



Washington State  
Department of Agriculture

---

# Implementation of the National Animal Identification System in Washington:

Activities and Recommendations of the Cattle Advisory Committee

---

Final Report to the Washington State Legislature

*As Required by Chapter 150, Laws of 2006 (SHB 3033)*

September 2007

Valoria Loveland, Director

For more information or additional copies of this report, please contact:

Washington State Department of Agriculture  
Animal Services Division  
P.O. Box 42560  
Olympia, WA 98504-2560  
(360) 902-1987

This report is available on the WSDA Web site at: <http://agr.wa.gov>

AGR PUB 300-198 (N/9/07)

Inquiries regarding availability of this publication in alternate formats should be directed to the WSDA receptionist at (360) 902-1976 or Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 902-1996.

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Overview of the National Animal Identification System.....</b>	<b>4</b>
NAIS Components .....	4
Current Status of the Program in Washington .....	5
Issues Raised by Livestock Industry .....	6
USDA Changes in Response to Public Input.....	7
<b>Cattle Advisory Committee Activities.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Expenditures.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Study of Other States’ Implementation Plans.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Summary of Research Findings .....	10
Summary of Selected Questions and Responses .....	12
<b>Demonstration Projects .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Recommendations of the NAIS Cattle Advisory Committee .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Outstanding Issues and Challenges.....</b>	<b>22</b>
Next Steps .....	23
<b>Appendices:</b>	
A. Substitute House Bill 3033 (2006 session)	
B. NAIS Cattle Advisory Committee Membership	
C. Questions for Research on Other States’ Plans for Implementing NAIS for Cattle	
D. Research Report Summary: Implementation Plans of Other States	

## **Acknowledgements**

---

The Washington State Department of Agriculture wishes to express its appreciation for the work of the members of the NAIS Cattle Advisory Committee and their dedication to the successful implementation of National Animal Identification System in Washington State. The members donated countless hours and covered all their own travel expenses to achieve the committee's objectives.

## **Executive Summary**

---

This report summarizes the activities and recommendations of the National Animal Identification System (NAIS) Cattle Advisory Committee established by SHB 3033 (2006). The 20-member committee, representing various segments of the cattle industry, studied NAIS implementation plans of other states, selected demonstration projects to conduct in this state, and developed recommendations for implementing the NAIS for cattle in Washington State. A preliminary report was provided to the Legislature in January 2007. This final report includes updated recommendations and provides information on the six demonstration projects conducted as part of this effort.

Though implementation of a voluntary NAIS at the federal level has been delayed, the Cattle Advisory Committee feels it is important to move ahead on a voluntary program in Washington.

The advisory committee affirmed that a national animal identification system is necessary to assist state and federal animal health officials to track animals to contain animal disease. It also recognized that such a program could support producers in meeting export requirements. The committee made the following recommendations for implementation of NAIS for cattle in Washington.

- Start implementation of animal identification by incorporating it into the brand inspection process.
- Establish a separate state database for animal tracking and animal ID tag tracking.
- Provide a funding mechanism for animal ID that uses state and private funds, is transaction-based, and shares the cost across the industry.
- Only allow the landowner to register a premises (a location where animals live or commingle).
- Establish an “operation registration” for cattle businesses that raise cattle in Washington but do not own land in Washington and for those landowners who choose not to register their premises.
- Require individual animal identification at change of ownership.
- Allow group lot identification through the first term of ownership.

As a result of its discussions, the committee also voiced its support for establishing a Washington Certified Beef Program through which a producer could receive third-party certification that cattle were born and raised in Washington.

In evaluating the demonstration projects, the committee felt the projects were worthwhile and provided useful real-life experiences. Project partners were glad they participated and felt they learned a lot through the projects. Successfully using new animal identification technology took some trial and error. Most felt RFID tags had good readability and were not very difficult to install or read once a facility was set up right and people were trained. As a result of the projects, they feel they are more ready for adding animal ID technology into their operations.

The committee also identified issues that still need resolution and made recommendations on:

- Increasing producer buy-in and participation in a voluntary program.
- Addressing the uncertainties of what the USDA NAIS system will look like.
- Addressing concerns about unsatisfactory tag and reader technology performance, especially at points in commerce.

The committee recognizes that without marketplace incentives or a government mandate, interest in adopting new animal identification technologies will lag. The committee recommends that WSDA improve the usefulness and availability of current Animal Health and Livestock Brand Inspection program information for tracking group lot cattle movements.

## **Background**

---

The purpose of the National Animal Identification System (NAIS) is to help state and federal animal health officials manage animal disease outbreaks. The goal of the system is to be able to track everywhere an animal has been within 48 hours of discovery of the disease, and to identify other animals that may have been exposed.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) published a draft Strategic Plan in April 2005 that called for mandatory premises registration and animal identification for cattle by January 2008. In anticipation of a mandatory program, the state legislature, in early 2006, directed the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) to create an advisory committee to recommend how to implement such a program in Washington State.

The urgency of the committee's work changed as USDA revised the NAIS program and delayed its implementation in response to industry concerns about various aspects of the system. In April 2006, USDA announced new timelines and benchmarks with a goal of achieving full producer participation by 2009. USDA has since announced that NAIS will be a voluntary rather than a mandatory federal program, leaving the door open for states to choose whether or not to have mandatory animal identification.

Though implementation of NAIS at the federal level is delayed, WSDA and the Cattle Advisory Committee agree that it is important to move ahead on a voluntary program in Washington that would meet the needs of NAIS supporters and also address the needs of farmers who do not support the program.

In December 2005, WSDA submitted a report to the legislature that considered the role of the state's Livestock Identification system in meeting the proposed federal requirements for animal identification. That report concluded that the current Livestock Brand Inspection program, formerly known as the Livestock Identification program, may have a role in meeting those requirements and that integrating Animal Identification with the Livestock Brand Inspection program would enhance the ownership documentation required for cattle and horses by the Livestock Brand Inspection program.

The 2005 report stated WSDA's commitment to working with the livestock industry to ensure these programs are connected in the best way to protect animal health and livestock ownership. The report, which can be found on the WSDA Web site, did not specifically address implementing animal identification for cattle in Washington.

In Substitute House Bill 3033, the legislature directed three activities for the committee:

- Research how other states are implementing the NAIS for cattle.
- Evaluate demonstration projects conducted by WSDA.
- Recommend an implementation plan for the NAIS in Washington State for the cattle industry, including funding amounts and sources, with a report to be submitted by WSDA to the Legislature in December 2006.

The complete text of SHB 3033 is in Appendix A.

## **Overview of the National Animal Identification System**

---

In 2004, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) began implementing the National Animal Identification System (NAIS). The NAIS is a national program in collaboration with federal and state departments of agriculture, tribes and the agriculture industry. It is designed to identify and track livestock as they commingle and interact with livestock from other premises. The system is intended to allow state or federal animal health officials to trace diseased and potentially exposed animals, with the goal of containing the disease as quickly as possible. The long-term goal of the NAIS is to be able to trace animals exposed to disease within 48 hours.

Quick identification of infected animals means less exposure. It means disease issues can be isolated and dealt with quickly. It means less time and money spent on eradication work. The faster state and federal animal health officials can assure consumers and trading partners of the health of the U.S. herd during an outbreak, the less economic impact on everyone, from U.S. taxpayers to commercial and noncommercial producers, to customers and to federal and state regulators.

Species included in the NAIS are bovine (cattle, bison), swine, sheep, goats, equine (horses, mules, donkeys), poultry, camelids (llamas, alpacas) and ratites (emus, ostriches). Currently, WSDA's priorities are commercial cattle operations and poultry.

### **NAIS Components**

The national program has three components: (1) Premises Registration; (2) Animal Identification; and (3) Animal Tracking.

#### **Premises Registration**

Premises Registration is the foundation of the NAIS. It involves the registration and identification of premises -- locations where animals are housed, held or commingled. Every registered premise receives a Premises Identification Number (PIN), which is a seven digit alphanumeric identifier. The PIN stays permanently with the premises. Premises registration allows for rapid response during an animal disease outbreak because animal health officials can quickly locate animals and animal owners.

#### **Animal Identification**

Animal Identification involves identifying individual or groups of animals. Animals that travel through the production chain as a group, such as poultry, swine and branded cattle, can be identified as a group. The Group Identification Number (GIN) consists of the PIN and the date the group was formed. Individual animals are identified with an Animal Identification Number (AIN), a 15-digit numeric identifier that stays with the animal for life. Currently, species work groups at the national level are deciding which type of identification devices work best for each species. Not all identification devices work with all animals. The work groups are also recommending what types of movements be reported.



### **Animal Tracking**

Animal Tracking involves reporting the movements of identified animals or groups of identified animals from premises to premises. This allows for state and federal animal health officials to trace where infected animals have moved in order to locate other infected or exposed animals.

### **Current Status of the Program in Washington**

NAIS is a voluntary program at the federal level. Each state has the option to make the NAIS or any of its components voluntary or mandatory. NAIS is a voluntary program in Washington State. All information submitted to Washington State for the purpose of participating in a state or national animal identification system is exempt from public disclosure under RCW 42.56.380.

### **Premises Registration**

WSDA has been registering premises since January 2005. As of August 31, 2007, 1,305 premises, or about six percent of potential premises, have registered.

### **Animal Tracking**

WSDA is conducting voluntary Animal Tracking on animals imported from Canada. Tracking of domestic animals is now feasible, but is gaining speed slowly.

### **Outreach and Education**

WSDA is conducting outreach and education activities throughout the state.

### **Funding**

In 2004, the Washington State Legislature provided funding for a WSDA staff position to manage the implementation of the national program.

To date, WSDA has applied for and received the three federal grants for premises registration:

\$115,000 for January 2005 - January 2006

\$206,000 for August 2005 - August 2007

\$141,000 for September 2006 - December 2006

An application is pending for \$179,000 for 2007.

USDA will not fund an animal tracking database or a tag-tracking database. However, in 2006, WSDA received \$43,375 from the U.S. Congress to assist in establishing an animal tracking database.

