UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PRIVATE

+ + + + +

ARMED FORCES EPIDEMIOLOGICAL BOARD

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

FEBRUARY 19, 2002

+ + + + +

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

+ + + + +

The Board met at the Island Club, North Island Naval Air Station, San Diego, California, at 7:24 a.m., Dr. Stephen Ostroff, presiding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPENING REMARKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ellen Embrey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stephen Ostroff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Rick Riddle</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD RESEARCH CENTER FOR DEPLOYMENT HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmdr. Margaret Ryan</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENING REMARKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Travis Luz</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD BIRTH &amp; INFANT HEALTH REGISTRY MILLENNIUM COHORT STUDY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmdr. Margaret Ryan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVENTIVE MEDICINE UPDATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Brian Balough</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. J. Gunzenhauser</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Kelly Woodward</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQUISITION OF ADENOVIRUS VACCINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Howell</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVY MEDICAL SURVEILLANCE UPDATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Alan J. Yund</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVENTIVE MEDICINE UPDATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmdr. Sharon Ludwig</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Michael Staunton</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeff Whitehead</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATE ON PENTAGON SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Walter Egerton</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(7:21 a.m.)

DR. OSTROFF: Let me call the meeting to order.

Let me begin by introducing Ms. Ellen Embrey, who was recently appointed the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Health Protection and Readiness in Dr. Winkenwerder's office. As the designated federal official, she has the honor of calling the meeting to order.

MS. EMBREY: Thank you, Dr. Ostroff. The formal beginning of the meeting as the designated federal official for the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board, federal advisory committee, Secretary of Defense, which serves as a continuing scientific advisory body to the Secretary of Defense for Health and the surgeons general of the military departments, I hereby call the winter 2002 meeting to order.

I am pleased to see such a large turnout today for this meeting. I think that this reflects both the importance of the AFEB, Department of Defense and interesting topics that are on the meeting agenda.

Captain Luz, please accept my appreciation for your willingness to host and provide the outstanding support for this today and tomorrow.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much. On behalf of the board, let me welcome everybody. We certainly look forward to working with you and with Dr. Winkenwerder. Certainly I can
speak for all of the board members in my tenure as the board
president.

In comparison to many of our recent meetings, we
have a very robust agenda, to say the least. There are a large
number of issues that we have before us.

Let me just begin by thanking Captain Luz and the
Naval Health Research Center staff for hosting the meeting of the
AFEB. I realize how difficult it is to put on a meeting of this
size, and we certainly appreciate it.

Let me just take a minute or two and just say the
last time that we met in September, we knew that a lot was going
to happen even at that time. That was the week after September
11th. I think all of us were very pleased and proud to be able
to at least contribute in some small way. I think, speaking at
least for myself and, I'm sure, for all of the board members, we
certainly are very proud of what's been achieved during that
interim time period.

In addition to what's been going on with our
forces overseas, another thing that we're very pleased about is
that Dr. Winkenwerder was nominated to be the Assistant Secretary
of Defense for Health Affairs. He was nominated on September
21st, I think, just after the last board meeting and was
confirmed by the senate on October the 16th. His CV and bio are
in the briefing books. He's responsible for overall supervision
of the health and medical affairs of the Department of Defense
and serves as the principal staff assistant and advisor to the Secretary of Defense for all DOD health policies, programs and activities and, subject to the direction of the Secretary of Defense, exercises oversight of all DOD health resources.

One of those resources is the AFEB. We're extremely pleased that he took the time out of his very busy schedule to be here with us for part of today and for part of tomorrow as well. I had the pleasure of meeting him back in December.

DR. WINKENWERDER: Thank you, Dr. Ostroff. It's really nice to be here. I appreciate the strong participation and involvement of so many people, including a lot of bright, thoughtful and very well-trained individuals who -- all of you have a very, very important role in helping to advise the Department of Defense, including surgeons general and my office.

So I want to thank you, first of all, for being here and doing what you do.

I understand that you do this work without pay. So you're really doing yeoman's work. We really appreciate that.

I personally appreciate what you're doing.

I'm going to just make a couple of prepared remarks and then I'll close with a couple other comments.

The AFEB considers -- and I'm saying this for some of you who -- and I've already run into a couple of you -- who are here for the first time, to outline the mission...
here -- considers medical issues as they relate to operations, policy, research and development and include, but are not necessarily limited to, preventive medicine, occupational environmental health and health promotion programs. AFEB prepares and makes recommendations based on science, technological and epidemiologic principles. All of you are nationally recognized with competence in your field.

