

FOUO

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan
(AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013

New England SMS 2013

May 9, 2013

AFTER ACTION REPORT/IMPROVEMENT PLAN

SEP. 27, 2013

FOUO

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

**After Action Report/Improvement Plan
(AAR/IP)**

New England SMS 2013

This page is intentionally blank.

ADMINISTRATIVE HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS

1. The title of this document is the New England SMS 2013 After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP).
2. The information gathered in this AAR/IP is classified as For official Use only (FOUO) and should be handled as sensitive information not to be disclosed. This document should be safeguarded, handled, transmitted, and stored in accordance with appropriate security directives. Reproduction of this document, in whole or in part, without prior approval from USDA, APHIS, VS, New England Area Office is prohibited.
3. At a minimum, the attached materials will be disseminated only on a need-to-know basis and when unattended, will be stored in a locked container or area offering sufficient protection against theft, compromise, inadvertent access, and unauthorized disclosure.

4. Points of Contact:

Area Veterinarian in Charge, New England Area Office
William G. Smith, DVM
USDA, APHIS, VS
160 Worcester-Providence Turnpike
Sutton, MA 01590
Phone : 508-363-2290
Email: William.G.Smith@aphis.usda.gov

Exercise Director and Facilitator:
Fredric L. Cantor, DVM, MPH
Area Emergency Coordinator, New England Area Office
USDA, APHIS, VS
160 Worcester-Providence Turnpike
Sutton, MA 01590
Phone: 508-363-2290
Email: Fredric.L.Cantor@aphis.usda.gov

Exercise Facilitator & NESAAASA, Secure Milk Supply Project Consultant:
Richard P. Horwitz
Environment and Culture Consulting
Senior Fellow, Coastal Institute, University of Rhode Island
Professor Emeritus, University of Iowa
19 Joann Drive, Barrington, RI 02806-2260
Phone or FAX: 401-289-0198 or Cell: 401-497-3991
Email: rhowitz@cox.net

For Official use Only - FOUO

**Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)
After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) New England SMS 2013]**

This page is intentionally blank.

CONTENTS

ADMINISTRATIVE HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS.....	1
CONTENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
SECTION 1: WORKSHOP OVERVIEW	7
SECTION 2: EXERCISE DESIGN SUMMARY	10
SECTION 3: ANALYSIS OF CAPABILITIES & OBJECTIVES	13
SECTION 4: CONCLUSION	22
APPENDIX A: IMPROVEMENT PLAN.....	23
APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP AGENDA.....	32
APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK SUMMARY.....	33
APPENDIX D: EXERCISE HANDOUTS / REFERENCES.....	35
APPENDIX F: ACRONYMS.....	36
APPENDIX G: GLOSSARY.....	36

This page is intentionally blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The USDA, APHIS, Veterinary Services (VS), New England Area office and the New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance (NESAASA) developed this biological threat—foreign animal disease workshop, New England SMS 2013, to test the permitting components of the New England Secure Milk Supply (SMS) Plan. The New England SMS Project, available at <http://nesaasa.weebly.com/ne-sms-project.html> is a region-specific effort, based upon the foundation and structure of the national SMS Plan available at www.securemilksupply.org/. The workshop planning team was primarily composed of the members of NESAASA. Meetings were held through individual and joint meetings, via conference calls and in person. Industry representatives were contacted individually to discuss the goals of the exercise and seek their input and suggestions on the workshop.

The primary goal of the workshop was to review and test the command and control, logistical, technical and communication issues surrounding setting up a Permitting Group and accessing data and evaluating criteria for permitting milk movement from dairy farms within a control zone in response to a foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) outbreak in New England. [Farm Readiness Reviews](#) of dairy farms in New England are ongoing to capture detailed emergency response and production information and to identify the capacity of dairy farms to meet biosecurity requirements for shipping milk to market during a FMD outbreak. Participants practiced accessing and managing these data and evaluated using the information to make permitting decisions.

The following objectives were developed for New England SMS 2013 Workshop:

- Objective 1: Review partner agency roles and responsibilities
- Objective 2: Practice accessing the Farm Readiness Review database
- Objective 3: Review Permitting Group structure, roles and responsibilities
- Objective 4: Practice implementing permitting plan in response to the scenario
- Objective 5: Discuss Permitting Group outreach to industry and public concerning actions and decisions

The purpose of this report is to analyze exercise results, identify strengths to be maintained and built upon, identify potential areas for further improvement, and support development of corrective actions.

Major Strengths

The major strengths identified during this exercise are as follows:

1. Key industry and state regulatory officials were present for the exercise.
2. Good discussion on Incident Command System (ICS), Permitting Group structure and interactions
3. State animal health officials were able to easily access, review and manage

Farm Readiness Review data on dairy farms in New England to assist in making risk-based permitting decisions.