WSDA received \$85,000 from the State Legislature to carry out SHB 3033.

**Issues Raised by Livestock Industry**

Since the initial proposal for developing an animal identification and tracking system was designed, a number of issues have been consistently raised by stakeholders. Following is a summary of the issues and resulting actions by USDA and WSDA.

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Cost	Who will pay for implementation costs such as identification devices, readers and databases?	USDA withdrew financial support for animal tracking and tag databases and equipment but provided a free premises registration database for states to use.
Confidentiality	How will private and business data be kept confidential?	USDA stated that animal tracking and animal tag data should be held by private and/or state organizations. In Washington, the state legislature amended the public disclosure statute in 2006 to exempt data submitted for NAIS from public disclosure.
Mandatory or Voluntary program	Will NAIS be voluntary or mandatory, and on what schedule?	USDA announced in November 2006 that NAIS will be voluntary at the national level and that it has no intention of making it mandatory in the future. The program is voluntary in Washington.
Fears, Lack of Trust in Government, Anti-NAIS movement	A myriad of fears including access to personal property, religious objections, rumors of penalties for non-compliance, loss of lifestyle, fear that signing up for the program will transfer rights from producers to the government, and that agri-business is trying to run small operations out of business.	WSDA has provided information to clarify the facts.  No one has to provide information to federal or state governments.

**USDA Changes in Response to Public Input**

The draft federal implementation plans took public input into account. The only rule that USDA published in the federal register is use of the NAIS numbering system for identification. The following chart shows examples of early USDA drafts and what was proposed as of November 2006. The USDA “requirements” are not yet finalized. As a result, many states are moving ahead to develop a program and support system that will meet the needs of the producers in their state.

<b>Early USDA drafts</b>	<b>November 2006 draft</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
NAIS will be mandatory.	NAIS is voluntary, unless individual states choose to make it mandatory.	Intense objections from many sectors.
Low-Frequency Radio Frequency Identification Devices (RFID) are required.	Minimum standard is a visual tag.	Reduce costs for small operations, 4-H and FFA animal owners.
All species must implement at the same time.	Priorities are commercial cattle operations and poultry.	International trade and avian influenza.
Data kept at the federal and state levels.	Premises data at the federal and state level. Identification numbers and animal movement tracking at the state or private level.	Protect data from public disclosure.
One large database for premises, one for tag numbers, and a third for animal tracking.	Many private and public databases, which will respond to inquiries through an “Animal Trace Processing System Portal,” operated by USDA.	Privacy concerns.

## **Cattle Advisory Committee Activities**

---

### ***Establishing the Advisory Committee***

As a first step in responding to the legislative directive, WSDA Director Valoria Loveland sent nomination forms to cattle industry representatives across the state. Twenty nomination forms were returned to the department. On June 12, 2006, Director Loveland appointed 20 committee members from different segments of the cattle industry, including beef producers, dairy producers, feeders, renderers, livestock transporters, sale yard representatives, elected officials and tribal representatives. Dr. Leonard Eldridge, State Veterinarian, was appointed by Director Loveland to chair the committee. See Appendix B for a complete list of the committee members.

### ***Advisory Committee Accomplishments and Activities***

The advisory committee held eight meetings and two subcommittee meetings. Here is a summary of the accomplishments at each meeting.

#### *July 7, 2006, Ellensburg*

- Orientation to NAIS.
- Approved Committee Charter.
- Approved questions for research on how other states are implementing NAIS for cattle.
- Approved criteria for demonstration projects.

#### *July 12, 2006, Moses Lake (Subcommittee Meeting)*

- Discussed possible demonstration projects.

#### *July 28, 2006, Conference Call*

- Approved demonstration projects proposed at Toppenish Livestock, Chehalis Livestock, and Everson Auction Market.
- Considered a project to demonstrate the integration of a brand inspection and animal identification, however, the cost and timeline were outside the limits of the demonstration projects and an alternative was to be sought.

#### *August 25, 2006, Ellensburg*

- Discussed demonstration projects and associated issues.
- Approved Agri Beef project.
- Selected Washington Cattlemen's Association to conduct research of other states.
- Approved setting aside \$30,000 for the WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection program demonstration project.

#### *September 29, 2006, Wenatchee*

- Received and discussed initial report on research in other states.
- Extensively discussed issues related to implementing NAIS for cattle in Washington..
- Recommended that Washington have its own database for official records.

*October 26-27, 2006, Moses Lake*

- Received and discussed second report on research in other states.
- Developed initial recommendations.

*January 16, 2007, Conference Call*

- Discussed presentation of committee’s preliminary report to legislative committee.
- Discussed extending authorization of the Cattle Advisory Committee until June 30, 2008.
- Discussed the preliminary report to the legislature.
- Received update on demonstration projects.

*January 19, 2007, Conference Call (Subcommittee Meeting)*

- Discussed possible database technology.

*February 22, 2007, Conference Call*

- Discussed current legislative activities.
- Approved second demonstration project for Everson Auction Market.

*April 26, 2007, Moses Lake*

- Discussed unresolved issues in regards to an animal identification program in Washington State.
- Received updates on demonstration projects.
- Reviewed and updated recommendations.

*August 22, 2007, Conference Call*

- Discussed the demonstration project reports and what was learned from the projects.
- Reviewed report recommendations in light of demonstration project results.

## **Expenditures**

---

WSDA received \$85,000 in FY07 to implement SHB 3033. The moneys were spent on the following activities.

<b>Research:</b> contract with Washington Cattlemen’s Association to research how other states are implementing NAIS for cattle	<b>\$9,900</b>
<b>Demonstration Projects</b>	<b>\$45,971</b>
Toppenish Livestock Commission	\$9,792
El Oro Cattle Feeders	\$1,606
Chehalis Livestock Market	\$123
Everson Auction Market	\$3,860
Everson Auction Market - Optibrand	\$9,863
WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection program	\$13,740
RFID Tags (for all projects)	\$5,385
RFID Reader Software	\$1,602
<b>WSDA costs:</b> Cattle Advisory Committee support; demonstration project work; and administrative costs	<b>\$29,129</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 85,000</b>

## **Study of Other States' Implementation Plans**

---

To accomplish the study of other states' plans, the advisory committee identified potential researchers. A competitive solicitation letter was sent to three potential researchers. Two research proposals were returned for consideration and the advisory committee unanimously chose the Washington Cattlemen's Association (WCA). Jack Field of the WCA interviewed multiple states and one Canadian province and asked them questions, developed by the advisory committee, about their implementation of the NAIS.

A brief summary of the research findings is included below. For a list of the questions developed by the committee, see Appendix C. For the detailed report with a complete list of the questions and responses, see Appendix D.

### **Summary of Research Findings**

Seventeen states and one Canadian province were contacted. Most provided information in response to all questions.

- |                   |             |                |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|
| ➤ Alberta, Canada | ➤ Michigan  | ➤ Oregon       |
| ➤ Arizona         | ➤ Minnesota | ➤ South Dakota |
| ➤ California      | ➤ Missouri  | ➤ Utah         |
| ➤ Colorado        | ➤ Montana   | ➤ Washington   |
| ➤ Idaho           | ➤ Nebraska  | ➤ Wisconsin    |
| ➤ Kansas          | ➤ Nevada    | ➤ Wyoming      |

### **Background Information**

The number of cattle in the responding states and province ranged from a low of 150,000 (Arizona) to a high of 6.65 million (Kansas). Washington State reported 1.12 million cattle. The average number was slightly over 2.5 million.

Twelve states and Alberta have some level of brand inspection with a wide range in the number of brand inspectors that did not appear to relate to the number of cattle. The lowest number of inspectors was four in Kansas, which reported the highest number (6.65 million) of cattle. The highest number of brand inspectors was 110 in South Dakota with 3.75 million cattle. Washington State is on the low end of number of inspectors (19) compared to the number of cattle (1.12 million).

All of the brand inspection programs are funded by fees. The animal health programs are generally funded by state general funds or a combination of state general funds and per-head taxes. Two states reported special grants.

### **Premises Registration**

Only two states (Michigan and Wisconsin) have mandatory Premises Registration. All others have voluntary Premises Registration.

Eleven states had 14,000 or less cattle premises registered, three states and Alberta registered 34,000 to 86,000 and one state, Michigan with mandatory registration, had 1,010,000 premises registered. The percent of premises registered in the voluntary states was less than 20% except for Alberta (30%), Nebraska (40%), and Utah (42%).

States have the option to modify the USDA definition of a premises. Eight states use the USDA definition; nine states and Alberta use a modified definition of a premises.

Six states and Alberta allow a Landowner to register a premises. Twelve states allow a Landowner or Producer to register.

### **Animal Identification**

Of the responders, Animal Identification is mandatory only in Alberta. Seven western brand states support Group Lot Identification. Most responders either intend to be a Tag Manager (7) or are still considering what role to take.

FFA and 4-H will participate in four states, have limited participation in four states and no participation in nine states. All responders replied that producers would pay for tracking devices and readers.

### **Implementation of NAIS**

Radio Frequency Identification is the method that all indicated they intend to use to implement the NAIS for cattle. Eleven states will also use brands (Group ID) to track events. Accuracy and accountability is acceptable at 90-95 % levels for most, with a low of 75% or “sufficient to trace.” All responders said that they had a help line or place producers can call to get questions answered.

The following table summarizes responses to selected questions.