The board, for those of you who are wondering about the history, was conceived in the beginning of World War II, established formally by the Secretary of War, before there was a DOD, in January, 1941. It was rechartered later when there became a Department of Defense and has operated since that time.

Since 1955, the board has produced over 400 recommendations with numerous individual reports. There's a tremendous history here. I think with that history goes a recognition not only within DOD but outside the rest of the federal government and even beyond that to the general public that this is a very important group that can be counted on to give unvarnished, unbiased, scientific advice. That's what we need. We need that. We need it today, I think, as much as we have ever needed it.

There are many, many important issues that have been worked on and are certainly the very important ones today that we'll consider. I look forward to working with you. I'm here not on a perfunctory mission, but I'm here because I
consider the work of this group very important. I want to send that signal. We've got a lot of important issues that we need to make recommendations to the secretary on, frankly.

So your perspective and your thought behind it, that's all helpful to me personally, but I think particularly to the leadership of the department.

So thanks again for being here. I look forward to participating for a couple of hours this morning and learning about your work. I may jump in from time to time.

I won't bother you with my background, but I was originally trained as an internist and also spent a couple years working to become an epidemiologist and health services researcher. Fate didn't take me in that direction in terms of a long-term career, but I enjoy this kind of work and appreciate what's involved with it.

So thanks so much. I turn it back over to you. I think we've got some presentations to make.

DR. OSTROFF: Right. Thanks very much. The other thing you didn't mention about your background is that you worked for a number of years at that other fine Atlanta institution down the street from the CDC.

DR. WINKENWERDER: Yes, exactly.

DR. OSTROFF: What we're going to do now -- unfortunately I think, as probably many of you are aware, there was some sort of accident on the bridge coming over the
causeway. Captain Luz isn't here yet, but we're going to go ahead and do the presentation anyway. I think Commander Ryan is going to accept the plaque.

LT. COL. RIDDLE: So, Captain (sic) Ryan, if you would please accept this plaque on behalf of the Armed Forces Epi Board. It's to the command and staff of the Naval Health Research Center in appreciation for hosting the winter 2002 meeting of the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board.

(Applause.)

LT. COL. RIDDLE: If we could have Shawn and Suzanne to join us too.

From Dr. Winkenwerder we have certificates for Shawn, for Suzanne.

Commander Ryan, Ms. Suzanne Clark and Mr. Shawn Watson, please accept these certificates of appreciation for your outstanding professional knowledge and willingness to assist and cooperate on all issues supporting the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board winter 2002 meeting.

Ms. Leslie Henry and Ms. Jennifer Strickler are not with us this morning. They'll be here later, but they've also helped us tremendously in setting this meeting up. I'm fairly new to the board. Believe me, it takes a lot of logistical efforts to pull one of these together and make it happen. We couldn't do that without the support of the hosting organization. We really appreciate that.
(Applause.)

CMDR. RYAN: Well, I'm not quite sure what happened to Captain Luz, but I'm --

REAR ADM. HART: Let me go ahead and welcome everybody on behalf of Captain Luz.

I have a certain intimate relationship with NHRC since I'm the reporting senior for our two research commands. I have spoken with Captain Luz periodically in the past about the importance of the AFEB -- maybe I better have someone speak for me now. He and I share the same high regard.

There's a number of treasures that we have in the Department of Defense. One of those treasures is our association with the AFEB. Anything that NHRC can do to further the good work of this body, we're more than welcome -- more than eager to do so.

So I don't know where Travis is. He's probably on the bridge somewhere. I hope he's behind the accident instead of in it. On behalf of Captain Luz and the NHRC, we welcome the AFEB.

CMDR. RYAN: Thank you, sir. Is this on, Colonel?

DR. OSTROFF: Yeah, we're going to go ahead. We have a couple of administrative remarks.

There are two new board members that are in attendance. I'd like to welcome them. We also have five of the six nominees, in addition to Dr. Haywood, over there, who
probably is the longest serving member of the board. It's good
to see him come back. The two new board members are Dr. Cline
and -- I have to find out where everybody is sitting -- Dr.
Cattani, who also serve as a consultant.

What I'd like to do -- because, to many of you,
not all the board members are familiar -- is to just go around
the table and have everyone introduce themselves so you know who
they are.

Why don't we start on this side?