4. Readiness Rating has utility as a planning and response tool.

Primary Areas for Improvement

Throughout the exercise, several opportunities for improvement in New England's ability to respond to an FMD incident were identified. The primary areas for improvement, including recommendations, are as follows:

- Revise criteria used in Readiness Rating based on discussions
- Clarify how to coordinate existing state and federal regulatory authorities and response plans to manage New England as a region
- Clarify emergency communication, and notification process with industry
- Develop and identify Farm Readiness Review feedback and improvement mechanisms for farmers
- Clarify FMD communication messages with public health agencies

SECTION 1: WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Workshop Details

Exercise Name

New England SMS 2013

Type of Exercise

Workshop to discuss and test permitting elements of the New England Secure Milk Supply (SMS) plan

Exercise Start Date

Thursday, May 9, 2013

Exercise End Date

Thursday, May 9, 2013

Duration

One day

Location

USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services, Conference Room, 59 Chenell Drive, Concord, NH

Sponsor

New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance, NESAASA

Program

The New England Secure Milk Supply project has been supported by USDA, APHIS, Veterinary Services (VS), National Center for Animal Health and Emergency Management (NCAHEM) through a cooperative agreement with New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance (NESAASA). Cooperative Agreement # 12-9644--1245.

Mission

Protection, Mitigation, Response and Recovery

Core Capabilities

Operational Coordination; Supply Chain Integrity and Security; Long-term Vulnerability Reduction; Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities; and Public Information and Warning.

Scenario Type

Biological: Foot-and-mouth Disease -- Foreign Animal Disease

Exercise Planning Team Leadership

Monthly NESAAASA meetings and exercise planning meetings were facilitated by the USDA, APHIS, VS, Area Emergency Coordinator for New England in consultation with the SMS Project consultant, Richard Horwitz.

Exercise Participating Organizations

STATE Ag:

CT Department of Agriculture
Maine Dept. of Ag/Cons/Forestry
MA Department of Agricultural Resources
NH Dept. of Agriculture, Markets, and Food
NYS Department of Agriculture & Markets
RI Dept. Environmental Management
Vermont Agency of Agriculture

STATE NH:

NH Homeland Security & Emergency Mgmt.
NH Department of Health and Human Services

FEDERAL:

USDA, APHIS, Veterinary Services, New England Area
USDA, APHIS, Wildlife Services, NH
USDA, APHIS, VS, NY/NJ Area
USDA, Farm Services Agency, NH
US Food and Drug Administration

INDUSTRY:

Dairy Marketing Services
Agri-mark Inc.
CROPP Cooperative/Organic Valley
Oakhurst Dairy
HP Hood

NGO:

New England Dairy & Food Council

Number of Participants

- Players: 10
 - State veterinarians 5
 - Assistant state veterinarians 1
 - Animal health Ag staff 4
 - New England states represented 6
- Recorder: 1
- Facilitators: 2
- Observers: 17
 - Industry 7
 - State Ag 5
 - State public health 3

SECTION 2: EXERCISE DESIGN SUMMARY

The New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance (NESAASA) was chartered in July 2010 by the New England Governors "to support and develop regional NIMS-compliant standards, processes, and capacity through collaborative planning, preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery efforts that help to ensure the safety, health and security of the regional food and animal and animal agriculture sector infrastructure and economy. NESAASA seeks to enhance New England regional animal and animal agriculture emergency preparedness and response to all hazards including chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRNE) incidents and natural disasters." One of NESAASA's primary projects has been the New England Regional Secure Milk Supply (SMS) project. **Information discussed in this report assumes a basic understanding of USDA, APHIS, VS, foreign animal disease response plans and the National and the New England SMS projects and their goals.** Available at both the National SMS and the NESAASA web sites.

NESAASA held a series of conference calls to discuss the goals and objectives of the exercise. A planning subgroup consisting of Veterinary Services representatives, Dr. Fredric Cantor and Dr. William Smith, state veterinarians and state public health veterinarians from Rhode Island and Maine, Dr. Scott Marshal and Dr. Michele Walsh, and the NESAASA, SMS consultant Dr. Richard Horwitz further refined the exercise design. Exercise planning outreach was also conducted by Dr. Cantor to dairy industry representatives for general feedback about the goals and objectives of the exercise.

The exercise was designed as a workshop. Components of the workshop were held concurrently, see Appendix B - Agenda . While observers reviewed the goals of the SMS Project and the plan's elements, state veterinarians from the New England states practiced accessing, manipulating and managing a web-based, secure, state- specific Farm Readiness Review database stored on servers located, at the National Center for Foreign Animal and Zoonotic Diseases (FAZD) at Texas A&M University, <http://fazd.tamu.edu/>, a Department of Homeland Security Academic Center for Excellence (COE). Farm Readiness Review data collection is ongoing. Data are collected by dairy regulators or other agricultural representatives in on-farm interviews with New England dairy farmers.

Exercise Purpose and Design

This exercise was a workshop to practice accessing and evaluating the use of the Farm Readiness Review, and its emergency contact, production and biosecurity data, and further refine the permitting elements of the New England SMS plan. Exercise play was limited to discussion and practice accessing and evaluating relevant New England secure milk supply project data. Concurrent sessions were held for observers to review and discuss the overall secure milk supply plan. Participants hoped to identify strengths and areas for improvements in the plan specifically use of the Farm Readiness Review database and the Readiness Rating in making permitting decisions.

The New England SMS project has been funded by APHIS, VS, National Center for Animal Health and Emergency Management (NCAHEM) through a cooperative agreement with NESAAASA, with the state of Rhode Island providing the lead fiscal and administrative coordination. The SMS Cooperative Agreement provided travel support for the state veterinarians to attend this workshop.

Exercise Objectives, Capabilities, and Activities

The identified exercise objectives below were linked to core capabilities-- distinct critical elements needed to achieve the National Preparedness Goal (www.fema.gov/national-preparedness-goal).