**Summary of Selected Questions and Responses**

	<b>Alberta</b>	<b>Arizona</b>	<b>California</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	<b>Idaho</b>	<b>Kansas</b>	<b>Michigan</b>	<b>Minn.</b>	<b>Missouri</b>
Premises registration voluntary or mandatory	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	mandatory	voluntary	voluntary
Number of cattle premises registered	34,000	6,000	86,000	14,000		4,300	1,010,000	11,200	6,500
Percentage of cattle premises registered	30	10	10	10 to 20	20	9	90 to 100	19	10
Use the USDA definition of a premises	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes
Use a different definition of a premises	x		x			x	x	x	
Multiple premises numbers if multiple pieces of land	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no
Reg.premises - Land Owner (LO), Producer (P), Lessee (L)	LO	LO	LO/P	LO	LO/P	LO/P	LO	LO	LO/P
Confidentiality covered by state law	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Is Animal ID voluntary or mandatory?	mandatory	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary
Support Group Lot ID?	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no
Tag Manager (TM), Distributor (TD), or Installer (TI)	TM	no	TM	TM	no	no	no	no	no
Special exceptions for small operations or USDA exemption	no	no	USDA	USDA	USDA	USDA	no	USDA	USDA
Will 4-H and FFA participate?			yes	limited	not yet	yes			yes
Who will pay for tracking devices and readers?	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers
Method that works best for commerce	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID
Tracking events required	Brand	Brand	USDA	Brand	Brand	USDA	USDA	USDA	USDA
What level of accuracy and accountability is acceptable?	100%	99%	sufficient to trace	100%	85%	92-95%	100%		
Help line or place to call to get questions answered	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number of cattle	5.9 M	150,000	5.4M	1.2 M	1.45 M	6.65 M	1.04 M	2.35 M	4.55 M
Some level of brand inspection?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no
Number of brand inspectors	25	15	60	60	41.8	4-6	NA	NA	NA
How is brand program funded	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	NA	NA	NA
How is Animal health program funded		state \$	general fund	State \$/ grants	general fund	general fund	Dept budget		



*Implementation of the National Animal Identification System in Washington:  
Activities and Recommendations of the Cattle Advisory Committee ~ September 2007*

	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	Oregon	South Dakota	Utah	Wash.	Wisc.	Wyoming
Premises registration voluntary or mandatory	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	mandatory	voluntary
Number of cattle premises registered	1,300	13,000			4,500	7,983	1,288	51,600	600
Percentage of cattle premises registered	4	40	10%	10-12%		42	5 to 9		
Use the USDA definition of a premises	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no
Use a modified definition of a premises	x		x		x			x	x
Require Multiple premises numbers if multiple pieces of land	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Reg. Premises – Land Owner (LO), Producer (P), Lessee (L)	LO	LO/P	LO/P	LO/P	LO/P	LO/P	LO/P	LO/P	LO/P
Confidentiality covered by state law	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Is Animal ID voluntary or mandatory	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary	voluntary
Support Group Lot ID	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes
Tag Manager (TM), Tag Distributor (TD), Tag Installer (TI)	TM	TM	TM	no	Under discussion	TM		no	no
Exceptions for Small Operations or USDA exemption	USDA	USDA	no	no	no	USDA	USDA	USDA	USDA
Will 4-H and FFA participate	not yet	yes	limited	limited	not yet	not yet		limited	not yet
Who will pay for tracking devices and readers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers	producers
Commerce methods- implement NAIS	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID	RFID		RFID	RFID
Tracking events required	Brand	Brand	Brand	Brand	Brand	Brand	Brand	USDA	Brand
What level of accuracy and accountability is acceptable	75-80%	upper 90%	100%	upper 90%	85%			90%-100%	85%
Help line or place to call to get questions answered	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number of cattle	1.6 M	1.8 M	500,000	750,000	3.75 M		1.12 M	3.4 M	1 M
Some level of brand inspection	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Number of brand inspectors	65	100	80-100	70	110		19		
How is your brand program funded	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven	fee driven
Animal health program funded how	mixture	general fund/fed \$	general fund/head tax	55% GF, 45% fees	general fund				general fund

## **Demonstration Projects**

---

SHB 3033 directed the Cattle Advisory Committee to evaluate demonstration projects that the department was to conduct at two or more facilities that handle large numbers of cattle. The committee approved the criteria for demonstration projects at its first meeting and, over the course of the year, approved proposals for a total of six demonstration projects. WSDA entered into agreements for demonstration projects to be conducted by the Everson Livestock Auction, Chehalis Livestock Market, Toppenish Livestock Commission, and Agri Beef's El Oro Cattle Feeders. The WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection Program also carried out a demonstration project. Participation in the demonstration projects was completely voluntary.

These demonstration projects were designed to evaluate the use of RFID tags to identify cattle moving through commerce. Project participants were to place RFID tags on dairy and beef cattle, report RFID Animal Identification numbers to WSDA, and trace the animals as far as possible through the commercial chain during the project period. WSDA provided RFID tags to the projects and reimbursed other approved expenses and equipment purchases at 60 percent of cost.

In evaluating the demonstration projects, the committee felt the projects were worthwhile and provided useful real-life experiences. Project partners were glad they participated and felt they learned a lot through the projects. Successfully using new animal identification technology took some trial and error. Most felt RFID tags had good readability and were not very difficult to install or read once a facility was set up right and people were trained. As a result of the projects, they feel they are more ready for adding animal ID technology into their operations.

### **Summary of Demonstration Projects**

Included in this report are short summaries of each of the six projects. More information on each project is available from WSDA.

#### ***Toppenish Livestock Commission***

The purpose of the project conducted with the Toppenish Livestock Commission (Toppenish) was to incorporate the identifying and reading of RFID tagged cattle into its regular sale day operations. Toppenish wanted to see how well it could read and transmit the RFID tags while continuing normal cattle handling procedures.

Toppenish Livestock Commission installed RFID reader panels in November and updated its computer system. Toppenish tagged 236 head of cattle during its project and ran a couple of consignments of tagged cattle during its regular Thursday sale on two different occasions. On the first occasion, in December 2006, WSDA's Livestock Brand Inspection program used wand readers to read 115 cattle consigned to the sale. The second occasion was in April 2007 when a consignment of 16 cows were tagged and read using the panel readers with 100% readability. Another 105 animals were tagged and read using the panel readers in May with a 99% readability rate.

Toppenish reported it had good RFID readability and that it was able to transmit the tag numbers along with the coinciding sale transactions. The flow of cattle appeared to be smooth through the reader. Through the project, Toppenish became more comfortable using the new software and reader, and believes that if it received tagged cattle it would be able to handle the reading and recording of animal identification numbers during a normal sale day.

Through participating in the demonstration project, Toppenish learned that:

- Using both visual tags and RFID buttons made recording animal identification numbers easier.
- When identifying livestock, having a good record keeping system is essential.
- Using RFID tags from officially recognized tag manufacturers helps to ensure the continuity of information flow.

### ***Chehalis Livestock Market***

The purpose of the project carried out by the Chehalis Livestock Market (Chehalis) was to educate cattle owners about animal identification, to encourage premises registration, and to offer its facility to smaller-count cattle farmers to have their cattle tagged.

Chehalis held several formal and informal meetings on cattle identification. At its first informational meeting on September 15, 2006, Dr. Paul Kohrs of WSDA spoke about premises registration and cattle identification to Chehalis Livestock Market customers and cattle advisory committee members who attended the meeting. On October 9, Chehalis met with the Allflex tag representative, received tags, and learned how to use hand-held wand readers. Chehalis also constructed a display board that it put in its lobby area that included information about cattle identification, ear tag samples, and premises registration applications.

Chehalis Livestock Market distributed 324 RFID tags to five different premises. Most of these tags were installed by owners Joe Parypa and Dave Balmelli. Due to logistics and the fact that some of the cattle were being sent to a feedlot, some tags were installed at El Oro's feedlot. The market reported that it had seen very few of its tag placements come back through its sale yard.

Producer interest and participation in the project was less than Chehalis expected, as many of Chehalis' customers did not feel comfortable providing the information needed to obtain a premises registration number. Still, the owners of Chehalis Livestock Market felt the project was important for themselves and their customers to become educated on animal identification and premises registration for cattle.

### ***Agri Beef's El Oro Cattle Feeders***

The demonstration project conducted by El Oro Cattle Feeders incorporated RFID tags into the feedlot's existing animal management system. Using tags provided by WSDA, El Oro:

- Tagged and processed cattle with individual RFID tags
- Cross-referenced the RFID tag with an El Oro lot and visual tag ID number
- Stored data in the El Oro animal health system, then downloaded the data to an Excel spreadsheet and sent it to WSDA

Prior to the project, El Oro was already experienced using and reading RFID tags due to its importing and feeding of Canadian cattle. The feedlot already had wand and panel readers, so installing and reading RFID tags on domestic cattle was a simple process.

In conducting its demonstration project, El Oro tagged 1,136 head of cattle from 10 lots representing five different premises. The cattle were tagged and the tags read into its animal health software program at initial processing. Initial weights were captured at this time and all animal health procedures and products administered were captured and applied to each electronic record. The cattle were scanned out at shipping using an Allflex panel reader.

The overall accuracy for reading RFID tags was 96.5%, with a read rate of 100% for the last two lots. These results do not include two lots of animals that El Oro was unable to scan due to panel reader malfunction. To achieve the 100% read rate by the end of the demonstration, El Oro made some structural modifications to the alley, added a second panel reader, and improved the tuning of the panels. Recently, Washington Beef has added the ability to read RFIDs and match up feedlot information with carcass weight and quality. Consequently, El Oro has begun using RFID on all cattle.

### ***Everson Auction Market***

The purpose of the Everson Auction Market's demonstration project was to evaluate the feasibility of using current systems with new technology to identify cattle under real world scenarios.

A group of 63 calves was successfully tagged using RFID technology. Once the cattle were tagged and recorded, they went through the Everson Auction Market and were sold. Everson then sent animal identification data, including RFID tag animal identification numbers and Premises Identification Numbers (PIN) to WSDA. Though Everson successfully demonstrated the use of RFID tags, this did not seem to dispel concerns about the technology's reliability in extreme weather conditions and its functionality at a livestock market.

Everson Auction Market, in collaboration with Roy Webster and Optibrand, also conducted a demonstration of Optibrand's system for retinal imaging for permanent biometric identification and for electronically collecting other data such as back tag numbers (using bar code scanning) and ear tag information.