CMDR. LUDWIG: I'm Commander Sharon Ludwig. I'm
the Coast Guard preventive medicine officer.

DR. WHITEHEAD: I'm Jeff Whitehead. I'm with
Force Health Protection, Canadian Department of National Defense.

MAJ. BALOUGH: Brian Balough, joint staff,
preventive medicine officer.

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: Jeff Gunzenhauser with the
Army Surgeon General's Office.

LT. COL. WOODWARD: Lieutenant Colonel Kelly

DR. NESS: Roberta Ness.

DR. MALMUD: Leon Malmud.

DR. BERG: Bill Berg, Captain, Virginia Health
Department.

DR. PATRICK: Kevin Patrick.

DR. POLAND: Greg Poland from the Mayo Clinic,
previously served on the board for six years.

    DR. RUNYAN: Carol Runyan, University of North Carolina School of Public Health and Injury Prevention.

    DR. SHANAHAN: Dennis Shanahan. I'm a private consultant.

    DR. SHOPE: I'm Bob Shope with the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston.

    COL. CROPPER: Leo Cropper of the Air Force Research Laboratory.

    MS. EMBREY: Ellen Embrey with the Department of Defense.

    LT. COL. RIDDLE: Lieutenant Colonel Riddle, the Executive Secretary for the AFEB.

    DR. OSTROFF: Steve Ostroff from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

    DR. WINKENWERDER: Bill Winkenwerder again from the Department of Defense.

    REAR ADM. HART: I'm Steve Hart, the Navy Surgeon General's representative and director of Navy Medicine Research and Development.

    DR. CAMPBELL: I'm Doug Campbell. I'm a consultant in North Carolina in occupational and environmental medicine.

    DR. CATTANI: Jacqui Cattani, director of the Center for Biological Defense in South Florida and professor of
public health at the College for Public Health.

DR. CLINE: Barnett Cline, professor emeritus, Department of Tropical Medicine, Tulane.

DR. FORSTER: I'm Jean Forster.

DR. GRAY: My name is Greg Gray with the University of Iowa.

DR. HERBOLD: John Herbold.

DR. LEMASTERS: Grace Lemasters, Department of Environmental Health, University of Cincinnati's College of Medicine.

DR. HAYWOOD: Julian Haywood, University of Southern California School of Medicine.

DR. GARDNER: I'm Pierce Gardner. I'm a professor of medicine at the State University of New York at Stoney Brook and also work as a consultant at the Fogarty International Center.

COL. STAUNTON: Michael Staunton.

CAPT. YUND: I'm Jeff Yund, the preventive medicine doc in the Navy and the Navy's liaison officer to the AFEB.

LT. CMDR. CONNER: Byron Conner. I'm actually sitting in for Captain Schor. Either that or he grew a little bit.

DR. OSTROFF: We're sorry that Captain Schor had an illness in the family and was unable to attend.
Let me turn the microphone over to Colonel Riddle for a few administrative remarks.

LT. COL. RIDDLE: Good morning and welcome. We couldn't plan for the accident this morning.

I have a couple of administrative remarks before we begin. I would like to thank Admiral Hart, the NHRC staff here for hosting this.

I also want to thank Ms. Jean Ford and Ms. Karen Bralley and Lisa Mims for all of their efforts in the background.

If you haven't signed in, please make sure you sign in at the registration desk. As a federal advisory committee, we are required by law to make a record of all at the meeting.

This afternoon when we finish up, the board and the preventive medicine officers will be going to MCRD for a tour. So we'll just carpool from here at 11:30. We have lunch reservations over at -- restaurant and then the tour starts at 1:30.

We do have a roster out there. If you don't plan on attending, let us know, because we have several folks that wanted to go, but they did limit us to about 30 people for the tour and then a presentation over there.

The next AFEB meeting is the 21st and 22nd of May.

We have three formal meetings a year. That is February, May and September, the third Tuesday and Wednesday. This meeting will be
at the United States Army Medical Research Institute for Infectious Diseases at Fort Detrick in Frederick, Maryland. It looks like we already have a fairly robust agenda for that meeting. We'll work the security clearances for all of our folks getting in, because at that meeting we review the chairman's threat list and make recommendations on immunizations and biologics in accordance with the ranked biological warfare.

We'll have refreshments both this afternoon -- this morning and afternoon and tomorrow. Lunch today is available at the 19th Hole Restaurant and the Beach House Cafe for those folks who are staying here. Tomorrow there will be a buffet here and also at the 19th Hole and Beach House Cafe.