Table 1. Exercise Objectives and Associated Core Capabilities

Exercise Objective	Core Capability
<u>Objective 1 (Module 1):</u> Awareness of Partner Agency Roles and Responsibilities	Operational Coordination
<u>Objective 2 (Module 2):</u> Practice Accessing Farm Review Database	Supply Chain Integrity and Security
<u>Objective 3 (Module 3):</u> Review Permitting Group Roles and Responsibilities	Operational Coordination
<u>Objective 4 (Module 4):</u> Practice Implementing Permitting Plan	<i>Long-term Vulnerability Reduction, Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities.</i>
<u>Objective 5 (Module 5):</u> Discuss Permitting-Related Outreach to Industry and Public	Supply Chain Integrity and Security, Public Information and Warning

Core Capabilities Addressed During Workshop

Descriptions of core capabilities as outlined in the first edition of the *National Preparedness Goal* are abstracted from the following web site: www.fema.gov/core-capabilities. Information on the relationship between the core capabilities and the target capabilities list (TCL) version 2.0, released in September 2007 list is available in the *Core Capability / Target Capability Crosswalk* document.

Operational Coordination

Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrates all critical stakeholders and supports the execution of core capabilities.

Supply Chain integrity and Security

Strengthen the security and resilience of the supply chain.

Long term vulnerability reduction

Build and sustain resilient systems, communities, and critical infrastructure and key resources lifelines so as to reduce their vulnerability to natural, technological, and human-caused incidents by lessening the likelihood, severity, and duration of the adverse consequences related to these incidents.

Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities

Identify, assess and prioritize risks to inform protection activities and investments

Public Information and Warning

Deliver coordinated, prompt, reliable, and actionable information to the whole community through the use of clear, consistent, accessible, and culturally and linguistically appropriate methods to effectively relay information regarding any threat or hazard and, as appropriate, the actions being taken and the assistance being made available.

Scenario Summary

Timeline: The first 24 hours of response to the identification of an infected, suspect or contact premises in New England. State animal health officials were asked to assume New England would be managed as a region* and that all of New England was in a control zone. Officials were asked to access their state-specific Farm Readiness Review database to identify farms they would consider for permitting. Officials were also asked to create an ideal farm for permitting to compare with the actual results of their state's farms.

* Evaluation of the New England milk watershed vulnerability for FMD (R. Horwitz, June 2011) identified significant continuity of business benefits to producers and processors if New England could coordinate a regional response to FMD, in effect to respond as one region.

SECTION 3: ANALYSIS OF CAPABILITIES & OBJECTIVES

This section of the report reviews the performance of the exercised capabilities, activities, and tasks. In this section, observations are organized by objective, capability and associated activities. The capabilities linked to the exercise objectives of New England SMS 2013 are listed below, followed by corresponding activities. Each activity is followed by related observations, which include analysis, and recommendations.

Objective 1: Awareness of Partner Agency Roles and Responsibilities

Core Capability: Operational Coordination:

To gain awareness of potential partner agency roles and responsibilities USDA, APHIS, Wildlife Services; USDA, Farm Services Agency, New Hampshire, and the Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Northeast Region, presented an overview of their agency roles and responsibilities, emphasizing specific capabilities and responsibilities in support of a foreign animal disease outbreak.

Strengths:

Observation 1.1: Key representatives from relevant agencies were present in the room to discuss the Secure Milk Supply plan and the scenario. State and federal agriculture representatives were joined by federal and state public health and dairy industry representatives.

Observation 1.2: Support agencies discussed potential roles and resources they could bring in support of an outbreak of a foreign animal disease. Some of the resources which could be made available included support for notification and communication.

Areas for Improvement:

Observation 1.3: Questions were raised about potential role of state and local police and transportation/public works assets in support of permitting and movement control.

Observation 1.4: Questions raised about public health agencies communication or operational support roles in response to a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak.

Analysis:

Discussion on stakeholders roles and responsibilities highlighted potential roles of FDA, state public health and industry and partner agricultural agencies. Follow up should include further clarification of the support or regulatory role of Farm Service Agency (FSA), FDA and state and local public health agencies.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1.1: None

Recommendation 1.2: None

Recommendation 1.3: NESASA should conduct outreach to key local and state police, transportation and public works officials, reviewing potential roles in permitting and movement control decisions. They should be invited to join NESASA for future permitting workshops and exercises.

Recommendation 1.4: Continue outreach to public health agencies to clarify public health's potential role in support of the SMS plan and FMD response. Relevant existing message maps should be shared with public health.

Objective 2: Practice Accessing Farm Review Database

Core Capability: Supply Chain Integrity and Security:

Working from individual computers, the six New England state veterinarians practiced accessing and manipulating the web-based, password-protected, secure, state-specific Farm Readiness Review database stored on servers at the National Center for Foreign Animal and Zoonotic Diseases (FAZD), Texas A&M University, a Department of Homeland Security, Academic Center for Excellence (COE).

Strengths:

Observation 2.1: Exercise facilities allowed simultaneous internet connections. Each state was able to work on the FAZD web-based farm readiness review database while preserving confidentiality. The workshop would not have been a success without this capability.

Observation 2.2: The state veterinarians were able to open state-specific individual databases on FAZD servers and practice managing the contents based on different FMD biosecurity risk criteria. This process proceeded rapidly and state veterinarians commented on the Farm Readiness Review database's flexibility and utility.