The Everson Auction Market demonstration project showed that there may be some interest in using retinal scanning to trace cattle, especially foreign cattle being imported into Washington. Also, given the concerns about RFID technology, the current cattle identification methods used by the market and WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection program seemed sufficient to meet current surveillance efforts in a timely manner.

### ***Everson Auction Market-Optibrand***

Based on positive comments from participants in its first demonstration project, Everson submitted a second demonstration project proposal to further evaluate the feasibility of the Optibrand system.

In this project, Optibrand trained Everson Auction Market personnel on live animal data collection and its data management software. Everson then conducted animal data collections at two local farms: the Flying Rafter K Ranch and the Nicholson Ranch. At the Flying Rafter K Ranch, 22 head of cattle were identified using retinal imaging of both eyes. Other data collected included: Premises Identification Number, GPS time, date and location data, Animal Identification (RFID) Number, and any other pertinent identification information.

Due to a battery charging error, Everson was not able to collect data on every animal at the Nicholson Ranch. In total, the project collected data on less than 200 head of cattle.

At Flying Rafter K Ranch, retinal images were collected from a sick cow that had to be euthanized. Everson used this opportunity to test how long after death a retinal image could be captured and match the original scan. Everson collected additional images of one of the animal's eyes postmortem at different intervals. In this case, the postmortem retinal pattern was able to be captured and matched with the live image for about seven hours.

From this demonstration project, Everson Auction Market learned that:

- Collecting retinal images takes more time than had been expected.
- Adequate training and practice is necessary for individuals operating the retinal-imaging camera to reach a sufficient level of proficiency.
- Proper lighting is needed to get good images. Temporary light control equipment, such as tents or canopies, may be needed. Producers need to be informed that their facilities may need to be adapted.
- Check to make sure all of the equipment is functioning properly. Plan for adequate power supply and back-up equipment.

### ***WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection Program***

The purpose of the WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection (LBI) program's project was to demonstrate the feasibility of establishing an electronic system that would allow brand inspectors to create electronic brand inspection documents in the field and transmit them electronically to Olympia the same day.

Currently, brand inspection documents are manually created paper documents, with field inspection documents sent to Olympia weekly and livestock market inspection records sent in every two weeks. These records are kept for at least six years. A limited number of these records have been entered into a small, in-house database with a limited search capability.

LBI also tested capturing RFID tag data to enhance the data collected during a brand inspection. To carry out this element of the project, LBI purchased and installed software on staff laptop computers to allow the capture of RFID data. After a training session using live cattle, LBI used wand readers to read RFID tags in a lot of already-tagged cattle during a routine brand inspection when the cattle were sold and leaving the state. The readability rate was only about 75% due to the set up of the facility. LBI also used wand readers to read 115 cattle consigned to the Toppenish sale in December 2006.

To establish a system to create electronic brand inspection documents in the field, LBI is participating in a web-based database development project that will span a number of WSDA programs. LBI began working with the contractor selected to develop the database in February 2007 and, as of August 2007, had completed phase one testing. LBI expects to field test the system in late fall using field inspections. If successful, LBI anticipates expanding the system's use to markets next spring.

The brand inspection data will be housed in the same database that is intended to include animal health and animal movement data collected by the WSDA Animal Health program. This will enhance the ability to use brand inspection data for animal health trace back.

## **Recommendations of the NAIS Cattle Advisory Committee**

---

The advisory committee compiled many recommendations on how it would like to see the NAIS implemented for cattle in Washington State.

### **Premises registration**

- Only allow the landowner to register a premises. Do not allow someone to register a premises for someone else's land.
- Create an "operation registration" for:
  - (1) cattle businesses that own land in Washington but choose not to register their premises; and
  - (2) cattle businesses that do not own land in Washington but raise cattle in the state.
- When registering a premises or operation, specify the location of a home base - the physical location where the landowner or operator can be contacted in case of an emergency. A home base could be in another state.
- Allow an operation to register its contact information without registering the location of its animals.

### **Database housing NAIS information**

- There should be a Washington State Database which houses and maintains information on premises, the identification numbers assigned to Washington premises or operations, and animal movement reports, including brand recorded movements.

### **Animal Identification**

- Identify animals at change of ownership. Identifying the cattle could be part of the sales transaction. Keep the Livestock Brand Inspection program in place and look at the integration of Animal Identification to take advantage of administrative efficiencies and existing brand laws. (Animal ID tags are for identification, whereas brands are used for ownership.)

### **Group lot identification**

- Cattle can have group lot identification as long as they are born and raised, single-branded, with the same owner. When registering group lot identification, include the number of cattle in the group.
- Once group lot cattle have had a change of ownership they must be identified individually. When the state or another tracking system registers the movement, the producer should receive a receipt showing evidence that identification devices were applied and movement was reported.

### **Funding**

- Share funding across the entire industry. Anyone involved in the commerce of cattle or crossing mandatory inspection points, including dairy cattle and packing facilities, must pay their share. Part of the funding should come from the state general fund. The advisory committee recommends 50% from the general fund and 50% to come from the industry to cover the costs of the entire system.

- Base industry fees on transactions. Have the committee examine existing systems to determine potential transaction fees.
- Fees should be assessed and administered by the WSDA Livestock Brand Inspection program.
- There were questions about transactions on animals not entering commerce (perhaps a reduced fee to encourage identification entries). This may be a business decision based on producer needs.
- For custom feedlots/grazing, the owner of the cattle should pay. An animal movement record would be entered into the tracking database if there were a change of premises.
- Establish a sunset review of fees every three to five years.
- Anytime a brand inspection is required, include an identification number. There will be other movements that may not require an inspection. These movements need to be recognized and recorded in an animal movement tracking database.
- Consider requiring brand inspection, or attach brand inspection certificates to health papers, on cattle imported into the state for any reason.

#### **NAIS - mandatory or voluntary**

- Washington should have its own voluntary identification program, with an automated system in place to support it.
- Promote voluntary participation to enhance effectiveness of the system for disease and animal health reasons.
- Washington State should participate in a national animal identification program under guidelines that the SHB 3033 committee recommends.

#### **Scenarios that will not call for animal movement recording**

- Animals that never leave the premises do not need to be identified.
- For animals that “get out” and cross over a neighbor’s land, no recording is necessary.
- For participation in local fairs, rodeos, and parades, movements to and from the premises are not required to be recorded. If there is any commerce, then the animals would need to be identified and movements recorded.
- Encourage 4-H and FFA participation in the program. If there is any commerce, then the 4-H and FFA animals would need to be identified and movements recorded.

#### **Commerce**

- Commerce occurs with change of ownership. For animal health reasons, all animals will be identified once they change ownership or change premises.

#### **Commingling**

- Require the operator to have:
  - (1) A registered brand or;
  - (2) A pasture permit with recorded brand or;
  - (3) Individual animal identification reported to the WSDA.
- When multiple producers routinely pasture their branded cattle together, do not require individual cattle identification until there is a change in ownership. Movements to the shared pasture are not reported.



### **Identification devices and distributors**

- Utilize the standards of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the USDA-approved numbering system and data standards.
- Allow for innovations to occur in individual identification. Private industry will continue to participate in distribution.
- Approved identification devices need to meet specific performance standards set by the SHB 3033 advisory committee.
- Approved identification device distributors must register with WSDA and report the identification numbers to WSDA as devices are sold to producers.

### **Confidentiality**

- Recommend that WSDA request the USDA to return all premises registration information and premises identification numbers until the federal government has passed legislation that USDA can protect the information. WSDA should not send USDA any more premises registration information.
- Recommend that WSDA maintain and fund its own premises registration database, identification device database and animal movement database.

### **Washington Certified Beef program**

- If a Washington Certified Beef program is created, it should be housed in a separate database from the NAIS and it should be voluntary. This program is to identify Washington bred and raised cattle as a marketing tool and is a separate module from animal identification.

## **Outstanding Issues and Challenges**

---

The committee identified several issues that still need resolution and discussed possible approaches to addressing these issues.

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Potential Approach</b>
1. Getting a clear message from the USDA that clearly outlines the goals of the USDA and what their ID system will look like.	Move forward with recommendations from the SHB 3033 committee so Washington State is prepared when the USDA defines its program.
2. Tag or ID device technology performance.	Work with companies and systems that are proven to be effective in a variety of applications throughout the beef industry.
3. Need to conduct animal ID at the speed that commerce is conducted today.	Work with livestock markets and other points of commerce to increase knowledge and ability to use improving animal ID technology.
4. Producers don't distinguish between marketing information and animal health information.	Support the development and use of technology for management and marketing purposes. Educate cattle producers on the value and need for animal tracking system.

The committee also recognized the challenges of increasing producer acceptance and participation in a voluntary program. To address these challenges, the committee made the following recommendations:

1. Concentrate on using the term "Contact Information" instead of "Premises Registration."
2. Inform producers about the animal health and financial risks of not participating in a cattle identification system.
3. Make it easy for cattle owners to voluntarily report animal movements that are not already documented:
  - Create an online website for producers to input animal movement information.
  - Create animal movement forms available to producers at livestock markets that Brand Inspectors could return to WSDA.
4. Conduct outreach and education about the state database being developed. Add a statement on all state program materials clearly indicating that all information submitted to WSDA for participating in a state animal identification system will be entered into a state database, not a national database.

The Cattle Advisory Committee reaffirmed the need for the Animal ID program for animal health reasons. Given the fluid state of the USDA "requirements," the committee recommended that the brand inspection process be used as a starting point for cattle identification. Automating the brand inspection process is a key step to integrate Animal ID with the Livestock Brand Inspection program.

WSDA used federal moneys allotted in 2006 to start work on a tracking system. In February 2007, WSDA re-launched an initiative to create a multi-program, shared database to improve the accuracy and usefulness of information currently provided to and used by the agency's food- and livestock-related programs. Through this effort a number of separate, incompatible databases will be replaced and many forms and records that currently exist on paper will be computerized. Once fully developed, this database will store brand recording and inspection information, animal health certificate and testing information, and premises registration information, and will be able to track group lot animal movements.

