

# Iowa Foot-and-Mouth Disease State Response Plan



This is a draft plan and is subject to change

February 27, 2020

## Table of Contents:

1. Introduction
  2. Pre-Outbreak Actions
    - i. Biosecurity
      - a. General Recommendations
      - b. Outdoor Access
      - c. Personnel policies
        - Hunting
        - International travel
        - Clothing
        - Shower-in Shower-out
        - Outside food
        - Outside materials
      - d. Mechanical vectors
    - ii. Premises Registration
  3. Classifications of an FMD Outbreak in relation to Iowa
    - i. Continental: FMD outbreak in Canada or Mexico but not in the U.S.
    - ii. Domestic: Confirmation of the first FMD case in the U.S. but not in Iowa.
    - iii. In-State: Surveillance shows a positive case in Iowa or epidemiologic evidence proves a connection of an Iowa herd/flock to an infected herd/flock.
- Appendix 1: Standstill Order
- Appendix 2: Epidemiological Investigation and Surveillance
- Appendix 3: Mitigation
  - i. Quarantine
  - ii. Control Area
  - iii. Permitting
  - iv. Mass Depopulation
  - v. Carcass Disposal
  - vi. Cleaning and Disinfection
  - vii. Vaccination

## 1. Introduction

Foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) is a severe and highly contagious viral disease affecting cows, pigs, sheep, goats, deer, and other animals with divided, or split, hooves. It can also infect hedgehogs and Asian elephants. It does not infect people and is neither a food safety nor public health concern [1]. Animals which pass ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection by the [USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service \(FSIS\)](#) at slaughter or a facility licensed and inspected by the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship (IDALS) [Meat and Poultry Inspections Bureau](#) are safe for human consumption, even if the animals may have been exposed to or have recovered from FMD. Products passing inspection are able to enter normal commerce.

Animals with FMD typically develop a fever with blisters on the tongue and lips, in and around the mouth, on mammary glands, and around hooves. Other signs of illness include depression, anorexia, excessive salivation, lameness, and reluctance to move or stand. Most adult animals do not die from FMD, but instead weaken and may recover, however they may never regain full productivity. Younger animals may not survive. Because clinical signs of FMD mimic signs of endemic diseases causing blisters ([Vesicular Stomatitis](#), [Senecavirus A](#), etc.), the recognition, identification, and confirmation of FMD may be delayed.

A single FMD detection could close international export markets for meat, dairy, and other products, causing billions of dollars in lost trade for the U.S. [2]. While there is a vaccination against FMD, a 2019 report from the U.S. Government Accountability Office found that the number of doses stockpiled in the *North American Foot-and-Mouth Disease Vaccine Bank* available during 2018 was less than 10% of the total doses needed to vaccinate all susceptible species in Iowa [3].

Therefore, the primary strategy to mitigate FMD's impact on Iowa's agricultural economy is to prevent it from entering or eradicating it as quickly as possible if it does enter. This may be accomplished through instituting restricted and/or controlled movements of susceptible species if the virus is detected in the U.S. and stamping-out positive or epidemiologically linked herds/flocks in Iowa. Identifying all premises before a potential outbreak would greatly increase IDALS' ability to control and mitigate an FMD introduction.

In the event of an outbreak the primary transmission risk to Iowa herds/flocks is direct transmission from infected animals to susceptible animals or indirect transmission from fomites (contaminated people, supplies, or equipment). Transmission from infected animals could occur from domesticated animals or wildlife. If infected, white tailed deer could potentially spread the virus but the role they would play in propagating an outbreak is thought to be limited [4] [5]. While feral swine can become infected with FMD and are reported in three bordering states (Missouri, Illinois, and Wisconsin); with the exception of Crawford County, Wisconsin (separated from Iowa by the Mississippi River), no county directly borders Iowa and the introduction of FMD from feral swine is unlikely at this time [6]. The risk of intentional release of FMD into an Iowa herd/flock is unknown.

85  
86 During any foreign animal disease (FAD) outbreak IDALS will work collaboratively  
87 with USDA to respond. The goals of any FAD response include: (1) detecting,  
88 controlling, and containing the disease as quickly as possible; (2) eradicating the disease  
89 using strategies that seek to stabilize animal agriculture, food supplies, the economy, and  
90 to protect public health and the environment; and (3) providing science- and risk-based  
91 approaches and systems to facilitate continuity of business for non-infected animals and  
92 non-contaminated products.

93  
94 Lastly, during an outbreak FMD may be incorrectly associated with [Hand, Foot and](#)  
95 [Mouth Disease](#) that affects people. This confusion with an entirely unrelated condition  
96 could cause unnecessary public health concern [7].  
97

## 98 2. Pre-Outbreak Actions

### 99 i. Biosecurity

- 100 a. IDALS places the responsibility of implementing good biosecurity practices  
101 on the producers and owners of a premises. At a minimum IDALS  
102 recommendations premises utilize existing enhanced biosecurity outbreak  
103 guidance available in the [NAHEMS Guidelines for Biosecurity](#) [8] and those  
104 outlined in the [Secure Pork Supply \(SPS\)](#), [Secure Beef Supply \(SBS\)](#), [Secure](#)  
105 [Milk Supply \(SMS\)](#), and/or Secure Sheep and Wool Supply, but also practice  
106 increased biosecurity practices, where appropriate, on a daily basis.  
107
- 108 b. IDALS further recommends:
- 109 • Premises that do not allow pigs to have outdoor access utilize  
110 guidance available in the [Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced](#)  
111 [Pork Production Biosecurity: Animals Raised Indoors](#) [9];
  - 112 • Premises that allow pigs to have outdoor access utilize USDA  
113 biosecurity recommendations as highlighted in the [USDA](#)  
114 [Biosecurity Checklist for Pigs with Outdoor Access](#) [10] and well  
115 as the [Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Pork Production](#)  
116 [Biosecurity: Animals with Outdoor Access](#) [11];
  - 117 • Premises housing beef cattle on feedlots utilize guidance available  
118 in the [Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for](#)  
119 [FMD Prevention: Beef Feedlots](#) [12];
  - 120 • Premises housing beef cattle on pasture utilize guidance available  
121 in the [Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for](#)  
122 [FMD Prevention: Cattle on Pasture](#) [13];
  - 123 • Premises housing dairy cattle utilize guidance available in the [Self-](#)  
124 [Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for FMD](#)  
125 [Prevention: Dairy](#) [14];
  - 126 • Premises housing sheep utilize guidance available in the Self-  
127 [Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for FMD](#)  
128 [Prevention: Sheep and Wool](#);
  - 129 • All premises implement personnel policies that restrict employees  
130 (and visitors) from:

- entering a premises for a minimum of 5 days after arriving in the U.S. after visiting any country or area of the world experiencing active FMD cases;
- bringing any clothing (including footwear) that was worn when hunting white tailed deer or other ruminants, hunting feral swine, or visiting a country or area of the world experiencing active FMD cases before it is completely washed and laundered;
- entering a premises without adhering to the premises' established biosecurity protocols;
- bringing cellular phones and other outside materials that have not been properly disinfected onto a premises; and
- Controlling potential mechanical vectors (such as flies) that may be present on the premises.

#### ii. Premises Registration

Premises registration of all livestock premises and assignment of a premises identification number will greatly enhance IDALS' ability to respond to and mitigate an FMD outbreak.

### 3. Classifications of an FMD Outbreak in relation to Iowa

There are three classifications of an FMD outbreak in relation to Iowa that would prompt IDALS to initiate a response. Formal notification of confirmed FMD cases outside of Iowa would be announced by USDA. Any confirmation of FMD within Iowa would be announced jointly by IDALS and USDA.

The three classifications of an FMD outbreak in relation to Iowa are:

- **Continental:** FMD outbreak in Canada or Mexico but not in the U.S.
- **Domestic:** Confirmation of the first FMD case in the U.S. but not in Iowa.
- **In-State:** Surveillance shows a positive case in Iowa or epidemiologic evidence proves a connection of an Iowa herd/flock to an infected herd/flock.

Iowa Code [163.1](#) describes IDALS legal authority to control infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals. Therefore during any FMD outbreak classification, IDALS may take the following actions:

#### i. Continental: FMD outbreak in Canada or Mexico but not in the U.S.

While historically FMD was endemic throughout North America, it was eradicated in from the U.S. in 1929, Canada in 1952, and Mexico in 1954 [15]. If FMD re-emerged in Canada or Mexico IDALS may:

- 177 • Receive confirmation of an FMD outbreak in North America (Canada or Mexico)  
178 from USDA and receive reports on trade status with the infected country.
- 179 • Notify internal staff of the potential threat and initiate frequent communication to  
180 ensure stand-by readiness to deploy if necessary.
- 181 • Confer with the Iowa Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory to review submission  
182 procedures for the National Animal Health Laboratory Network (NAHLN), including  
183 the designated National Veterinary Service Laboratory (NVSL) [Foreign Animal  
184 Disease Diagnostic Laboratory \(FADDL\)](#).
- 185 • Communicate the threat to stakeholders and the public. IDALS will explain the  
186 disease and its effect on susceptible livestock, provide a description of the current  
187 response, make recommendations on how producers should protect their herds/flocks,  
188 explain how to report suspected cases or unusual disease, and provide resources to  
189 find more information. Complete details on communication pathways can be found in  
190 the *IDALS' Foreign Animal Disease Communications Plan*.
- 191 • The State Veterinarian may issue quarantine orders or special import rules/orders in  
192 cases where there is a potential FMD threat to Iowa agriculture. Import rules may  
193 include:
- 194     ○ Special import permits or requirements for susceptible animals entering Iowa.
- 195     ○ Negative results to diagnostic tests. Diagnostic tests may be utilized to the  
196 highest degree possible to demonstrate a lack of evidence of infection.
- 197 • Notify cooperating state agencies, including but not limited to Homeland Security and  
198 Emergency Management (HSEMD), Iowa Department of Public Health (DPH), Iowa  
199 Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Iowa Department of Public Safety (DPS)  
200 and Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT). HSEM can coordinate the  
201 notification process.
- 202 • Notify veterinary and other professional associations, licensed and accredited  
203 veterinarians, livestock and trade associations, livestock producers, transit companies,  
204 and others of any changes to import regulations.
- 205 • Conduct historic tracing and surveillance of susceptible animals imported from the  
206 FMD-affected country within a minimum of two incubation periods (30 days) prior to  
207 the date of onset (or best approximation) of the index case.
- 208     ○ Information may be gathered from a number of sources, including Certificates  
209 of Veterinary Inspection (CVIs), entry permits, producer records, and  
210 livestock market and slaughter facility records. These may include shipments  
211 from high-risk areas such as the infected country, production systems  
212 associated with the outbreak, or from other states with frequent movements  
213 from the infected country (e.g., movements from Mexico into Texas).

- 214 • Begin a more aggressive surveillance program to try to determine if FMD has been  
215 introduced into Iowa. Available diagnostic testing will be utilized to the highest  
216 degree possible as a tool to help determine the FMD status of individual animals or  
217 herds/flocks.
- 218 ○ Tests may be conducted on:
  - 219 ■ Animals based on epidemiological link(s);
  - 220 ■ Animals showing suspicious clinical signs;
  - 221 ■ Recent samples submitted to the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory at  
222 Iowa State University for diagnosis of illness (i.e. targeted samples);  
223 and/or
  - 224 ■ Samples collected from concentration points, such as slaughter  
225 facilities, buying stations, livestock markets, etc.
- 226 • If it is anticipated that the incident may require support beyond IDALS resources,  
227 IDALS will notify the Governor's office and coordinate with Iowa Department of  
228 (HSEMD) to review needed resources and purchasing procedures to support a  
229 response.
- 230 • Continuously update the Governor's Office and HSEMD, and collectively anticipate  
231 future needs and evaluate the need for a Declaration of Emergency.