Areas for Improvement:

Observation 2.3 State veterinarians were able to easily discuss the permitting process and concerns with the other states because they were co-located. Communication is likely to be more remote and difficult during a real event.

Observation 2.4 It is unclear how long access to FAZD data and servers will be guaranteed.

Analysis:

The confidential nature of farm premises production and other data requires that only qualified personnel are able to access these data. The system on the FAZD server allows each state to store their Farm Readiness Review risk assessment data securely. Before the exercise, memorandum of understanding detailing non-disclosure controls and procedures were negotiated and signed between each state Ag entity and representatives of FAZD. Access to the web-based, password protected portal was tested during the exercise. During the workshop state veterinarians were able to access their state-specific database and were able to readily practice filtering and manipulating these data. Web-based access to the database during a response will be important.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 2.1:

Future workshop sites should be evaluated for capacity to allow multiple portals with internet connectivity.

Recommendation 2.3:

Clarification of a potential multi-state decision making process and mechanism should be made whether through a memorandum of understanding, changes to the NESASA charter, pre-scripting a delegation of authority letter to incident command or some other mechanism. Outreach to the Northeast States Emergency Consortium (NESEC) should be considered for feedback and further guidance.

Recommendation 2.4:

Develop continuity plan for long-term access to servers and data.

Objective 3: Review Permitting Group Roles and Responsibilities

Core Capability: Operational Coordination:

The occurrence of FMD somewhere in New England was presented as a general scenario to the New England state veterinarians. The players agreed to regulate New England as a region for the purpose of this exercise. (The concept of a New England wide coordinated response to a FMD outbreak is a key doctrinal component of a successful milk continuity plan as determined by studies of milk movement patterns in New England, R. Horwitz, 2011.) The players discussed setting up a control zone and setting up an ICS Permitting Group under Operations as presented in the USDA, APHIS, VS, FMD Redbook. Permitting Group membership, communication within the Operations Section, coordination with the Planning Section and outreach to a Joint Information Center (JIC) were also discussed.

Strengths:

Observation 3.1:

The Permitting Group Action Plan developed for the exercise clarified ICS Permitting Group structure and identified key procedures and processes needed to efficiently and effectively stand up and operate a Permitting Group.

Areas for Improvement:

Observation 3.2:

Recent disease responses by VS have not required setting up and staffing a Permitting Group, limiting knowledge and experience by current agricultural response teams.

Analysis:

The procedures and processes required for standing up an ICS Permitting Group in response to a FMD outbreak were actively discussed. Communicating within the command structure, industry stakeholders and the public were also reviewed. Recommendation to Operations that livestock movement, direct-sales and agri-tourism should also be stopped highlighted the potential sudden and far-reaching impact of a disease report on the agricultural industry. The Permitting Group Action Plan was also helpful in clarifying the need for liaisons and other strategies for quickly communicating permitting decisions with industry, Joint Information Centers and other stakeholders.

The outline for setting up and operating a Permitting Group has previously not been detailed. This information should be shared throughout agency for further feedback and to identify training elements. The need to communicate efficiently and effectively with industry stakeholders was also highlighted.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 3.1:

Elements of the Permitting Group Action Plan developed for this exercise should be integrated into the New England SMS Plan.

Recommendation 3.2.1:

Permitting Group Action Plan developed for exercise should be shared with other VS, state agriculture and emergency management response staff for further feedback, review and comment.

Recommendation 3.2.2

Training should be developed for setting up and staffing a Permitting Group and other APHIS, VS-specific disease response ICS structures.

Objective 4: Practice Implementing Permitting Plan

Core Capability: Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities:

The secure milk supply plan emphasis on managed permitted movement of milk from within a control zone during an outbreak of FMD was discussed as an essential element for business continuity for the dairy industry. Based on the scenario, the players discussed criteria for allowing milk movement. Players developed an ideal farm profile, and resultant readiness rating to compare with their states' farm readiness profiles. Real-time review of state-specific farm readiness review scores and other variables allowed regulators to discuss the management of disease control compared to the risk of permitted milk movement.

Core capability: Long-term Vulnerability Reduction: Players discussed strategies for improving farm readiness review scores by leveraging existing partner agency programs and support, and through increased education and outreach to farmers.

Strengths:

Observation 4.1 The online database was useful in quickly reviewing and assessing the impact of permitting decisions on 100s of premises. This would not have been possible or proceeded as quickly if not for the Farm Readiness Review, the database, the Readiness Model and the Readiness Rating.

Observation 4.2 Participants were able to rehearse a permit approval and distribution protocol for farms.

Areas for Improvement:

Observation 4.3

Mechanism to permit movement across state lines remains unclear.

Observation 4.4 During the workshop, participants could only review premises where data had been collected and entered into the database. Across the region, although many more farms have been reviewed, less than 50% of results have been entered into the database.

Observation 4.5

During discussion participants identified additional criteria that could impact the biosecurity risk analysis and therefore the permitting decision. Examples of additional criteria discussed include; at-risk species on premises (swine), time since review completion and number of hauler pickups per route.

Observation 4.6

The mechanism for distributing the permit to producers (as well as haulers and processors) remains unclear.

Observation 4.7

The mechanism for continuing and integrating the SMS program into state and regional practices and organizational structures remains unclear.