The restrooms are just right outside the door. If you do have any information that needs to get to you while you're here at the meeting, we do have a fax here in the building. The number is 619-545-0522. Then there's a phone right outside the door here. That number is 619-545-0360. Lisa will be out there to handle it.

For any transportation issue, please see myself or Lisa or Karen.

Tonight we have the dinner of the board. There are maps up on the table. It's open to all of the board members and attendees. We'll try to leave from the Navy Lodge lobby at about 8:45 -- or 6:45 this evening. That's in Old Town.
We also -- to aid with the transcription, if you could please identify yourselves and speak into the microphones.

I think our audio guy is tied up in the traffic also. Karen is taking a crash course this morning filling in. So we'll get through it.

Also, please remember this is a federal advisory committee. It is open to the public. There may be members of the public and press present here.

DR. OSTROFF: Let's move on now to our presentation since Captain Luz is not here yet. I think Commander Ryan is going to give the overview. She's the director of the Department of Defense Center for Deployment Health Research at the Naval Health Research Center.

She's going to give the overview and then also talk about some of the work being done at NHRC. Thank you.

CMDR. RYAN: Thank you, sir. Actually, I hear that Captain Luz is on his way up. So I may -- should I wait, Colonel, or --

LT. COL. RIDDLE: If you want to -- you want to -- or we could transition --

CMDR. RYAN: Do you want me to go to the next --

LT. COL. RIDDLE: Yeah, let's go ahead and give your brief and we'll let Captain Luz --

CMDR. RYAN: Dr. Winkenwerder, Ms. Embrey, Admiral Hart, Dr. Ostroff and members of the board and distinguished
guests, welcome to Naval Health Research Center. I'm delighted to represent my group, the Department of Defense Center for Deployment Health Research, which is one of the directorates at the Naval Health Research Center.

We have within our center sort of two research arms, if you will. One is deployment epidemiology. We think we're one of the largest, if not the largest, group of epidemiologic researchers in the Department of Defense. We also have a research interest in emerging infectious disease. We have an impressive infectious disease laboratory where our focus is mostly respiratory infections.

Tomorrow you'll hear a little bit more -- I'm sorry, not tomorrow, but later today -- a little bit more about the infectious disease part from my colleague, Dr. Russell, who will speak about the pneumococcal vaccine trial.

We currently have 68 research staff. Three of us are active-duty medical officers in the Navy. We currently have one or two Air Force billets about to come to fruition at our research center, which we're delighted about since it is a DOD center. The rest are Henry M. Jackson contract staff, really a wonderful staff that I'm privileged to work with.

The origins of our team actually grew out of the legacy of the Gulf War, that is, the brunt of our research and the concerns about what made Gulf War veterans have problems after deployment.
The original Gulf War studies in our team are a credit to Captain Gray, Dr. Gray, who is now a distinguished member of the board. He developed these seven studies which were well embraced by the Department of Defense and led to some wonderful research products.

The studies of symptoms, hospitalizations and reproductive health effects, which were the main concerns of the Gulf War veterans -- and these are some of the highlights of products that grew out of that research.

We actually still have some active projects looking at Gulf War exposed veterans and the epidemiology about the Gulf War exposures. Most of the research has, of course, developed past the Gulf War to more current deployment concerns.

Again, the focus of our group is always to publish in the peer review literature, which is the standard we hold ourselves to.

Because of that success, the Department of Defense stood up three centers for deployment health back in 1998, '99. One was the Deployment Health Research Center, which was designated here at NHRC. Then there's a clinical center, our sister center, at Walter Reed, and a medical surveillance center at CHPPM, at the Army's Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine. So all three make up the centers for deployment health.
These are some of the projects that we evolved into after the Gulf War. You can see there's still a few points here -- registry studies relate to Gulf War illness. Health experience of Saudi Arabian National Guard is an interesting study that we're doing with our colleagues in Saudi Arabia and their post-Gulf War experience.

We're comparing the experience of those deployed to Southwest Asia, which is the Gulf War area after the war, and Bosnia to the Gulf War veterans. We have some interesting epidemiologic work looking at the health experience of those who have received Anthrax vaccine.

We're looking at ciprofloxacin used in the last 12 months, which is an interesting epidemiologic analysis after the bioterrorist threats in 2001. We're looking at risk factors for dysfunctional careers and dysfunctional family life that may be predicted in recruits by some current screening tools. We've got a little bit of work in tobacco cessation in recruits because we have this interest in basic trainees.