## 232 **ii. Domestic: Confirmation of the first FMD case in the U.S. but not in Iowa**

233

234 In addition to the activities and considerations listed for the Continental classification, if  
235 FMD is detected in the U.S. but not Iowa IDALS may:

236

- 237 • Be in frequent communication with USDA to confirm:
  - 238 ○ Situational awareness of the FMD status of other states, including current  
239 response strategy (stamping-out) and epidemiological links to Iowa and other  
240 states;
  - 241 ○ The identity of FMD contacts that may have been transported to Iowa within  
242 the last 30 days at a minimum;
  - 243 ○ Status of trade with U.S.'s international trading partners;
  - 244 ○ If USDA is considering a Secretarial Emergency Declaration for the affected  
245 state(s).
  - 246 ○ If USDA is recommended a national standstill order for all susceptible  
247 species.

- 248 • If a standstill order is implemented, immediately contact DOT and DPS.
- 249 • Conduct surveillance to provide the highest degree of confidence possible that animal  
250 and/or animal product movements can occur to support business continuity without  
251 spreading infection. This may include monitoring for clinical signs and testing of live  
252 animals including, but not limited to, screening serum samples stored at the Iowa  
253 Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory and/or testing animals at packing plants.
- 254 • Carefully evaluate the risk of animals and animal products to be imported. Imports  
255 that pose a high-risk of introducing FMD will be prohibited from entering Iowa.  
256 Imports from certain geographical areas, production systems associated with the  
257 outbreak or other locations that may have epidemiological links to FMD Infected  
258 Premises will be carefully screened before being allowed to enter Iowa.
- 259 • Implement all, or aspects of, the [\*IDALS' General Standstill Protocol\*](#).
- 260 • Investigate imports into Iowa within the last 30 days that may pose a risk to Iowa  
261 livestock.
- 262 • Continue the surveillance program for FMD to determine any epidemiological links  
263 to premises in Iowa.
- 264 • Activate a Departmental Operations Center.
- 265 • Ready the premises identification database to facilitate the identification of premises  
266 that may be at-risk or infected.
- 267 • Communicate with veterinary and other professional associations, licensed and  
268 accredited veterinarians, livestock and trade associations, livestock producers, transit  
269 companies, and others concerning the elevated threat, and provide information on  
270 monitoring the health of susceptible animals, and implementing enhanced biosecurity.
- 271 • Re-evaluate the threat and take action to protect Iowa livestock. In addition to  
272 movement controls, actions may include epidemiological investigations, reminders of  
273 reporting requirements, and enhanced surveillance at livestock markets and slaughter  
274 facilities, among other activities.
- 275 • Confer with USDA to evaluate federal resources that may be available, if needed.
- 276 • Request HSEMD to notify appropriate personnel from supporting local and state  
277 agencies.
- 278 • Reassign and/or pre-position IDALS staff members to locations of anticipated need,  
279 such as to the Departmental Operations Center (DOC), the State EOC, the Joint  
280 Information Center (JIC), or an existing Incident Command Post.
- 281 • Coordinate with HSEMD to anticipate needed resources and purchasing procedures to

282 support a response to a potential outbreak.

283 • Request specific agencies provide support for response activities, which may include  
284 implementing a call center to respond to questions from veterinarians, producers,  
285 allied businesses, and the public, instituting Just-In-Time Training for response tasks,  
286 providing outreach to a variety of audiences to keep them aware of the threat and  
287 mitigation measures, and requesting supporting agencies send representatives to the  
288 JIC to develop and distribute messages to appropriate stakeholders.

289 • Notify all producers, processors, and transit companies about the changes to Iowa’s  
290 import and movement criteria, and provide information about the permitting system  
291 and requirements.

292 • Continue to monitor all states.

293 • Closely monitor any epidemiologically linked premises to determine what, if any,  
294 additional actions need to occur on that premises to stop the outbreak. This would  
295 designate a transition from the Continental to In-State classification.

296 **iii. In-State: Confirmation of FMD in Iowa or Epidemiologic link of Iowa herd/flock to**  
297 **infected herd/flock**

298  
299 In the event of confirmation of FMD in Iowa or the epidemiologic link of an Iowa herd/flock  
300 to an infected herd/flock, IDALS is the lead agency for the emergency response to eradicate  
301 the disease and initiate recovery. In addition to the activities and considerations listed for the  
302 Continental and Domestic classifications, if FMD is suspected or detected in Iowa IDALS  
303 may:

304  
305 • Receive notification of an epidemiological contact from an Infected Premises, or may  
306 be notified of suspicious clinical signs in a susceptible animal in Iowa.

307 • Conduct epidemiological investigations (with or without the assistance of the USDA)  
308 to identify Infected Premises and Contact Premises.

309 • Collaborate with USDA to dispatch a state or federal Foreign Animal Disease  
310 Diagnostician (FADD) to conduct an investigation and collect diagnostic samples for  
311 laboratory submission. Divided samples will be provided to the Iowa State University  
312 Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory in Ames and sent to the designated Foreign Animal  
313 Disease Diagnostic Laboratory (FADDL) for confirmation and virus isolation. An  
314 FADD investigation is conducted according to [VS Guidance Document 12001.2 -](#)  
315 [Policy for the Investigation of Potential Foreign Animal Disease/Emerging Disease](#)  
316 [Incidents \(FAD/EDI\).](#)

317 • Collaborate with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Federal  
318 Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to determine if FMD was intentionally introduced into  
319 Iowa.