Analysis: Participants felt there was tremendous utility in use of the database and the Readiness Rating. Players were surprised that none of the existing farms met their ideal Readiness Rating, highlighting the gap in current farm readiness and the challenges of balancing continuity with disease control goals.

Willingness of farmers to participate in the Farm Readiness Review process was reported to be very high. Limitations to data collection and entry to the database appear to relate to staffing limitations, logistical issues. State support and the mechanisms, for continuing the review process need to be clarified by the departments of agriculture.

A second round of Farm Readiness Review has not yet been completed. It will be important to confirm the premise that updating these data will proceed quicker than the first round, supporting the long term ability to sustain the data collection process.

The questions relating to the regional permitting process included: would state delegate authority for permitting to the Incident Commander consistent with the SMS plan, would each state have a representative on the Unified Command or would authority remain with each state veterinarian?

The strength of the Farm Readiness Review and the Readiness Rating is its increased transparency to the regulatory process. Its ability to remove human bias may improve acceptance of permitting decisions

The challenge of balancing continuity vs. disease control efforts and its implications for a regional secure milk supply plan were noted. Emphasis on continuity might support a wide geographic control area with increasing restrictive permitting criteria as the extent of outbreak is better defined. Whereas a disease control emphasis would support tight permitting criteria within a smaller defined control zone. Participants noted that flexibility will still be needed in making response decisions depending on the specific circumstances of the outbreak.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 4.1 Further development and refinement of the database and the criteria used in the Readiness Model should be considered.

Recommendation 4.2 Develop permit distribution protocols for inclusion into SMS Plan.

Recommendation 4.3 The goals, processes and triggers for sharing of data between state and federal partners in an emergency should be clarified. Documents should be signed by an appropriate state agricultural or other official as determined by members of NESAASA, state agricultural or state emergency management officials.

Recommendation 4.4.1 The Farm Readiness Review has been designed to allow on-farm direct entry of results to the database. Use of this capacity would eliminate need to re-enter hand written responses. Other roadblocks to completed reviews and entering information into the database should be evaluated and corrected.

Recommendation 4.4.2 Clarify continued state agriculture support and mechanisms for continuing the review process.

Recommendation 4.4.3 Clarify how would deal with farms that do not participate in the voluntary review. Evaluate if there is a threshold participation rate for the Farm Readiness Review and the Readiness Rating to be an effective process and measure of risk.

Recommendation 4.5.1 Re-evaluate and revise criteria used in Readiness Model based on discussions during workshop. Develop more detailed definitions of a wash station and other terms used in the Farm Readiness Review.

Recommendation 4.5.2 Test the validity of the Readiness Ratings and the process for Weighing the Readiness Criteria. Begin by determining stability of the Readiness Model. Request that other disease response experts within VS. also participate in Weighing the Readiness Criteria.

Recommendation 4.6 Detail the mechanics of permitting such as formatting, distributing, notifying and rescinding permits.

Recommendation 4.7.1 A continuity plan for the New England SMS Project should be developed, clarifying mechanisms for supporting and promoting continued participation in the Farm Readiness Reviews, moving the current database on FAZD servers to regional servers and hosting of the web-based plan and support documents on a regional site.

Recommendation 4.7.2 Planners should communicate individual farm readiness rating results with farm owners. Develop a roadmap for farm owners to improve biosecurity practices and readiness ratings.

Recommendation 4.7.3 States should formally accept FAD PReP FMD response documents and New England SMS Plans, as amended, into existing state agricultural emergency response plans.

Objective 5: Discuss Outreach to Industry and Public

Core Capability: Supply Chain Integrity and Security: State veterinarians and industry representatives' discussed challenges of communicating permitting decisions in a secure, rapid and effective manner to farmers, haulers and processors. Delays increase environmental contamination and reduce integrity of the fluid milk supply chain and its ability to operate safely and recover.

Core Capability: Public Information and Warning: Notification of the public on permitting process and decisions and implications for food safety and security were discussed. Outreach and coordination with Joint Information Center industry and agricultural regulatory liaisons was discussed. Milk permitting decisions need to be communicated to farmers, processors and the public quickly and accurately, but may require emphasizing different messages.

Strengths:

Observation 5.1:

Good discussion on challenges for communicating with public and industry stakeholders in an emergency.

Observation 5.2

Farm Readiness Review database may include emergency contact information which is not readily available in other state agricultural databases.

Observation 5.3

Communication challenge specific to the permitting process was identified. Permitting is required for safety and security of the animals and to prevent and control disease spread among the animals, not for food safety reasons.

Areas for Improvement:

Observation 5.4

There was uncertainty about the best process and method to communicate permitting decisions and changes to industry and other stakeholders in a timely, accurate and efficient manner.

Observation 5.5

Safety message to public is complicated by similarity of animal disease named foot-and-mouth disease with a different human disease named hand, foot-and-mouth disease.

Analysis:

Participants commented that important permitting communication issues were identified. The public's response to different permitting strategies was discussed. It could be hard to explain why what milk is acceptable for permitting today is not acceptable tomorrow. Discussed that the public is likely to be confused by this process and could confuse permitting safety with product safety.

State officials will be very busy during any response and events will occur very quickly. Responders will need to pre-identify emergency industry contacts to facilitate communication.

Specific communication issues identified related to the permitting of milk movement included the need for rapid notification of premises, the large number of premises, industry confidentiality issues, and inconsistent or irregular means of contact. Cultural competency issues were also raised. Beyond language, there are populations of farmers who do not use phones in New England.