Implementing and operating a tracking system will require funding. Throughout the duration of the Cattle Advisory Committee, members discussed how a future Washington State Animal Identification program would be funded. They recommended that funding should be split evenly by the state general fund and the cattle industry, and that industry provide its share using a transaction-based system. Without knowing exactly what a Washington State Animal ID program would entail, the committee felt it needed to wait to have more specific discussions about funding in the future when there was more detail.

Given the recommendations of the Cattle Advisory Committee, WSDA has identified the next steps it will take to develop a state animal identification system for animal health purposes.

#### **Next Steps**

1. Continue to register premises for cattle and other species on a voluntary basis.
2. Continue outreach and education on the need for an animal identification system to help state and federal animal health officials manage animal disease outbreaks
3. Continue to develop an information management system that moves animal health and brand inspection documents from paper to electronic format, and makes searching and retrieving information for animal health purposes faster and more useful.
4. Determine the costs of operating an automated animal tracking system that incorporates animal health, identification and brand inspection information, and work with industry to recommend funding amounts and sources.
5. If requested, assist the cattle industry in developing a Washington Certified Beef program, certifying that the cattle were born and raised in Washington, to be implemented by WSDA rules and funded by the participants.

## Appendix A

---

### SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 3033

---

Passed Legislature - 2006 Regular Session

State of Washington

59th Legislature

2006 Regular Session

**By** House Committee on Economic Development, Agriculture & Trade (originally sponsored by Representatives Pettigrew, Kristiansen, Grant, Kretz, Holmquist, Cox, B. Sullivan, Clements, Campbell, Haigh, Newhouse and Linville)

READ FIRST TIME 2/3/06.

AN ACT Relating to animal identification; creating a new section; and providing expiration date.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

**NEW SECTION. Sec. 1.** (1) The director of agriculture shall convene an advisory committee composed of representatives from the various segments of the cattle industry that will be involved in the implementation of the state's component of the national animal identification program for animal health and disease trace-back purposes. The advisory committee shall be chaired by the director of agriculture or the director's appointee. In making the appointments to the advisory committee, the director shall consult with organizations that represent the affected segments of the cattle industry. The director may appoint additional members to the advisory committee as deemed necessary. The director shall appoint to the advisory committee one member from a federally recognized tribe who is in the cattle industry.

(2) The advisory committee shall evaluate the requirements of the federal program and examine approaches being taken by other states to implement the requirements, with an emphasis on neighboring states and the states that engage in the largest amount of trade in cattle with Washington, and evaluate demonstration projects that the department shall conduct at two or more facilities that handle large numbers of animals. The advisory committee shall make a recommendation on how the federal requirements should be implemented in Washington that includes recommended funding amounts and sources. In developing a funding proposal, the advisory committee shall consult with the office of financial management.

(3) The department shall submit a written report of the activities and recommendations of the advisory committee to the house of representatives and to the senate by December 1, 2006.

(4) This section expires July 1, 2007.

Passed by the House February 11, 2006.

Passed by the Senate March 6, 2006.

Approved by the Governor March 20, 2006.

Filed in Office of Secretary of State March 20, 2006.

## **Appendix B**

NAIS Cattle Advisory Committee  
Appointed 6/12/2006  
Membership

Chairman Dr. Leonard Eldridge, DVM  
State Veterinarian

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>
Brenda Balmelli	Chehalis
Dennis Bly, Lincoln Co. Commissioner	Davenport
Alan Chlarson	Moses Lake
Terry DeBruin	Everson
George DeRuyter	Outlook
Ed Field	Quincy
Jack Field	Ellensburg
Jay Gordon	Elma
Dick Hinthorne	Seattle
Neil Kayser	Centreville
Ted Kerst	Spokane
Joel Kretz, State Representative	Republic
Bruce Matsumura	Toppenish
Ernie Motteram	Pullman
David Secrist	Moses Lake
Larry Stap	Lynden
Craig Vjeraska	Omak
Roy Webster	Colville Tribe
Ted Wishon	Colville
Willard Wolf	Valleyford

## **Appendix C**

Washington State Department of Agriculture  
NAIS Cattle Advisory Committee

### **Questions for Research on Other States' Plans for Implementing NAIS for Cattle**

Approved 7/7/06

#### **Premises Registration**

1. Mandatory or Voluntary? What percent of premises were registered on a mandatory basis? What percent of premises were registered on a voluntary basis?
2. Fee to register, or source of funding? How much for how long? How is the money allocated throughout the system?
3. Is confidentiality of data protected by state law?
4. Definition of a premise?
5. When a producer uses multiple pieces of land, do you require a premises number for each one? Or one only?
6. Who is allowed to register the premises? Producer? Landowner?
7. Does your state have any incentives to register premises?
8. What percent of cattle premises are registered?
9. How do you handle leased land?
10. How do you handle land that straddles state borders?

#### **Animal Identification**

11. Mandatory or Voluntary?
12. Who pays for identification devices? Is cost underwritten in any way?
13. Do you allow group ID for branded cattle? Under what conditions do you require individual ID?
14. If you are a brand state, how do you handle unbranded cattle?
15. Is your state going to be a tag manager, tag distributor, or tag installer?
16. Do you have special exemptions for small herds or small farms?
17. Will 4-H and FFA projects need individual ID? How will you address cost issues?
18. How will you treat group identified (branded or not) cattle coming in from out of state?
19. How will you integrate brand inspections with animal identification? Who is tagging? When does the animal become identified and how?
20. Do you use group ID for cattle?

#### **Animal Movement**

21. What software will you use to track animal movement? Costs? Issues? Costs for producers? Who enters data and how?
22. Who will pay for tracking devices (readers)?
23. What methods have worked best for you to implement NAIS at the speed of commerce?
24. What tracking events will you require/recommend?
25. What cattle issues remain challenging in your state?
26. What level of accuracy and accountability is acceptable? E.g. 100%, 90%?
27. What information have you had to change? And how? Enhance? Hinder? Hurdles?

28. Do you have a hotline/customer service to help or education users/public?
29. Private industry: Who is doing the database?
30. Sale Yard: Who is doing the work and how many does it take?

**State characteristics**

31. Number of cattle.
32. Number of cattle operations (farms, etc.).
33. What is the relationship between the brand department and the animal health department?
34. Number of brand inspectors and ownership inspectors (FTEs)?
35. How is your animal health program funded?
36. How is your brand program funded?
37. Fee structure?
38. Contact name and number for further questions?
39. Is the tagging/reader industry helping with costs for ranchers?
40. Have you addressed issues of liability associated with cattle identification?
41. Is there a hole in your system? What is it?
42. What type of infrastructure are you building?
43. What types of education are you doing?
44. What type of help line will you provide?

Proposed states to be consulted (Oregon, California - We trade most with California and Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Missouri, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas).

Look at California, Oregon and Idaho first then look at branded states if there is time.

**Appendix D**

**Research Report Summary on  
Implementation Plans of Other States**

SHB 3033 Research Summary

November 2, 2006

Submitted by the

Washington Cattlemen's Association



## **Introduction**

The Washington Cattlemen's Association (WCA) was awarded a research contract through the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) to contact State Veterinarians, Animal Health Officials, National Animal Identification System Coordinators, Brand Department Supervisors, and Trade Associations in the states and in a Canadian Province that the SHB 3033 Advisory Committee recommended. These states and Canadian Province were contacted so the WCA could conduct research to learn about the efforts each state and province are making to prepare for implementing individual cattle identification.

The WCA contacted and researched the following states and Canadian Province: Oregon, Idaho, California, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, South Dakota, Kansas, Arizona, Colorado, Nebraska, Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Alberta, Canada. Over 28 people were contacted throughout this research. Each of these states and Canadian Province were asked the same series of questions that the HB 3033 advisory committee developed at the first meeting. The questions focused on Premises Registration, Animal ID, and Animal Movement. Additionally, each state and province were asked how their Animal Health Programs (and Brand Programs if they were a brand state) are funded. Each state and Canadian Province who helped by participating in ID surveys and interviews would like to receive a copy of the findings.

### **Premises Registration**

1. **Mandatory or Voluntary? What percent of premises were registered on a mandatory basis? What percent of premises were registered on a voluntary basis?**
  - All states use voluntary registration except for Wisconsin and Michigan.
    - Wisconsin registered 50% of its premises on a mandatory basis.
2. **What percent of cattle premises are registered?**
  - Arizona- Approx. 6,000- 10%
  - California- over 86,000- Approx. 10%
  - Colorado- USDA stats- 14,000 - Colorado stats 10-20%
  - Idaho- USDA claims 20%
  - Kansas- 4,300 out of 50,000, KS goal is to have 25% registered by the end of the year
  - Michigan- 1,010,000- between 90-100%
  - Minnesota- 11,200, out of 60,000 livestock operations
  - Missouri- 10%, approximately 6,500
  - Montana- 1,300 out of 32,000
  - Nebraska- 13,000 out of 31,000 roughly 40%. Nebraska offered vise-grip pliers, popcorn, key chains, and refrigerator magnets to producers that register a premise
  - Nevada- Global Animal Management
  - South Dakota- using the SPRS system 4,500 registered at this time (no gimmicks)

- Utah- 7,983 out of 19,000 +/- this does not include equine facilities
- Wisconsin- 51,600- WI registered 25,772 (50% prior to their mandatory law going into effect 11-1-05) the remaining 27,288 after the law went into effect.)
- Wyoming- 600 registered to date
- Alberta- 34,000 operations which include both beef and dairy , 30% registered in Alberta

### **3. Number of cattle and number of brand inspectors**

- AZ- 15 inspectors, tribal nation probably has more cattle than the rest of the state (150,000)
- CA- 60 inspectors, 5.4 million cattle
- CO- 60 inspectors, 1.2 million cattle
- ID- 41.82 full-time inspectors, 450,000+/- dairy and 1,000,000 beef cattle; 1.9-2.2 million brand inspections
- KS- 6.65 million head 7.5 million harvest, 4-6+/- inspectors
- MT- 65 inspectors, 1.6 million mother cows
- NE- Approximately 100, 1.8 million beef, one time feedlot capacity 2 million head, daily harvest of 30,000 head
- NV- 80-100 inspectors, 500,000 cattle
- OR- 70 inspectors, 625,000 beef, 125,000 dairy
- SD- 15 full-time, 95 part-time. All cattle: 3,750,000 head. Beef cows: 1,720,000 head. Feedlots: 400,000 head. Dairy Cows: 80,000 head. (West River inspection)
- WY- 56 full time, 20-25 part time inspectors, and 1,000,000 cattle. Weather conditions have played a role in reducing numbers
- AB- LIS has 108 employees, of which 45 are full time staff, which equates to approximately 25 FTE's. LIS also pays the contracts (through the Provincial Ministry of Agriculture) of two full-time Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) Livestock Investigators. These investigators do the enforcement of the Acts and Regulations for LIS.- AB Total 5,900,000 head.