- 320 • Initiate containment activities on the Infected (or Suspect) Premises. Initially, in most  
321 cases this will include quarantine, setting up premises biocontainment, and a review  
322 of producer records to trace recent animal movements into and out of the herd/flock  
323 (*see Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection ii. Quarantine*).
- 324 • Request FMD vaccinations from the USDA Veterinary National Stock Pile and  
325 implement a the *Iowa FMD Vaccination Plan* (*see Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection*  
326 *vii. Vaccination*).
- 327 • Form a Unified Command with USDA to exercise state and federal authority to  
328 protect animal health. Initially, local USDA representatives will participate. Positions  
329 may rotate to other USDA representatives over time and as more assistance is  
330 requested.
- 331 • Assign personnel to Incident Command System positions to manage the emergency  
332 response activities with the help of supporting agencies.
- 333 • Prompted by a positive laboratory result confirming FMD, establish a Control Area  
334 around the Infected Premises, and institute movement controls (*see Appendix 3:*  
335 *Mitigation, subsection ii. Quarantine and subsection iii. Permitting*), as well as  
336 epidemiological tracing (*see Appendix 2: Epidemiological Investigation and*  
337 *Surveillance*).
- 338 • Through HSEMD, request supporting agency representatives to report to the SEOC  
339 with knowledge of available capabilities and resources.
- 340 • Continue disease surveillance to detect other Infected Premises or potential spread of  
341 FMD.
- 342 • Communicate through HSEMD with state agencies and local emergency managers  
343 and officials of the affected areas to determine local resource needs and availability.
- 344 • Based on a stamping-out strategy dependent on the size of the herd/flock, implement  
345 a depopulation plan with greatest probability of depopulating the herd/flock in a  
346 timely manner (*see Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection v. Mass Depopulation*).
- 347 • Collaborate with Iowa's Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to approve the  
348 animal owner's disposal plan for carcasses and other associated materials (*see*  
349 *Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection vi. Carcass Disposal*).
- 350 • Require biocontainment protocols to prevent spread of FMD from Infected Premises  
351 (*see Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection iv. Biocontainment*).
- 352 • If not already instituted, implement a system of permitted movement to approve and  
353 document movements into, within, and out of the Control Area (*see Appendix 3:*  
354 *Mitigation, subsection iii. Permitting*).

- 355
- 356
- 357
- Develop protocols for cleaning and disinfection to decontaminate buildings, areas and articles on the premises after infected animals have been removed. Protocols will be guided by [FAD PReP Guidelines: Cleaning and Disinfection](#).
- 358
- 359
- 360
- Decide the method of releasing a Control Area and restrictions imposed on movements into, out of, and within the Control Area. The Control Area may be released as a whole or in parts to gradually reduce the size. Considerations include:
    - Premises due to be released do not appear to pose a risk for further spread of FMD;
    - Results of epidemiological surveillance and confirmed/suspected cases in the vicinity;
    - Disease status of other neighboring premises;
    - Progress of the eradication effort and current response approach; and/or
    - Reasonable confidence that the non-infected premises due to be released will not be vulnerable to re-exposure (*see Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection iii. Permitting*).
- 361
- 362
- 363
- 364
- 365
- 366
- 367
- 368
- 369
- 370
- 371
- Recommend slaughter or euthanasia of any exposed or recovered animals due to the chance that some may become long-term carriers [16].
- 372
- 373
- 374
- 375
- 376
- Allow repopulation once infected/contagious animals have been removed and the environment of a premises is no longer a risk to spread FMD (through cleaning and disinfection or a fallow period - *see Appendix 3: Mitigation, subsection vi. Cleaning and Disinfection*). Conditions for repopulation may change if the response strategy transitions from stamping-out.
- 377
- 378
- Continue disease surveillance to detect new infections, and also to collect data to prove FMD freedom if possible.
- 379
- 380
- Initiate regular briefings for the media and for information release to the general public through the JIC.
- 381

## Appendix 1: Standstill Order

During an FMD outbreak IDALS may implement aspects of the [\*IDALS' General Standstill Protocol\*](#). While the order is in effect, no unpermitted movements of animals susceptible to FMD would be allowed within the state. Exceptions may be made, depending on the epidemiology of the outbreak, for critical movements (i.e. slaughter, etc.) at the discretion of IDALS.

## Appendix 2: Epidemiological Investigation and Surveillance

During an FMD outbreak the following premises definitions will be used:

- **Infected Premises (IP):** any premises with laboratory confirmed FMD
- **Contact Premises (CP):** any premises with an established epidemiological link to a IP in the previous 30 days at a minimum

The following are IDALS' initial goals of an FMD epidemiological investigation conducted in Iowa:

- identify each potential IP through tracing activities, assign a premises classification and investigation priority;
- identify any CP (this includes all potential CP within a production system where sites may be separated by large geographic distances); and
- characterize the nature of the FMD outbreak, identifying any potential lateral transmission pathways and mitigation strategies.

Identifying potential CP within the same production system may include, but is not limited to, IDALS auditing the following aspects of movement onto and off a premises:

- live animal movement logs,
- animal product movement logs,
- feed delivery logs,
- personnel logs,
- visitor logs (both domestic and international),
- list of equipment shared between premises,
- animal disposal logs (i.e. rendering, etc.), and
- supply delivery logs (i.e. fuel delivery, etc.)

In addition to active investigations, the need for statewide FMD surveillance may become necessary. This will take two forms: 1) passive surveillance and 2) active surveillance.