Recommendations:

Recommendation 5.1 None

Recommendation 5.2 None

Recommendation 5.3 Share permitting communication topics identified with response partners and stakeholders and explore if previously discussed. If not, develop message map.

Recommendation 5.4.1 Guidelines for permitting notification should be discussed and included in the SMS Plan.

Recommendation 5.4.2 Pre-identify lines of emergency communication and primary points of contact with industry.

Recommendation 5.4.3 Clarify the requirements and needs of a regional emergency communication and notification system. Explore the availability of existing notification systems used by partner agencies which could be expanded to include agricultural emergency and regulatory needs.

Recommendation 5.5.1 Continue the discussion on the revision of the disease name. Evaluate if "Hoof and Mouth" disease could be used in conjunction with FMD to facilitate message that the disease is not a public health threat.

Recommendation 5.5.2

Continue outreach to public health agencies. Determine if existing message maps on FMD and human health are acceptable to public health agencies.

SECTION 4: CONCLUSION

The workshop was invaluable for a number of reasons. It highlighted potential practices and protocols for setting up a Permitting Group under the Incident Command System. Access via a web-based password protected portal to the Farm Readiness Review database assured that only qualified personnel were able to access these data and that they can do it remotely. The Readiness Rating and the Farm Readiness Review database had great utility in assisting state veterinarians and other key response officials in reviewing premises quickly so they could make an informed risk-based decision. The discussion on the use of database and Readiness Model also identified changes which would improve the value of the Readiness Rating. These included adding more detailed definitions to terms used, reviewing and revising criteria to improve the Readiness Rating and conducting further studies to evaluate the validity and stability of the Readiness Model. The workshop identified a number of key permitting related communication issues which need to be addressed.

The workshop identified numerous areas where industry and response agencies can work together to improve the security of the milk supply and to support the continuity of the fluid milk industry.

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

APPENDIX A: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

This IP has been developed for the New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance (NESAASA) following the New England Secure Milk Supply 2013 workshop, conducted on May 9, 2013 in Concord, NH .

Table A.1: Improvement Plan Matrix

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
Objective 1 Awareness of partner agency roles and responsibilities	1.1 Strength- Relevant agencies were in the room to discuss the Secure Milk Supply Plan and the scenario	1.1 None					
Core Capability: Operational Coordination	1.2 Strength - Support agencies roles and resources discussed	1.2 Evaluate existing support agency emergency communication tools and potential use for regional agricultural emergency response	Accepted: Research potential communication / notification systems	NESAASA	Fredric Cantor	Ongoing	July 2014
	1.3 Improvement- Role of state police and department of transportation in permitting unclear	1.3. Conduct outreach on role of state police and departments of transportation- invite to participate in future workshops	Accepted: Meet with agencies to discuss potential roles. Develop scenario which involves these agencies	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	State Veterinarains and Exercise planning committee	Aug 2013	July 2014
	1.4 Improvement- Clarify whether public health agencies have formally evaluated roles in response to FMD	1.4 Share existing message maps with public health agencies and request feedback	Accepted: Identify if existing message maps developed with, or approved by, public health	VS, NCAHEM	Fredric Cantor, Jon Zack	Aug 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
Objective 2 Practice Accessing Farm Review Database Core Capability: Supply Chain Integrity and Security.	2.1 Strength - Exercise site allowed simultaneous, multiple internet connections	2.1 Future workshop sites should be evaluated for this connectivity capability	None	NESAASA	Dr. Fredric Cantor	March 2014	May 2014
	2.2 Strength – State veterinarians were easily able to access and manipulate secure data from this remote site	2.2 None					
	2.3 Improvement - State veterinarians may not be co-located during a real event delaying communication of permitting decisions	2.3 Need to clarify multi-state decision making process and mechanism	Accepted: Outline steps in MOU, or other mechanism, to be signed by state veterinarians or other state Ag officials	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	Draft already developed and circulated	July 2014
	2.4 Improvement - Long-term access to data on FAZD servers is not defined	2.4 Develop continuity plan for long-term access to data and servers	Accepted: Objective is already included in current year cooperative agreement work plan	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	Aug 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
Objective 3 Review Permitting Group Roles and Responsibilities Core Capability: Operational Coordination	3.1 Strength- Permitting Group Action Plan clarified ICS structure	3.1 Incorporate Permitting Group Action Plan elements into New England SMS plan	Accepted:	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	Already completed	Done
	3.2. Improvement- Limited experience within VS and state agriculture for setting up and staffing Permitting Group	3.2.1 Permitting Group Action Plan developed for this exercise should be shared with in VS and other groups for comment and feedback	Accepted:	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
		3.2.2 Develop training on mechanics of setting up and staffing an ICS Permitting Group	Accepted: Forward recommendation to NCAHEM and VS training planning group	VS, NCAHEM	Bill Smith & Jon Zack	August 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
Objective 4 Practice Implementing Permitting Plan Core Capabilities: Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities: Long-term Vulnerability Reduction:	4.1 Strength - Online database useful for quickly reviewing and assessing impacts of permitting decisions	4.1 Further development and refinement of the criteria used in the Readiness Model should be considered	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
	4.2 Strength - Participants were able to rehearse permit approval and distribution protocols for permitted farms	4.2 Develop protocols for approving and distributing permits and then integrate into SMS Plan	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
	4.3 Improvement - The mechanism for permitting movement across state lines remains unclear	4.3 Mechanism should be developed outlining the goals, process and triggers for the sharing of data between states in an emergency	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
	4.4. Improvement - Not all farms have been reviewed. Not all data have been entered into Farm Readiness Review database	4.4.1 Roadblocks to completing Readiness Reviews and entering info into database should be evaluated and corrected to the extent possible.	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
(Cont.) Objective 4 Practice Implementing Permitting Plan Core Capabilities: Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities: Long-term Vulnerability Reduction		4.4.2 State agricultural support and mechanisms for continuing the Farm Readiness Review process need to be confirmed	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
		4.4.3 Clarify how would prioritize farms that do not participate in review and their impact on validity of Readiness Rating	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
	4.5 Improvement - Additional criteria which could impact Readiness Model were identified	4.5.1 Re-evaluate and revise the Readiness Model and Weighing of Readiness Criteria based on discussions during the workshop	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
(Cont.) Objective 4 Practice Implementing Permitting Plan	4.5 Improvement- (Cont.)	4.5.2 Begin to test validity of the Readiness Rating - - Request other disease response experts within VS evaluate Weighing of Readiness Criteria used in the Readiness Model	Accepted	Veterinary Services NCAHEM and NESAASA	Dr. Jon Zack, Dr. Fredric Cantor	August 2013	July 2014
Core Capabilities: Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities Long-term Vulnerability Reduction	4.6 Improvement- Logistics for distributing permit to producers (as well as haulers and processors) remains unclear	4.6 Develop SOP for formatting, distributing, notifying and rescinding permits	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
(Cont.) Objective 4 Practice Implementing Permitting Plan	4.7 Improvement: Mechanisms for continuing and integrating the SMS program into regional practices and organizational structures remain unclear	4.7.1 A continuity plan for the New England SMS Project should be developed	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
Core Capabilities: Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities:		4.7.2 Develop roadmap for improving Readiness Ratings. Communicate individual Readiness Ratings with producers	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
Long-term Vulnerability Reduction		4.7.3 States should accept FMD FAD PReP documents and New England SMS Plan into state agriculture emergency planning and response documents	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014

