise or real event and how the department can improve.

Control	Developed a public health response plan, including pandemic influenza response, crisis and emergency risk communication, and Strategic National Stockpile (SNS) <sup>1,2</sup>	Yes
	Michigan SNS plan reviewed by CDC <sup>2</sup>	Yes
	- Score on CDC technical assistance review (1-100)	88
	Number of Michigan cities in the Cities Readiness Initiative <sup>3</sup>	1
Crosscutting	Developed roles and responsibilities for a multi-jurisdictional response (ICS) with: <sup>1</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	
	- Hospitals	Yes
	- Local/regional emergency management agencies	Yes
	- Federal emergency management agencies	Yes
	Public health department staff participated in training to support cooperative agreement activities <sup>4</sup>	Yes
	Public health laboratories conducted training for first responders <sup>5</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	No
	Activated public health emergency operations center as part of a drill, exercise, or real event* <sup>6</sup> (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	Yes
Conducted a drill or exercise for key response partners to test communications when power and land lines were unavailable <sup>6</sup> (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	Yes	
Improve	Finalized at least one after-action report with an improvement plan following an exercise or real event <sup>6</sup> (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	Yes

\* Activation means rapidly staffing all eight core ICS functional roles in the public health emergency operations center with one person per position. This capability is critical to maintain in case of large-scale or complex incidents, even though not every incident requires full staffing of the ICS.

† States were expected to perform these activities from 9/1/2006 to 8/30/2007. These data represent results from the first half of this period only.

<sup>1</sup> CDC, DSLR; 2006; <sup>2</sup> CDC, DSNS; 2007; <sup>3</sup> CDC, DSNS CRI; 2007; <sup>4</sup> CDC, DSLR; 1999-2005; <sup>5</sup> APHL, Chemical Terrorism Preparedness; May 2007; <sup>6</sup> CDC, DSLR; 2007