423 **Passive surveillance** will occur from veterinarian and producer reporting of  
 424 suspicious clinical signs and mortalities noted in susceptible animals. IDALS will  
 425 widely communicate that anyone suspecting a possible FMD introduction into  
 426 Iowa reports it immediately to IDALS and/or the USDA. At which time either an  
 427 IDALS or USDA FADD will be dispatched to the premises to conduct an  
 428 investigation.

429  
 430 **Active surveillance** will occur through screening diagnostic samples that are  
 431 collected on a regular basis. This would include any samples from susceptible  
 432 animals submitted to the Iowa Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, for any purpose,  
 433 as well as samples retained at the Laboratory from the previous 60 days. Samples  
 434 may be screened with the following diagnostic tests:  
 435

Test	Sample Types
RT-PCR (Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction)*	Tissue (tonsil, spleen or lymph node)
ABC CSF Staining (Avidin-Biotin Complex Classical Swine Fever)	Tissue (tonsils preferred)
ELISA (Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay)**	Serum (10mL Red top tube)
Immunoperoxidase**,+	Serum (10mL Red top tube)
Virus Isolation	Tissue (tonsil, spleen or lymph node)
Virus Neutralization** ++	Serum (10mL Red top tube)
Nested PCR***	Tissue (tonsil, spleen or lymph node)

436 *\*RT-PCR will be used in suspect cases because of the rapid turn-around time and the lag*  
 437 *in time before the pigs will produce antibody.*

438 *\*\*Screening tests used for OIE screening for international trade.*

439 *\*\*\*Only to be used after a positive rRT-PCR reaction*

440 *+ Used after an inconclusive ELISA test*

441 *++ Used after an inconclusive Immunoperoxidase test*

442  
 443 At the onset of the surveillance program any sample that screens positive would  
 444 be sent to a designated National Veterinary Service Laboratory (NVSL) [Foreign](#)  
 445 [Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory \(FADDL\)](#) for confirmatory testing. This  
 446 would continue until testing became decentralized and more widely available at  
 447 other laboratories.

448  
 449 Depending on the capacity/capabilities of the Iowa State University Veterinary  
 450 Diagnostic Laboratory in Ames and other reference laboratories, oral fluid testing  
 451 in swine may also be incorporated into a statewide FMD surveillance program  
 452 [17].  
 453

454 Any sample that tests and is then confirmed positive, regardless of the sample  
455 type, would prompt an epidemiologic investigation to determine where the  
456 infected animal originated and where it could have potentially exposed other  
457 susceptible animals.  
458

## 459 **Appendix 3: Mitigation**

### 460 **i. Quarantine**

461 Any premises with confirmed FMD or that is epidemiologically linked to a confirmed  
462 FMD case will be placed under a quarantine as established in the [IDALS's General  
463 Quarantine Protocol](#). If a premises is part of a large production system, the entire system  
464 may or may not be temporarily placed under a quarantine while the epidemiologic  
465 investigation of that system is ongoing.  
466

### 467 **ii. Control Area**

468 During an FMD outbreak a Control Area will be established to contain the infection,  
469 target stamping-out activities, and control animal movements. The function and minimum  
470 size of the Control Area is explained in the [IDALS General Control and Monitoring  
471 Zones Protocol](#). However, during an FMD outbreak IDALS may expand the outer  
472 boundaries of the Control Area or include multiple premises within one production  
473 system in the Control Area based on the epidemiology or scale of the outbreak.  
474

### 475 **iii. Permitting**

476 Premises inside the Control Area may be allowed permitted movements based on  
477 protocols established in the [IDALS General Animal Permitting Protocol](#). Any premises of  
478 a large production system with an epidemiological link to one of their premises in the  
479 Control Area may be designated a CP.  
480

### 481 **iv. Mass Depopulation**

482 To maximize biocontainment procedures and reduce the overall viral burden of an  
483 infected premises the goal is to have all infected and exposed premises depopulated as  
484 soon as possible, preferably within 24 hours, after the confirmed diagnosis [18]. The size  
485 and strength of the animals, necessary restraint, as well as the safety and expertise of  
486 available responders may factor into IDALS' selection of appropriate depopulation  
487 methods. IDALS may consider various methods during an FMD outbreak and the method  
488 chosen may depend on resource availability, premises and herd/flock size, and worker  
489 safety concerns. However, regardless of the method chosen, if a producer wishes to seek  
490 indemnity for depopulated animals, USDA APHIS must preapprove the method. Any  
491 animal that dies prior to depopulation will not qualify for indemnity.  
492

493  
494 The following is a list of some depopulation methods in alphabetical order IDALS may  
495 chose during an FMD outbreak:

- 496 ○ Carbon dioxide and other gasses,
- 497 ○ Firearms,
- 498 ○ Injectable euthanasia,
- 499

- 500 ○ Penetrating captive bolt, and
- 501 ○ Ventilation shutdown.

502

503 Potential depopulation methods:

- 504 • *Carbon Dioxide and Other Gasses:* Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) has been used
- 505 commercially in harvesting poultry and swine to stun the animal prior to
- 506 exsanguination. Asphyxiates such as carbon dioxide, nitrogen, argon, and carbon
- 507 monoxide exclude oxygen. An animal exposed to an atmosphere which is
- 508 completely devoid of oxygen will lose consciousness very rapidly. Some farms
- 509 use carbon dioxide as their primary method of euthanasia for suckling or nursery
- 510 pigs (up to 70 lb [154 kg]). The AVMA has categorized the use of CO<sub>2</sub> as a
- 511 “preferred method” for the depopulation of swine and small ruminants under 2
- 512 months of age. It is not listed for cattle of any age or small ruminants over 2
- 513 months of age under any circumstance [19].

514

515 Personnel involved in the procedure must be trained. Safety procedures along

516 with appropriate safety equipment must be utilized according to guidelines

517 reviewed or established by the Safety Officer.