For Official use Only - FOUO

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
Objective 5: Discuss Outreach to Industry and Public Core Capabilities: Supply Chain Integrity and Security Public Information and Warning	5.1 Strength - Good discussion on challenges of communicating with industry and public	None					
	5.2 Strength - Farm Readiness Review Database may include emergency contact information not available within other state Ag databases	None					
	5.3 Strength - Public communication challenge specific to permitting identified and discussed	5.3 Investigate if FMD-specific message maps for permitting have been developed	Accepted	NACHAEM	Dr. Jon Zack	August 2013	July 2014
	5.4 Improvement – Uncertainty about best way to communicate permitting decisions quickly	5.4.1 Permit notification guidelines should be developed and included in the SMS Plan	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
		5.4.2 Pre-identify industry emergency communication points of contact	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor, State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014

Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)

After Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP)

New England SMS 2013]

Capability	Observation Title	Recommendation	Corrective Action Description	Primary Responsible Agency	Agency POC	Start Date	Completion Date
(Cont.) Objective 5: Discuss Outreach to Industry and Public Core Capabilities: Supply chain integrity and Security Public Information and Warning		5.4.3 Explore availability of existing emergency alert network / notification systems that could be adopted, or expanded, to include regional agricultural emergency use	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor and State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014
	5.5 Improvement: Safety message complicate by similarity in disease name with human disease	5.5.1 Begin discussion with other stakeholders about revision to disease name	Not accepted: Beyond scope of SMS Plan				
		5.5.2 Continue outreach to public health agencies and determine if existing message maps are acceptable to public health agencies	Accepted	NESAASA and State Departments of Agriculture	Dr. Cantor and State Veterinarians	August 2013	July 2014

APPENDIX B: MAY 9TH WORKSHOP AGENDA

8:00 Registration:

8:30 Introduction

- Overview of agenda
- Participant introduction
- Brief review of SMS Project

Module 1:

Key partner agency-- Short overview & potential roles in a FMD outbreak
USDA, Wildlife Services, NH, VT
USDA, NH, Farm Services Agency
Food and Drug Administration

Module 2:

FAZD Reports - Practice accessing data and printing risk assessment reports

or

Review of the New England Secure Milk Supply Project

- Regional Milk movement risk assessment
- Risk Readiness rating factors
- Next steps in developing readiness rating

Module 3

FMD Scenario - Action Plan for a Permits Group in Regional FMD Response
Sections 1-7 Get Organized

LUNCH

Module 4:

FMD Scenario -Action Plan for a Permits Group in Regional FMD Response
Sections 8-13 Establish and Implement a Procedure for Issuing Permits

- New England is managed as a region
- New England is managed as individual states

or

Continuation of partner roles and responsibilities discussion

Module 5:

Industry Dispatcher to Hauler Communication (Industry Representatives)

- Review procedures/ process / requirements
- Simulate response to scenario
- Clarify data needs and requirements

Module 6: Define Future actions

Adjourn 4:30 pm

APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

BASED UPON WRITTEN AND VERBAL FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING POST-WORKSHOP INTERVIEWS

Surprised by the number and the potential complexity of the communication issues which were identified.

