



# Washington

<http://www.doh.wa.gov/phepr>



## Washington Co-Sponsors Public Health Initiatives

Cross-border collaboration bolsters disease surveillance and response during an emergency.



The Washington State Department of Health co-sponsored the fourth annual Pacific Northwest Cross Border Workshop with the British Columbia Ministry of Health in May 2007. Partnerships among the border states have led to successful responses to incidents such as SARS and a *Salmonella* pet food outbreak. Over 200 public health and emergency management professionals represented the Canadian western provinces, the northwest United States, the Native American and First Nations tribes, and the two federal governments.

Expert presentations and group discussions were conducted on epidemiology, surveillance, public health laboratories, emergency management, communications, and public health law. The meeting also covered special topics in cross-border initiatives, tribal preparedness, pandemic influenza planning, and similarities and differences in planning between the United States and Canada.

Effective cross-border response in a public health emergency will require planned, coordinated activities by

multiple agencies. Barriers to effectiveness include lack of familiarity with the roles and identities of appropriate responders, lack of established lines of intra- and interagency communications and data sharing, lack of planning and agreements for sharing scarce resources, and failure to address legal or jurisdictional issues that may restrict international cooperation. The workshops have been successful in identifying areas in which cooperation can be strengthened as well as partners' ability to respond to both national and international public health emergencies.

**According to the Washington State Department of Health, the cooperative agreement is valuable because** state and local public health jurisdictions have been able to build critical programs and infrastructure to support preparedness and response activities. Funds have been used to hire staff in all program areas, purchase vital equipment and software, and support training, planning, and exercise efforts.

## Snapshot of Public Health Preparedness

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

## Disease Detection and Investigation

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

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

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

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



# Washington



## Public Health Laboratories

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

Detect & Report	Number of Washington laboratories in the Laboratory Response Network <sup>1</sup>	6
	Rapidly identified <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7 using advanced DNA “fingerprinting” techniques (PFGE): <sup>2</sup>	
	- Number of samples received (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	101
	- Percentage of test results submitted to CDC database (PulseNet) within 4 days	97%
	Rapidly identified <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> using advanced DNA “fingerprinting” techniques (PFGE): <sup>2</sup>	
	- Number of samples received (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	10
	- Percentage of test results submitted to CDC database (PulseNet) within 4 days	100%
	Had a laboratory information management system that could create, send, and receive messages <sup>3</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes
- System complied with CDC information technology standards (PHIN) <sup>3</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes	
Had a rapid method to send urgent messages to frontline laboratories that perform initial screening of clinical specimens <sup>3</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes	
Crosscutting	Conducted bioterrorism exercise that met CDC criteria <sup>4</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	No
	Conducted exercise to test chemical readiness that met CDC criteria <sup>4</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes

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

## Response

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

Control	Developed a public health response plan, including pandemic influenza response, crisis and emergency risk communication, and Strategic National Stockpile (SNS) <sup>1,2</sup>	Yes
	Washington SNS plan reviewed by CDC <sup>2</sup>	Yes
	- Score on CDC technical assistance review (1-100)	90
	Number of Washington cities in the Cities Readiness Initiative <sup>3</sup>	1
Crosscutting	Developed roles and responsibilities for a multi-jurisdictional response (ICS) with: <sup>1</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	
	- Hospitals	Yes
	- Local/regional emergency management agencies	Yes
	- Federal emergency management agencies	Yes
	Public health department staff participated in training to support cooperative agreement activities <sup>4</sup>	Yes
	Public health laboratories conducted training for first responders <sup>5</sup> (8/05 – 8/06)	Yes
	Activated public health emergency operations center as part of a drill, exercise, or real event* <sup>16</sup> (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	Yes
Conducted a drill or exercise for key response partners to test communications when power and land lines were unavailable <sup>16</sup> (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	No	
Improve	Finalized at least one after-action report with an improvement plan following an exercise or real event <sup>16</sup> (partial year, 9/06 – 2/07)	Yes

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

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

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