518

- 519 • *Firearms:* When firearms (gunshot) is the method of choice, it is important that
- 520 firearm handlers use a caliber of firearm, projectile, and propellant load that are
- 521 appropriate for the species being euthanized, the location of the procedure, and
- 522 the overall situation. The shooter should comply with all guidelines established by
- 523 the Safety Officer such as the use of protective head and eye gear. The AVMA
- 524 has categorized the use of firearms as a “preferred method” for depopulation of
- 525 swine (other than suckling pigs) and cattle. It is not recommend for confined or
- 526 restrained small ruminants at a distance of over 3 feet [19]. For large herds/flocks
- 527 this may take a substantial amount of time and labor to complete.

528

529 For reference purposes in choosing a suitable firearm for euthanasia of livestock,

530 [FAD PReP/NAHEMS Guidelines: Mass Depopulation and Euthanasia](#) provides

531 the weight of the projectile, muzzle velocity, and muzzle energy available with

532 various cartridges that are in common use. This document also describes the

533 proper use, target area, and safety considerations in the use of firearms for

534 euthanasia.

535

- 536 • *Injectable euthanasia:* The use of chemical methods to euthanize livestock during
- 537 an animal health crisis may not be practical because of the residue potential if
- 538 carcasses must be rendered, composted, or buried. Chemical adjunct measures
- 539 include injection of lethal amounts of products such as chloral hydrate, chloral
- 540 hydrate and magnesium sulfate, or various alkaloid poisons. Potassium chloride
- 541 (KCl) which is not controlled and is readily available will produce cardiac arrest
- 542 when bolused by the intravenous or intracardiac route. The dose of KCl required
- 543 is 7.2gm/100Kg of body weight. The animal should be rendered insensible before
- 544 KCl is administered. Any product to be used as a lethal adjunct measure should be
- 545 one with specific published clinical properties.

546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591

The AVMA has categorized the use of injectable euthanasia as a “preferred method” for depopulation of swine, cattle, and small ruminants [19]

- *Penetrating Captive Bolt*: Euthanasia by penetrating captive bolt is appropriate for most hoofstock. This method targets the cerebral region and the brainstem. In the hands of trained and experienced personnel, this method produces rapid and humane death and is especially useful in field situations to euthanize numerous animals and/or avoid carcass residues associated with some chemical methods.

Penetrating captive bolt devices are placed in contact with the skull to deliver a lethal blow to the animal through direct trauma to the brain. The use of an extended length penetrating captive bolt is usually fatal when properly conducted. Personnel must be prepared to administer an adjunct measure such as pithing or IV KCL administration to ensure rapid death if the use of the penetrating captive bolt fails to result in death. The AVMA has categorized the use of penetrating captive bolt guns as a “preferred method” for depopulation of all swine, cattle, and small ruminants [19].

Refer to [FAD PRoP/NAHEMS Guidelines: Mass Depopulation and Euthanasia](#) for the proper use, target area, and safety considerations in the use of penetrative captive bolt for euthanasia.

Non-penetrating captive bolts are intended to deliver concussive trauma to render an animal unconscious, and have not been specifically designed to result in death. They should be used with an adjunct measure to ensure death. The AVMA has categorized the use of non-penetrating captive bolt guns as a “preferred method” for depopulation of all swine [19].

- *Ventilation Shutdown (VSD)*: While AVMA preferred methods will first be considered in an FMD response, VSD may be considered if these methods will not achieve depopulation of infected herds (based on the presumptive positive result) within a timely manner or be accomplished in a way that assures human safety. VSD is an adjunct method that may be considered by IDALS for depopulation of infected swine based on the defined policy and considered on a premises-by-premises basis. However, VSD should be used only after a full consideration of the epidemiologic threat posed concludes that no other method can be completed in a timely manner to minimize the chance of the virus spreading. Timely implementation would significantly reduce virus amplification and the risk of ongoing transmission while also protecting nearby and epidemiologically linked production facilities [20]. However, depending on weather conditions and facility design, VSD may require supplement heating for buildings during colder seasons and/or an added source of CO<sub>2</sub> gas. The AVMA has categorized the use of VSD as “permitted in constrained circumstances” for depopulation of all swine. VSD is not listed for cattle or small ruminants under any circumstance [19].

592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631

## v. Carcass Disposal

In most cases during an FMD outbreak IDALS will require on-site disposal of animal carcasses and other associated materials. On-site disposal eliminates the need to move carcasses great distances and eliminates potentially moving live virus off the premises. During an FMD outbreak in most cases IDALS will require the animal owner to utilize one of the following on-site disposal methods:

- above ground burial,
- incineration,
- composting, or
- natural in-place decomposition for swine.

Explanations on disposing of carcasses using burial, incineration, composting, and incineration can be found in the [NAHEMS Guidelines: Disposal](#) and [Iowa DNR Mass Animal Mortality Plan](#).

If IDALS elects to go with natural in-place decomposition several factors need to be considered. The first is the amount of time it will take for the carcasses to reach a point where they are easier to move. With pig carcasses indoors and not exposed to the elements, decay rates will be slowed [21] [22]. In addition, pigs weighing more than 50 lbs may take 3 times as long to decompose as pigs weighing less [23] [24]. This would require more time for facilities housing pigs larger than nursery piglets, with gestation barns potentially taking the longest to reach the ideal decomposition phase. While no studies have been performed on the rate of natural carcass decay inside a swine facility it has been shown that on average swine carcasses left outdoors during the spring, summer, and fall take approximately 2 weeks to reach skeletonization to a few months during the winter [25]. Therefore when ambient temperatures fall below 60°F it may become necessary to heat facilities to expedite the decomposition process. If facilities are kept at 60°F or higher, carcasses >50 lbs should reach skeletonization and be removed after approximately three weeks with carcasses <50 lbs taking approximately two weeks. At this stage, remains can be disposed of using another method.