Should have been a 2-day meeting because of the communication issues alone

It would be helpful to know more about the other industry continuity plans, like the secure egg supply and the secure pork supply plans. Would like to see a comparison of practices and recommendations of continuity plans between industries.

Reported that 85% of those in the database state they can get a functioning wash stations--hard to believe. Need definitions of terms such as what constitutes a functioning wash station. Suggest follow up study check that the wash station meets certain criteria.

There is definitely a value to pre-rating the farms. If farmers knew criteria would help with their long-term planning for upgrades and improvements. Value if could be used to help farmers improve biosecurity.

Integration of review process with existing farm regulatory visits is required for sustainability of process. Has this been accomplished?

Need to review criteria used [in the readiness model] and simplify the model for its long-term continuity and success.

Process and model increases transparency and provides a pathway for eliminating regulatory bias. But farmers still need to trust model. Need further validity studies: Does the model represent what it says it does?

The model may not be useful in all situations--Clarify the scenario when the model would be most useful.

Assembling milk from smaller producers will take time. If goal is the largest quantity of milk in the shortest period of time then larger producer will have to be favored.

Need clarification of definitions like, what constitutes a functioning wash station?

Uncertainty for how quickly incident command would be able to set up a functioning permitting group.

If farmers knew criteria and rating compared to other farms and what would need to do to improve could provide an incentive. Has to be presented the right way.

Risk model complexity- Do 1-2 pigs vs 100 present dramatically different risks? What data supports this?.. ...Expert opinion or assumptions. We are trying to make process transparent and more accountable? Trying to get away from soft criteria and individual perceptions of levels of risk.

Goal was to add fairness and transparency to a regulatory process. There still seems to be an arbitrary nature to the number.

Concerned that rating seems to be based on a few high priority criteria so perhaps need to simplify the model and set up more discrete ratings-- gold, silver, bronze?

Simplify communication message by developing basic top ten biosecurity /emergency practices for truck drivers and dairy farms and disseminate. Test these products with stakeholders before finalize!

How can industry help? What data should they be ready to share to support permitting process and it what format. Can newer efficiencies in recording and tracking milk flow data support improvement in continuity planning and permitting operations?

Any follow-up letter , notice to producers should be sent in conjunction with a proposed meeting date to discuss significance and identify and respond to concerns.

There is value to education and training and readiness rating.

Suggest re-review now that have discussed issues and evaluate changes in responses

Producer should be given opportunity [and tools] to improve their readiness rating. Regulators need to be able to defend that model measures what it says.

APPENDIX D: HANDOUTS/ REFERENCES

- 1) ** Horwitz, R. *Action Plan for a Permits Group in a Regional FMD Response*. Appendix A. New England SMS 2013, Situation Manual. May, 2013.
<http://nesaasa.weebly.com/ne-sms-project.html>
- 2) **APHIS-USDA. *Foot-and-Mouth Disease (FMD) Response. Ready Reference Guide—Quarantine, Movement Control, and Continuity of Business*
www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/fmd_rrg_cob_qmc_plan.pdf
- 3) **APHIS-USDA, *National SMS Plan. National SMS Plan Update*.
www.securemilksupply.org/
- 4) APHIS-USDA. Foreign Animal Disease Preparedness and Response Plan (FAD PReP) website.
www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/materials_ref.shtml
- 5) Horwitz, R. Foot-and-Mouth Disease (FMD) As a Hazard for New England Dairies. Prepared for the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA-APHIS) and the Maine Department of Agriculture, Division of Animal and Plant Health Under Cooperative Agreement Number 10-9623-1062 (BCOP, FFY 2010) with the New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance (NESAASA). June, 2011. <http://nesaasa.weebly.com/ne-sms-project.html>
- 6) USDA-APHIS-VS, National Center for Animal Health Emergency Management (NCAHEM), Foot-and-Mouth Disease Response Plan: “The Red Book”. June 2011
www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/fmd_response_plan.pdf

** Handout during the workshop

APPENDIX F: ACRONYMS

Acronym	Meaning
DHS	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
HSEEP	Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program
SMS Plan	Secure Milk Supply Plan
NESAASA	New England States Animal Agricultural Security Alliance
FMD	Foot-and-Mouth Disease
FAZD	National Center for Foreign Animal and Zoonotic Diseases

APPENDIX G: GLOSSARY

Control Zone: Designated areas of premises quarantine or movement restrictions of animal agricultural related activity during a disease event.

Core Capabilities: Distinct critical elements necessary to achieve the National Preparedness Goal. www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1828-25045-9470/national_preparedness_goal_2011.pdf

Farm Readiness Review: On-site assessment of dairy farms that are licensed in New England states, emphasizing the capacity of each operation to meet specific, elevated biosecurity requirements for managed movement of fluid milk during a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak.

Readiness Model: A representation of the range and relative importance of criteria -- specific farm conditions and capacities -- that regional regulators judge to be important in qualifying for permission to ship fluid milk during a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak.

Readiness Rating: A composite measure of the capacity of a dairy farm to meet elevated biosecurity requirements for permission to ship fluid milk during a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak.

Weighing of Readiness Criteria: Process for measurement of the relative importance of criteria in the Readiness Model in the judgment of the regulatory authorities. (The measurement is derived from Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) assessment of the regulators' consensus in pairwise comparisons. The results of the pairwise comparisons are used to assign weights to criteria that are applied in the Farm Readiness Review and to calculate a composite Readiness Rating for each farm.)