### **4. Definition of a premise**

- States that use the USDA definition of a premises:
  - AZ, CO, ID
  - MO, NE, OR, UT, must have 911 address where animals reside.
- CA- The definition of premises in California is consistent with definition provided in the USDA's program standards. *"A premises is an identifiable physical location that, in the judgment of the State Animal Health Official or Area Veterinarian in Charge and, when appropriate, in consultation with the affected producer, represents a*

*unique and describable geographic entity where activity affecting the health and/or traceability of animals may occur.”*

- CO- Any operation that is operated as a separate contemporary group.
- KS- An identifiable geographic location under common ownership or management used for the purpose of feeding, grazing and/or other activity where the animals are not interchanged or commingled with animals from outside the Premises.
- NV- Let the producer define it. Focus on registering the home base of the operation or the properties.
- MN- Any location that houses livestock of any kind for any use.
- MT- A premises is defined as a location operated by an entity that participates in food animal production and/or commerce that is, in the opinion of the State Animal Health Official or area Veterinarian in Charge, epidemiologically, or geographically distinct from other livestock production units.
- SD- Use the USDA definition with the State Veterinarian having the final approval.
- WI- A premises is a location that keeps, houses, or commingles livestock. “Premises” include: farms, hobby farms, vet clinics, stables, livestock markets, livestock trucker and dealer premises where animals are kept; slaughter and rendering facilities; livestock exhibitions, and any other location where livestock are kept.
- WY- Your operation is your premises.
- AB- Legal land location of the home quarter section.

**5. Does your state have any incentives to register premises?**

- Nebraska offered vise-grip pliers, popcorn, key chains, and refrigerator magnets to producers that register a premises.

**6. Can you register on-line?**

- AZ- Not at this time but hopefully by the end of September
- CO- Yes
- KS- Yes
- MO- Yes
- NV- Yes also requires landowners signature
- SD- Yes
- WA- Yes
- AB- Yes

**7. Fee to register?**

- None

**8. Source of funding, how much for how long, how is the money allocated throughout the system?**

- USDA Cooperative Agreement Grants, grants needed to be renewed annually. Funds are allocated by providing free sign ups and education (see report).

**9. When a producer uses multiple pieces of land, do you require a premises number for each one? Or one only?**

- CO- If the operator is moving more than 75 miles they are required to have multiple premises registered.
- AZ- If the land is contiguous one number, if land is non-contiguous AZ requests multiple premises numbers. All other states.

**10. Who is allowed to register the premises? Producer? Landowner?**

- AZ- Landowner, same with leased land.
- CA- The owner of the premises, the legal representative of the owner, the lessee of the property, or an authorized state or federal animal health official conducting official programs can request a premises identification number.
- CO- Landowner, leased land fall under the operator.
- ID- Either on ISDA recommends the landowner being contacted.
- KS- Tie premises to the operation not the land.
- MO- Either.
- MN- Landowner.
- MT- Whoever is in charge of the premises.
- NE- Technically both, Department of Agriculture requests that the landowner is notified.
- NV- Both, but the landowner's name must be included.
- OR- Landowners and leases.
- SD- Almost anyone can register; renters can register but identify a key contact.
- UT- Both, focus on owner or manger of livestock.
- WI- Both (mandatory registration).
- WY- Landowner or livestock owner.

**11. How do you handle leased land? How do you handle land that straddles state borders?**

- CO- Register in the state that the majority of the land is in or headquarters.
- AB- They would register the land premises in each Province, if they were registered and taxed in separate Provinces.

**12. Is confidentiality of data protected by state law?**

- MI- Yes.
- AZ- Yes, bill 1103 the omnibus bill.

- CA- California Public Records has provisions to protect information, including proprietary information such as production records.
- CO- No.
- CO- Thinks the same way that the Federal Government does that since they don't own the information it should not be a problem to protect it.
- ID- Yes.
- KS- Not at this time, there is proposed legislation.
- MO- Yes.
- AB- Yes both federally and provincially.
- MN- Yes.
- MT- No.
- NE- Yes, LB 856 - Gives the NE Department of Agriculture authority to participate in NAIS, any information a producer submits is to be kept in confidentiality and jail time and other penalties are included if information is disclosed.
- NV- Yes.
- OR- No.
- SD- Yes.
- UT- Yes.
- WY- Yes passed a comprehensive statute on animal ID. Any information gathered is exempt from disclosure and the USDA must sign an affidavit that states they will not disclose the information. The premises registration requires driver's license, social security number and/or other information for those that do not have a registered brand to ensure that the person registered is who they claim to be. Concerns are there about being able to protect data that is held outside the state that is not protected by state statutes.
- WI-Yes premises registration data is confidential by the Wisconsin Premises Registration Act. The act states that the information is exempt from FOIA and can be only used by animal health officials. The premises ID itself is not confidential but all of the information associated with it is. The premises ID information cannot be shared with other government agencies such as the IRS.

## **Animal Identification**

### **13. Mandatory or Voluntary?**

- Every state contacted is approaching Animal ID on a Voluntary basis.
  - Exception of AB (mandatory ID tags).
- WI- Starting a voluntary ID program, very small branding system (not widely used). Following National Cattle Species Work Group recommendation of individual RFID

- (steers and spayed heifers are the only animals exempt from individual ID). WI does not accept brand inspection (BI) as official ID.
- WY- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection change of ownership, slaughter, out of county movement (exemption available). Would like to see group lot incorporated.
  - UT- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection at interstate shipment, sales, slaughter. Supports group lot.
  - SD- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection west of the Missouri River (almost half the state). Have not addressed group lots from out of state yet.
  - OR- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection at change of ownership and interstate shipment. Supports Group lot.
  - NV- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection for movement out of counties regardless of ownership. Supports group lot but has not figured how to incorporate it yet.
  - NE- Voluntary ID, Western 2/3 of state is mandatory brand inspection (sales, slaughter, shipment for interstate movement).
  - MT- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection (change of ownership, county to county movements, out of state, all livestock markets, slaughter). Still discussing incorporating group lot. Waiting to hear from USDA.
  - MN- Voluntary ID focusing on premises registration, following NAIS model not sure about group lot ID.
  - MO- Voluntary ID, Voluntary brand inspection, not supportive of group lot.
  - KS- Voluntary ID, not a brand state but 4 counties require brand inspections, no group lot for cattle.
  - ID- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection (sales, shipment, slaughter, very supportive of group lot).
  - CO- Voluntary ID, brand inspection state but not a mandatory brand state. Following the USDA no group lot.
  - CA- Has animal health programs that mandate animal identification for certain events such as interstate movement. Additionally, disease control programs may also require individual identification. For instance, the brucellosis control and eradication program requires official identification of heifers at the time of vaccination. CDFA is exploring transitioning the existing numbering systems to be consistent with the NAIS program. Following USDA requirements towards group lot.
  - AZ- Voluntary ID, Mandatory brand inspection (sales, shipment, slaughter. Have not yet discussed group lot ID).

#### 14. **Are you a brand state?**

- The following states require some level of mandatory brand inspection: Oregon, Idaho, California, Nevada, Montana, South Dakota, Utah, Arizona, and parts of Kansas, Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, Alberta.

**15. Who pays for identification devices?**

- The producer and the industry pay the cost.

**Is cost underwritten in any way?**

- Yes, by some pilot programs funded through the USDA.

**16. Do you allow group id for branded cattle? If so, under what conditions do you require individual ID?**

- Brand states are supportive of their programs and intend on honoring other states brand slips.
- Non-brand states and states with partial brand are not supportive of group-lot ID.

**17. If you are a brand state, how do you handle unbranded cattle? (We charge 50 cents more on slicks or cattle that have been traded and don't have the owners registered brand.)**

- Brand states are supportive of their programs and intend on honoring other states brand slips.
- Non-brand states and states with partial brand are not supportive of group-lot ID.

**18. Is your state going to be a tag manager, tag distributor, or tag installer?**

- AZ- Not a tag manager, just discussion about movement tracking, AZ is talking about housing the information so the state vet will have access to the information.
- CA- CDFA, as any other state animal health agency, will likely be a Tag Manager. This will be needed to obtain official identification devices for disease eradication programs. CDFA will not be a Tag Manufacturer nor likely be a Tag Reseller, the two other classes under the AIN program. Tag Distributor and Tag Installer are not categories defined by USDA.
- CO- Tag manager- installer, not decided yet but likely to be a tag manager.
- ID- Not at this time.
- KS- No, leave it to the private sector.
- MN- More than likely not.
- MT- Probably will consider it, possibly to manage tags for vets for animal health issues (Bangs, TB).
- NE- Yes there have been mixed discussions but no formal decisions have been made at this time.
- NV- Would not mind being a tag manager or installer, not sure about being a distributor.
- OR- Have not discussed this yet.
- SD- Currently thinking and discussing this issue.