The second is the potential occupational safety issues when entering a barn where natural in-place decomposition has occurred. When entering the barn to remove decomposed carcasses personnel should wear appropriate PPE including respirators.

Lastly proper insect control should be implemented to prevent flies and other insects as serving as mechanical vectors and carrying the virus to other premises.



632 **vi. Cleaning and Disinfection**

633 In general Cleaning and Disinfection (C&D) protocols for FMD should follow the basic  
634 principles outlined in the [IDALS's General Cleaning and Disinfection Protocol](#). The  
635 following are disinfectants currently approved for FMD [26]:  
636

- 637 • Aseptrol FC-TAB
- 638 • Aseptrol S10-TAB
- 639 • Lonza DC-101
- 640 • Maquat MQ615-AS
- 641 • Oxonia
- 642 • Virkon S
- 643 • Acetic acid
- 644 • Citric acid
- 645 • Sodium hypochlorite

646  
647 Additional information on these disinfectants can be found on the [USDA APHIS](#)  
648 [webpage](#).  
649

650 **vii. Vaccination**

651 **NOTE:** The *Iowa FMD Vaccination Plan* is currently under development between  
652 IDALS, USDA, and Iowa State University with funding made available through the 2018  
653 Farm Bill (Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018).  
654

655 While vaccines against FMD exist, there are seven known types and more than 60  
656 subtypes of the FMD virus and immunity to one type does not provide cross protection.  
657 Instead, vaccines must be closely matched to the viral strain circulating [2].  
658

659 FMD vaccine provides immunity for up to six months. Cattle, sheep, and goats require a  
660 single vaccine dose for full immunity, while swine require two doses two weeks apart.  
661 Animals would need to be re-vaccinated every six months for as long as vaccination is  
662 being used as a control measure [2].  
663

664 In the event of a FMD detection in Iowa, IDALS will work with USDA APHIS to  
665 vaccinate at risk animals and stop further spread. Vaccination Strategies include:  
666

- 667 • Vaccinate-to-kill: killing means any procedure which causes the death of an  
668 animal that does not enter the human food chain.
- 669 • Vaccinate-to-slaughter: slaughter means any procedure which causes the death of  
670 an animal by bleeding where the animal may enter the human food chain.
- 671 • Vaccinate-to-live: the animal is allowed to live out its useful life-span.  
672

673 FMD-free status will not be able to be established until the long-term control and  
674 eradication program is successful. FMD-free *with vaccination* status may be an  
675 intermediary step to FMD-freedom *without vaccination*.  
676

677 FMD-free status *with vaccination* can be attained 2 years after the last outbreak as long as  
678 there is no evidence of virus circulation within the past 12 months ([OIE TAHC Article](#)  
679 [8.8.3](#)). If vaccination is stopped, FMD-free status may be attained 12 months after the last  
680 evidence of FMD infection and the last FMD vaccine was administered ([OIE TAHC](#)  
681 [Article 8.8.2](#)).

682  
683 If the FMD-free status *with vaccination* can be attained, it is expected few countries will  
684 resume trade with the U.S. as long as they can access sources of animal protein from  
685 countries that are FMD-free without vaccination.

686  
687 If FMD-free status *without vaccination* can be attained as recognized by OIE, it is  
688 expected to take much longer for the U.S. trading partners to recognize the status and  
689 resume trade.  
690  
691

