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Description of the Program:

- Response to and coordination of foodborne illness investigations, food recalls and tracebacks, including those identified by local, state and federal partners.
- Engaging and planning our response to food emergencies, which can include foodborne illness investigations, tracebacks of foods that may be implicated in a food borne illness or food contamination incident, recall of foods that may be implicated in a food borne illness or food contamination incident.
- Developing capacity of our federal, state, local and industry or private sector partners to respond in a timely manner to a food emergency.
- Analysis of past responses to food emergencies to develop and implement policies and procedures to increase the speed of response to those events.

Why it matters:

- To minimize the effects of a to a foodborne illness or food emergency event, a quick and effective response is required.
- When a foodborne illness or a food traceback or recall is initiated, the emergency response engages all levels of FDD staff, including field inspectors, regional supervisors, and Lansing office management and administrative support staff. The emergency response takes priority until the emergency is resolved. Speed and accuracy of response ensures the citizens of the state are protected from further illness or injury, which can mean inspection staff in the field are not able to complete regular inspection work. Increasing FDD’s capacity to respond to emergencies and maintain regular inspection frequencies will enable the division and FSPER to identify and develop strategies to protect the public.

### Key Stakeholders

- Michigan residents
- Michigan Grocers Association
- Michigan Restaurant Association
- Associated Food and Petroleum Dealers
- Michigan State University
- Michigan Association of Public Health
- MDCH Enteric and Respiratory Illness Epidemiology Unit, etc.

### Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Foodborne Illness Events reported</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of confirmed foodborne illness events</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of illnesses caused by Foodborne illness</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Recalls</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Traceback investigations conducted</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foodborne Illness and Emergency Response Program

Accomplishments:
- Provided capacity building training to local health department staff, MDARD Food Safety staff, the Food and Drug Administration and U.S. Department of Agriculture, FSIS Office of Investigative Enforcement and Audit staff, focused on multi-disciplinary and multi-jurisdictional response to food emergency events.
- Rapid Response Team (RRT) activation of a multidivisional Incident Management Team to investigate and respond to lasalocid contamination in animal feed with multistate and multijurisdictional implications.
- MDARD coordinated efforts with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Detroit District Office to use a Unified Command Structure to respond to severe flooding in Southeast Michigan the week of August 11, 2014. MDARD and FDA also conducted an after action debrief to address lessons learned and identify areas for improvement.
- Took leadership roles in FDA RRT Program by co-chairing the Capability Assessment Tool revision workgroup, and partnering with the MN Dept. of Ag. to conduct a survey of RRT states in preparation for the August Partnership for Food Protection 50-state meeting.
- Multi-jurisdictional Foodborne Outbreak Investigation training was developed and presented in five locations around the state to 171 personnel from local, state, and federal agencies.
- Food traceback, traceforward and recall training was developed and presented to 136 front line food regulatory officials from local and state agencies by a workgroup of MDARD senior inspectors and LHD staff targeting other field investigators and regulators.

Measuring Success:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>FY 2014*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Incidents/Activities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRT Activation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRT Response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRT Exercise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incident Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbreaks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalls</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Exercise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results of Activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Measures Implemented</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Advisory Issued</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall Audit Check Conducted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*first year of tracking these metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Foodborne Illness and Emergency Response Program measures and tracks information about the type of foodborne illnesses in Michigan and the resulting response and number of activities conducted.

Program Goal:
To limit the incidence and spread of foodborne illnesses and/or foodborne events which affect the citizens of Michigan.
Overview of Foodborne Illness Outbreak Results and Enforcement Actions

Under Michigan’s Public Health Code, PA 368 of 1978 (MCL 333.2433), LHDs are required to investigate the causes of disease. The Michigan Food Law of 2000, sec. 3129(2), requires LHDs to notify MDARD of foodborne illness outbreaks they are conducting. MDARD uses foodborne illness data to:

- Investigate emerging threats;
- Identify trends;
- Adjust risk-based controls to prevent future illnesses, and,
- Ensure accurate reports are reflected at the state and national level.

**Foodborne Illnesses**

Total # of incidents reported to MDARD ................................................................. 116 (1,236 illnesses)
Total # of incidents identified as confirmed or probable foodborne illness outbreaks ................................................................. 30 (768 illnesses)
Median number of illnesses reported per confirmed or probable foodborne outbreak ............................................................................. 5

Leading causative agents of foodborne outbreaks reported to MDARD in 2013 were:
- **Norovirus** ........................................................................................................... 3
- **Salmonella** species .......................................................................................... 4
- E. coli O157 ........................................................................................................... 1
- E. coli O26 ............................................................................................................. 1
- **Bacillus cereus** .................................................................................................. 1
- *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* .................................................................................... 1

Of the incidents reported to MDARD, 16 percent identified a causative agent.

**Recalls**

- Number of food recalls .................................................................................... 124
- Number of recall audit checks ........................................................................... 41
- Recall text/email alert subscribers .................................................................... 6,863

**Enforcement** (Food, Food Service and Dairy programs)

- Enforcement Letters (including warning, label and other enforcement letters) .................................................... 4
- Informal Hearings/Compliance Reviews ............................................................. 14
- Administrative Fines ......................................................................................... $41,530
- Prosecutions ...................................................................................................... 0
- Seizures ................................................................................................................ 739/235,619 lb
- Dollar Amount of Seized Product ................................................................... $3,151,014
- Re-inspections/Fees .......................................................................................... $9,198

- Administrative Action (office conference, informal hearing, formal hearing, civil fine, order) ........................................ 795
- Court Action (civil, criminal) ............................................................................. 446
- Total Permit Suspensions (Dairy) ..................................................................... 79
- Total Pounds of Suspected Contaminated Milk Disposal (Dairy) ...................... 1,409,089 lb