- UT- Some discussion of being a tag manager, but none as far as a distributor and installer.
- WI- Not at this time, we will promote producers, buy approved AIN tags from distributors and assist third parties in the state that would like to report AIN numbers to the state.
- WY- Not at this time, the state has discussed being a data repository.
- AB- Tag allocation is done through the National Program (CCIA) where unique tag numbers are issued to the tag manufacturers. The manufacturers then supply them to "registered" tag distributors such as feed stores, farm supply outlets, etc. These registered outlets must retrieve seller/buyer information and it is entered in the CCIA database. Tagging stations are also registered with the CCIA and they would traditionally be inspection points such as sale yards or assembly yards. Basically if a producer cannot tag the animal he could bring it to the sale yard and have it tagged for him, at a cost determined by the sale yard or tagging station.

**19. Do you have special exemptions for small herds or small farms?**

- AZ- No, USDA has an exemption for self-consumption not leaving the premises.
- CA- California has not mandated or exempted any part of the program and encourages uniform standards be developed across the country. Historically, both large and small farms have been involved in disease outbreaks in California (e.g., Pseudorabies, Exotic Newcastle Disease, Tuberculosis, Scrapie, Brucellosis, etc.
- CO- Nothing different from the USDA guidance.
- ID- No.
- KS- No, not at this time.
- MO- No.
- MN- Encouraging everyone to register, not discouraging anyone. MN will follow the USDA guidelines. (If an animal never leaves a premises there will be no need for ID.)
- MT- No.
- NE- USDA self-consumption exemption. Premises registration is being encouraged but not animal ID.
- NV- No, everyone is treated the same.
- OR- No.
- SD- No.
- UT- None, only the USDA self-consumption exemption. If the NAIS was mandatory ID would be required on all animals upon entering commerce.
- WI- For premises registration anyone with an animal is included. Under WI Voluntary efforts anyone that would like to participate is welcome.



- WY- No, USDA self-consumption exemption.
- AB- No all operations are treated the same.

**20. Will 4-H and FFA projects need individual ID? How will you address cost issues?**

- MO- Youth projects are required to have a RFID tag.
- AZ- Have not discussed this yet.
- CA- We will follow existing regulations (state, county, fair) where most animals need some form of identification. Additionally, we will support Species Working Group recommendations for this production sector.
- CO- Trying to integrate RFID for daily rate of gain. Most likely 4-H and FFA will cover the cost.
- ID- Have not discussed this.
- KS- Finney County, Garden City Kansas had 100% of animals RFID prior to arrival. All animals were read at arrival.
- MN- Have not discussed this.
- MT- Have not discussed this
- NE- NEDA has been with 4-H and FFA for premises registration, there is also discussion about converting existing 4-H tags over to RFID.
- NV- Premises are already entered as part of the Scrapie program. Currently taking an animal health approach.
- OR- Not really significant, used readers purchased through grant to read tags.
- SD- Have not yet discussed this yet.
- UT- There has been some discussion. All animals must be individually ID at this time. No plans to help out with costs.
- WI- Under voluntary effort, some fairs have made premises a requirement to show and already require individual ID.
- WY- Has not yet been discussed. There is a concern over the co-mingling of animals and the potential of disease transmission.

**21. How will you treat group identified (branded or not) cattle coming in from out of state?**

- Brand states are supportive of their programs and intend on honoring other states brand slips.

**22. How will you integrate brand inspections with animal identification?**

- Each brand state is currently discussing how they will do this none of the states had this finalized at the time of the interviews.

**23. Who is tagging?**

- Producers.

**When does the animal become identified and how?**

- Each state contacted is adhering to their brand laws to determine when an animal is identified.
- AB- The producer is tagging the animals when they leave the herd of origin. This could mean that producers will not RFID tag their cows which remain on their own property (leased, rented, etc.) and they will not tag these animals until they "leave" the herd of origin and go to a sale yard, packing plant etc. Some producers are tagging all of their animals immediately and maintaining them at their own property. The RFID tag is retired (read) at the packing plants and that information is sent from the packing plant to the CCIA database to show that the tag is retired. With the insertion of Age Verification there are quite a few producers registering their animals' birth dates and these same RFID tags can be scanned (read) and a birth certificate produced to verify age. That is a separate use to the tag.

**Animal Movement**

**24. What software will you use to track animal movement?**

**a. Costs? Issues? Costs for producers? Who enters data and how?**

- The issues of cost are widespread across all contacted states. None has a plan of how the cost of a system will be spread across the industry.

**25. Who will pay for tracking devices (readers)?**

- Producers and industry.

**26. What methods have worked best for you to implement NAIS at the speed of commerce?**

- RFID.

**27. What tracking events will you require/recommend?**

- States with brand inspection programs are tentatively planning on relying on the events that require brand inspections. Non-brand states are focusing on the recommendations from the USDA.

**28. What cattle issues remain challenging in your state?**

- NV- Age; because cows calve on the range, age verification is at best a general estimate. Developing an infrastructure, getting producer buy-in on NAIS as well as getting producers to register their premise.
- CA- There is a goal to exchange information and promote the eradication of bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis on both sides of the US-Mexican border. Another goal is also to mitigate the risk of tuberculosis and brucellosis spread through the cattle trade. For tuberculosis, this is accomplished by improving control of tuberculosis in Mexican states by enhancing surveillance, movement control, epidemiology, and reducing prevalence. For brucellosis this is accomplished through programs that ensure that only castrated and spayed cattle are imported as feeder cattle.

- MT- Sending a better message to the industry about animal ID, and enhancing voluntary participation.
- AB- Initial adoption was difficult with producers and some regional areas of the province. BSE and serious disease outbreaks in European and British countries made the producers more aware of the need for a National ID program. Being shut out of a major market (USA) as a result of BSE cases was a harsh reality for the producers and having lived through hard times in the livestock industry they are more acceptable to change and modernize. Education and awareness was the hardest task, considering the vast size of the geographical areas for Alberta's livestock industry.

**29. What level of accuracy and accountability is acceptable? E.g. 100%, 90%?**

- AZ- 99% or higher.
- CA- Adequate to conduct most animal disease trace backs.
- CO- Need to focus on a 100% bookend system and then fill in the middle later.
- ID- Premises 85%, RFID rates 85%, 85% should suffice for disease trace back.
- KS- 92-95% would be extremely lucky.
- MO- Not yet determined.
- MI- 100%.
- MT- 75-80% for a disease trace back.
- NE- Ideally 100% upper 90's would be acceptable.
- NV- NAIS 100%, Brand strive for 100% and realize that will not happen.
- OR- For animal health high 90s, the brand must be 100%.
- SD- 85%.
- UT- 90%.
- WI- 100% for premises, and 90% movements.
- WY- 85% should be satisfactory, in a voluntary system the goal is to get 75% of premises registered and ID 90% of those cattle.
- AB- Expectations for compliance on tag use is 100% for leaving the herd of origin. Reading rates is still to be determined by the industry and the government, but it will be a very high rate in our opinion. The industry and CCIA are still testing aggressively and will not be satisfied until they come up with accuracy levels that will serve the industry and its trading partners with confidence.

**29. What information have you had to change? And how? Enhance? Hinder? Hurdles?**

- The biggest issue is the USDA changing its message on NAIS. As the USDA changes each state must change as well.

**30. Do you have a hotline/customer service to help or education users/public? If not, do you plan to provide one?**

- Every state contacted had someone at each state's department of agriculture that could answer questions. Several states have information online and some states have on-line tutorials for producers.

**31. Private industry: Who is doing the database?**

- States that responded to this question talked about breed programs such as Angus Source and FAIR system or the USAIO.

**32. Sale Yard: Who is doing the work and how many does it take?**

- Nebraska and Kansas are conducting some small pilots at sale barns to study the commingling issues at each site.

**State characteristics**

**33. What is the relationship between the brand department and the animal health department?**

- Very close relationships in every state.

**34. How is your animal health program funded?**

- AZ- State money.
- CA- General Fund dollars.
- Funding for the California Department of Food and Agriculture's (CDFA) animal health programs comes from two sources, general fund and cooperative agreements with USDA. The first is a line item in CDFA's budget and the second is via annual cooperative agreements with USDA.
- CO- State budget and grants.
- ID- General fund.
- KS- General fund.
- MI- Michigan Department of Agriculture budget.
- MT- Federal co-op agreements, per capita taxes on livestock, services/ inspection fees, licensing. State special revenue, no general fund.
- Montana Department of Livestock has no animal health fund. We have an Animal Health Division administered by the State Veterinarian, which is funded by state special revenue – Department of Livestock\per capita tax on livestock or fees – no general fund.
- NE- General fund dollars and some federal program grants NAIS, AI.
- NV- General funds/head tax.
- OR- 55% General funds, balance from fees.
- SD- General funds.

- UT- General funds.
- WI- General funds, licensing fees, USDA Co-op grants.
- WY- General Funds.

**35. How is your brand program funded?**

- Fee driven.

**36. Fee structure?**

- CA- Inspection fees - \$1.05 per head  
Recording fees - \$60.00 for 2-years, effective July 1, 2006

**Brand Inspections**

- \$12.00- Service Charge on all Ranch Inspections at one (1) site. (Plus \$1.05)
- Brand Inspection fee, and when applicable a \$1.00 Beef Council fee
- \$1.44- Hide
- \$1.05- Ranch Inspection; change of ownership
- \$1.05- Out of Modified Point of Origin pasture-to-pasture; no change of ownership (suckling calves with mothers are not charged a fee)
- \$1.05- Out-of-State; change of ownership (all cattle charged a fee)
- \$1.05- Out-of-State pasture-to-pasture; no change of ownership (suckling calves with mothers are not charged a fee)
- \$1.05- Destination Inspection Livestock Markets
- Licensed Slaughterhouse
- Fair or Exposition Sale
- \$0.70- Livestock Market Re-Inspection
- \$0.54- Registered Feedlots
- \$0.36- Sale yard cattle and Out-of-State cattle shipped directly in to Registered Feedlot
- \$1.00- Beef Council, when applicable
- Brand Recording Documentation
- \$60.00- Recording Fee (Non-refundable Application Fee)
- \$60.00- Transfer Fee
- \$60.00- Biennial Brand Renewal Fee
- \$85.00- Brand Re-instatement Fee
- \$120.00- Re-recording Fee

- CO- Brand recording fee currently \$125 (for 5 years) will increase to \$225 (5 year term) for the 2007 renewals. Country calls 55 cents per head plus \$10 service charge cattle. Horse in country \$1 per head with a \$15 minimum. Sale barns 55 cents per head horses \$2 per head no service charge. Permanent travel cards \$43 dollars. Feedlot going from a feedlot to a USDA inspected plant is 2 cents under the per head cattle, or if over 500 head the first 500 at 2 cents under the per head and any additional 5 cents under. Per head inspection and recording fees can be raised and lowered by the brand board for all fees.
- ID- Minimum fee of \$20 per inspection or \$.94 per head cattle.
- KS- \$45 – 5 year brand registration (each county sets brand rates).
- MO- In 1992 the legislature created a fund called the Missouri Brand Fund and the funds taken in for the brand program were to be used solely for the branding program.