DRAFT

# References

- [1] A. R. Spickler, "Foot and Mouth Disease: Technical Factsheet," 2015. [Online]. Available: [http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/Factsheets/pdfs/foot\\_and\\_mouth\\_disease.pdf](http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/Factsheets/pdfs/foot_and_mouth_disease.pdf). [Accessed 25 February 2020].
- [2] USDA APHIS, "Foot and Mouth Disease and Vaccine Use," May 2018. [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/animal\\_health/fs-fmd-vaccine-use.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/animal_health/fs-fmd-vaccine-use.pdf). [Accessed 25 February 2020].
- [3] U.S. Government Accountability Office, "Foot-and-Mouth Disease: USDA's Efforts to Prepare for a Potential Outbreak Could be Strengthened," U.S. government, Washington, D.C., 2019.
- [4] M. Moniwa, C. Embury-Hyatt, Z. Zhang, K. Hole, A. Clavijo, J. Copps and S. Alexandersen, "Experimental foot-and-mouth disease virus infection in white tailed deer," *Journal of comparative pathology*, vol. 147, no. 2-3, pp. 330-342, 2012.
- [5] J. W. McVicar, P. Suttmoller, D. H. Ferris and C. H. Campbell, "Foot-and-mouth disease in white-tailed deer: clinical signs and transmission in the laboratory.," *Proceedings, Annual Meeting of the United States Animal Health Association*, vol. 78, p. 169, 1974.
- [6] USDA: APHIS, "Feral Swine Populations 2017 by County," 2 February 2018. [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife\\_damage/feral\\_swine/images/2017-feral-swine-distribution-map-county.jpg](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife_damage/feral_swine/images/2017-feral-swine-distribution-map-county.jpg). [Accessed 30 November 2018].
- [7] CDC, "Hand, Foot, and Mouth Disease (HFMD)," 6 December 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/hand-foot-mouth/index.html>. [Accessed 27 February 2020].
- [8] Center for Food Security and Public Health (CFSPH), "NAHEMS Guidelines: Biosecurity," June 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/pdf/fad-prep-nahems-guidelines-biosecurity>.
- [9] Secure Pork Supply (SPS), "Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Pork Production Biosecurity: Animals Raised Indoors," 2017 August. [Online]. Available: [http://www.securepork.org/Resources/SPS\\_Biosecurity\\_Self-Assessment\\_Checklist\\_-\\_IndoorProduction.pdf](http://www.securepork.org/Resources/SPS_Biosecurity_Self-Assessment_Checklist_-_IndoorProduction.pdf).
- [10] USDA: APHIS Veterinary Services, "Biosecurity Checklist for Pigs with Outdoor Access," December 2017. [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/animal\\_health/biosecurity-for-pigs-outdoor-access-checklist.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/animal_health/biosecurity-for-pigs-outdoor-access-checklist.pdf).
- [11] Secure Pork Supply (SPS), "Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Pork Production Biosecurity: Animals with Outdoor Access," September 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://www.securepork.org/Resources/SPS-Biosecurity-Checklist-for-Animals-with-Outdoor-Access.pdf>.
- [12] Secure Beef Supply (SBS), "Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for FMD Prevention: Beef Feedlots," [Online]. Available: [http://securebeef.org/Assets/SBS\\_Self-Assessment-Checklist-for-Enhanced-Biosecurity-FMD-Feedlots.pdf](http://securebeef.org/Assets/SBS_Self-Assessment-Checklist-for-Enhanced-Biosecurity-FMD-Feedlots.pdf).
- [13] Secure Beef Supply (SBS), "Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for FMD Prevention: Cattle on Pasture," [Online]. Available: [http://securebeef.org/Assets/SBS\\_Self-Assessment-Checklist-for-Enhanced-Biosecurity-FMD-Pasture.pdf](http://securebeef.org/Assets/SBS_Self-Assessment-Checklist-for-Enhanced-Biosecurity-FMD-Pasture.pdf).
- [14] Secure Milk Supply (SMS), "Self-Assessment Checklist for Enhanced Biosecurity for FMD Prevention: Dairy," [Online]. Available: [http://securemilksupply.org/Assets/SMS\\_Enhanced-Biosecurity-Self-Assessment-Checklist.pdf](http://securemilksupply.org/Assets/SMS_Enhanced-Biosecurity-Self-Assessment-Checklist.pdf).
- [15] J. Rodriguez-Torres, "International approach to eradication and surveillance for foot-and-mouth disease in the Americas," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 916, no. 1, pp. 194-198, 2000.
- [16] J. Arzt, G. J. Belsham, L. Lohse, A. Bøtner and C. Stenfeldt, "Transmission of foot-and-mouth disease from persistently infected carrier cattle to naive cattle via transfer of oropharyngeal fluid," *Mosphere*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. e00365-18, 2018.
- [17] O. Beemer, M. Remmenga, L. Gustafson, K. Johnson, D. Hsi and M. C. Antognoli, "Assessing the value of PCR assays in oral fluid samples for detecting African swine fever, classical swine fever, and foot-and-mouth disease in US swine," *PLoS one*, vol. 14, no. 7, 2019.

- [18] USDA: AHPIS, "Foot-and-Mouth Disease Response Plan: The Red Book," September 2014. [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal\\_health/emergency\\_management/downloads/fmd\\_responseplan.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/fmd_responseplan.pdf). [Accessed 26 February 2020].
- [19] American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), "AVMA Guidelines for the Depopulation of Animals: 2019 Edition," AVMA, Schaumburg, 2019.
- [20] USDA, "HPAI Outbreak 2014-2015: Ventilation Shutdown Evidence and Policy," 18 September 2015. [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal\\_health/emergency\\_management/downloads/hpai/ventilationshutdownpolicy.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/hpai/ventilationshutdownpolicy.pdf). [Accessed 12 December 2018].
- [21] B. S. Shean, L. Messinger and a. M. Papworth., "Observations of differential decomposition on sun exposed v. shaded pig carrion in coastal Washington State," *Journal of Forensic Science*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 938-949, 1993.
- [22] G. S. Anderson, "Comparison of decomposition rates and faunal colonization of carrion in indoor and outdoor environments," *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 136-142, 2011.
- [23] A. Sutherland, J. Myburgh, M. Steyn and P. J. Becker, "The effect of body size on the rate of decomposition in a temperate region of South Africa," *Forensic science international*, vol. 231, no. 1-3, pp. 257-262, 2013.
- [24] S. Matuszewski, S. Konwerski, K. Frątczak and M. Szafałowicz, "Effect of body mass and clothing on decomposition of pig carcasses," *International journal of legal medicine*, vol. 128, no. 6, pp. 1039-1048, 2014.
- [25] J. Wang, Z. Li, Y. Chen, Q. Chen and X. Yin, "The succession and development of insects on pig carcasses and their significances in estimating PMI in south China," *Forensic Science International*, vol. 179, no. 1, pp. 11-18, 2008.
- [26] USDA APHIS, "Disinfectants Approved For Use Against African Swine Fever Virus," [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal\\_health/emergency\\_management/downloads/asf-virus-disinfectants.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/asf-virus-disinfectants.pdf). [Accessed 2019].
- [27] C. A. Mebus, C. House, F. R. Gonzalvo, J. M. Pineda, J. Tapiador and J. J. Pire, "Survival of foot-and-mouth disease, African swine fever, and hog cholera viruses in Spanish serrano cured hams and Iberian cured hams, shoulders and loins," *Food Microbiology*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 133-143, 1993.
- [28] Center for Food Security and Public Health, "NAHEMS Guidelines: Disposal," December 2012. [Online]. Available: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal\\_health/emergency\\_management/downloads/nahems\\_guidelines/disposal\\_nahems.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/nahems_guidelines/disposal_nahems.pdf). [Accessed 11 December 2018].
- [29] P. Chevillon, C. Mircovich, S. Dubroca and J. Fleho, "Comparison of different pig euthanasia methods available to farmers," *Proc Int Soc Anim Hyg*, pp. 45-46, 2004.