The fees taken in are from the new registrations, renewals, transfers, additional certificate copies and the sale of the brand books and are put into the brand fund.

So far we have not had to request any additional funds from the general revenue. All computers and their software, printers and supplies, printing and mailing of the brand books, printing of certificates or wallet cards, boxes for mailing of books and office supplies have come out of the brand fund. After two years what funds are not used goes back into general revenue for the State of Missouri. My pay is not taken out of the fund. Since the funds go back into general revenue every two years I update my computer, printer, computer software and purchase office supplies that's needed before the funds go into general revenue.

- Registration fee- \$35
- Renewal fee- \$20
- Transfer fee- \$10
- Additional copies of the brand certificate- \$10
- They do not have brand inspectors or inspection fees in Missouri
- Brand book fee is \$15 (the mailing and four supplements are included in the initial cost of the brand book)
- MT- Brand registration 10 yrs. \$100 not pro-rated, may file a new lien for \$30 plus a per capita on livestock of \$1.75 per head everyone pays this!!
- NV- Brand recordings and transfers are \$100. All livestock brands are required by state law to be re-recorded every 4 years @ \$100. Sale of Official Brand Books is \$35.00. Currently \$10 for the first animal and \$1 per head thereafter, horses \$10 and \$3 thereafter. Less than 10 head and over 10 miles time and mileage rate \$16 hr plus federal mileage rate. Change of ownership, movement across a district line, slaughter. There is the ability for a self-inspection for grazing uses. Must be the owner's cattle with his registered iron. Must buy a book of permits for \$3 per movement, which must be returned to the state. Self-inspection is not allowed

under change of ownership, or slaughter. No general tax dollars, with the exception that NV pays only 25% of 4 Agriculture Law Enforcement officers that have department-wide enforcement responsibilities (brands, animal health, plants, bugs, ports of entry, patrols, etc.).

The Brands Department (Division of Livestock Identification) has authority for up to 110 positions of Deputy Brand Inspector I. They use their own vehicles and get the state rate of mileage reimbursement, now \$0.445 per mile. We try to have one or two in every town and every agricultural area in order to cut down on the travel time and mileage. They are supervised by a Brand Inspector II or an Agriculture Enforcement officer.

We have 5 Brand Inspector II's who are peace officer certified investigators/enforcement officers. These are part-time, hourly employees, totally fee funded, who are limited to 19.5 hours per week so that we don't have to pay so much in benefits.

They make about \$18/hour and because of the limitations are mostly older, retired people, from other law enforcement agencies. They do brand inspections, theft investigations, work ports of entry, weigh stations and some supervise BI Is in a specific geographic area. BI IIs have a state vehicle that is law enforcement equipped and are on the highway patrol statewide radio system.

They are supervised by Jim Connelly or Lt. Dennis Journigan who is an Agriculture Law Enforcement officer and I use my allotted 25% of his time to oversee the law enforcement side of the Brands program.

In the office, we have Jim Connelly as program Administrator for the Division of Livestock ID and, the department wide, Agriculture Law Enforcement Unit. My compensation is split, half out of the Brands (fee funded) budget and half out of Ag Enforcement (Department of Agriculture general funds). A fulltime Administrative Assistant who takes care of the books and scheduling of deputy brand inspectors; a fulltime Brand Recorder who does brand recording, transfers, walk-in brand inspections, published the Official Nevada Brand Book every 4 years, and helps with reconciling the submittals from all the Deputy Brand Inspector Is. BI Is are required by state law to submit their inspection slips, money, timesheets and travel claims every two weeks.

Our annual budget is about \$1.2 million.

We inspect approximately 470,000 animals per year and write about 45,000 inspection slips per year.

The basic rate on cattle is \$10 for the first one and \$1 per head thereafter on the same slip. If the owner brings a small stock trailer load to the Inspector we only charge \$1 per head. If the inspection is less than 10 head and over 10 miles away we add time and mileage to the basic rate. For inventory inspections, BLM or USFS impounds or wild horse inspections and sale yard inspections are time and mileage.

The basic rate on horses is \$10 for the first one and \$3 for each thereafter on the same slip plus time and mileage as applicable above. We also sell Lifetime and Annual horse transportation permits for \$35 & \$15 respectively.

Licenses- The division also licenses all livestock auctions and sales at \$100/year and all livestock dealers and agents at \$100 and \$25/year respectively.

Head Tax- Nevada State Statutes require each owner of livestock to declare and pay an annual assessment on each head of livestock owner the year previous. The tax is \$0.28 per head of beef cattle; \$0.53 per head of dairy cattle; \$0.75 per horse, mule or ass; \$0.07 per head of swine; and \$0.07 per head of goats. Sheep are taxed separately by the Nevada Sheep Commission.

Nevada is really tight during that last of the 4 year brand recording cycle before we get a re-recording that gives the budget about a half million dollar shot in the arm.

- OR- Proposal to go to \$1 dollar currently at 75 cents per head plus 25 dollar travel fee. Sale yards and feedlots are exempt from travel fee.
- SD- Currently in the process of raising 70 cents per head. Horse \$3 per year or \$10 for lifetime. In process of increasing to the cap of 80 cents per head. They also charge on country calls a portion of the fee that goes to the inspector. There is a mandatory brand inspection requirement for horses.
- UT- 35% general fund and the balance fee driven. Brand recording \$75 (5 years cattle and horses are together; sheep is a separate recording) renewal is \$50 for 5 years. Per head inspection 60 cents cattle 75 cents horses, yearly travel permits for show cattle and horses is \$10/animal yearly and a lifetime on a horse is \$25/horse. Minimum certificate \$5. No time and mileage.
- WY- Brand renewals \$140 per species, \$1.50 per head no exceptions.
- AB- \$220 per brand registration (lifetime), all cattle are inspected, whether branded or not and are charged the same rate (\$1.00 per head). \$3.00 for annual horse permit, \$55 for a Livestock Dealers' license, \$30.00 for a Livestock Dealers' Agents license. Audits (banks, feeder loan programs etc.) and requested inspections are based on an hourly rate and mileage.

**37. Contact name and number for further questions?**

- See research file.

**38. Is the tagging /reader industry helping with costs for ranchers?**

- Yes in some of the pilots.

**39. Is there a hole in your system? What is it?**

- AZ- Getting producers involved, participating, and registering premises. Premises numbers and public lands. 83% of AZ is public lands only 17% is privately owned.
- CO- More holes than positive aspects at this time. It is easier to make it fail than succeed.
- KS- Biggest concern is public livestock markets and the commingling.



- MT- Main hole the USDA is trying to do too much all at once. The bookend approach like Canada took would be the best way to start with a limited amount of species, and start with sexually intact animals. Perhaps reconsider the 48-hour trace back. Take more of a calculated smaller approach. Birth premises and slaughter premises.
- NE- Following the USDA guidelines and approach, thus far there has been good participation. There could have been some things done like tying source and age verification programs in order to help sell the program. The discussions over COOL and implement it.
- NV- At these early stages of animal ID, the lack of infrastructure in the industry to follow the movement of cattle is shown to be the biggest obstacle at this time. USDA's lack of a clear direction.
- OR- The biggest hole is that the brand does not ever track co-mingled piece of the picture.
- UT- Premises to premises movement where no change of ownership occurs, and no brand inspection is required.
- WI -Challenges with the USDA in regards to the lack of national direction, which include technology standards and timelines, etc.
- WY- Brand system, escalating costs. If an ID system is based on premises basis and the brand program is based on county lines.
- AB- Tag technology, which is limited at this particular time. The hole would be capturing animal movement from time of birth to death (tag retirement).

#### **40. What types of education are you doing?**

- CA- Seminars, workshops, attending fairs, industry meetings, mail outs, magazine articles, video, etc. These are in partnership with the University of California Extension, University of Ca Davis, Cal Poly University, Chico State, Farm Bureau, California Cattle Association, California Woolgrowers, California Veterinary Medical association, California Horse Racing Board, other CDFA agencies, etc.
- ID- 4-H, Idaho Cattle Association, Idaho Dairy Association, Idaho Vet Association, University of Idaho, Cooperative Extension.
- MI-The Michigan RFID Education Task Force was established in 2006 as a cooperative effort of the Michigan State University Extension, Michigan Department of Agriculture, Michigan Farm Bureau, Michigan Cattlemen's Association, and the Michigan Milk Producer Association. The objective of this task force is to develop, deliver, and assess the impact of an educational effort to enhance adoption of radio frequency identification (RFID) of cattle in Michigan. The task force is addressing this objective with a variety of industry print communications, media presentations, producer meetings, displays, and demonstration sites.

- MT- Website, informational brochures, fair booths, speak at meetings. Have also subcontracted with several trade organizations to help with outreach.
- NE- Brand, armed services agency, extensions.
- NV- Target proactive field inspectors that will be able to perform animal ID and do this from their car to allow for real-time access to the information.
- WY- Town hall meetings and WSGA publications.