We've looked at epidemiology of other common things of concern, like STDs and asthma, H. pylori infections. Then we have some large survey studies. These are two small survey studies, actually, immunization knowledge, attitudes and beliefs and a study of complementary and alternative medicine.

We have a clinical trial center. It's actually down the hill from us, physically removed, but at one of the
clinics that's a branch clinic of the large medical center here, the Naval Medical Center San Diego -- at this branch clinic, we've stood up a center where we've staffed it with folks who see patients for some clinical trials.

We stood this up originally to do two VA/DOD cooperative studies in Gulf War veterans, which have recently wrapped up. Those were studies of antibiotic treatment and multi-symptom treatment of those with chronic multi-symptom illnesses.

Now we're doing two sort of interesting studies with patients and the effect of combination treatment with D-permethrin and pyridostigmine bromide on symptoms and neurocognitive function and an assessment of the potential relationship between obesity and adenovirus infection, sort of a marrying of our interested infectious disease and other epidemiology.

These are our three large projects in our center.

So all of what I've just shown you are actually smaller projects in relationship to these through Recruit Assessment Program, the birth and infant health registry and the millennium cohort study.

This morning I'll be giving you a few more slides particularly on the birth and infant health registry and millennium cohort study, as I know they're of interested to the board, and the Recruit Assessment Program is, of course,
something we'll discuss all morning tomorrow.

Just a few quick slides on the overview of the laboratory. Again, Dr. Russell will perhaps give you a better feeling of the laboratory work that we're doing. We have some unique capabilities for diagnosing respiratory pathogens of importance to our deployed members and to all of our active-duty members.

We have a wonderful relationship with centers around the country and a few that are outside of the United States in respiratory disease surveillance and respiratory disease research projects.

So we're doing surveillance for viral pathogens, which of importance includes adenovirus, influenza, some surveillance for Group A strep, for strep pneumonia. There's a pneumococcal vaccine trial, again, Dr. Russell will speak of, some pertussis work at a few of the basic training centers. It's surveillance for respiratory syncytial virus, which is actually a collaboration with our colleagues in the United Kingdom.

Again, the standard we hold ourselves to is to publish in the peer review literature. These are some of our recent products. We're also proud that the laboratory is CAP certified, College of American Pathology certified, since 1999 and that we're under consideration as a WHO collaborating center.

That's my team up on the hill there in Point Loma.

It's really a beautiful place to work and some wonderful people
to work with. I'm privileged to represent them today to give you this brief overview. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

DR. OSTROFF: I think we have a minute or two. Are there any questions?

(No audible response.)

DR. OSTROFF: It's early. Captain Luz is here.

We switched the order so that you can do the overview. Welcome. Thank you for hosting the meeting.

CAPT. LUZ: Good morning, and we're certainly honored to be hosting this group and this meeting this next few days.

My apologies. I had no idea that Point Loma was an hour and ten minutes away. Actually on the bridge there was a four-car accident and somebody actually pushed me during that particular period, trying to get me here early. So I appreciated that as well.

Again, welcome. I think a few of you are coming over to see us while you're here in town. Again, we're happy to host you and welcome you, again, to our facility over at Point Loma.

You have a more complete version of this slide in your packets, but I just wanted to take the opportunity to address the other capabilities that we have outside of Point
Loma. It's, again, in support of Force Health Protection and the
pillars therein.

Starting up in your upper left-hand corner, again,
the Naval Health Research Center San Diego is just part of, you
know, the laboratories that are in support of operational medical
research. You can see the DOD centers that Commander Ryan talked
about with her group.

We also have birth defects and the agent for AIDS
and the epidemiological issues that we're confronting right now
in Africa. Commander Schafer was actually a part of the SG's
lineup this morning, giving that brief. It's been a wonderfully
successful effort that's been continued with funding through DOD
as well.

In the lower left-hand corner we have our
electromagnetic radiation facility. That's at Brooks Air Force
Base down in San Antonio. Again, addressing such issues as
lasers for air crew -- we hope to get involved in the electric
boat that's coming out as well within the Navy. That's a very
capable group down there.

Continuing over to the Naval Aerospace Medical
Research Laboratory in Pensacola, Florida, they're doing anything
from trying to determine the best candidates for the aviation
curriculums and programs down there to sound attenuation issues
and others.

Moving up a little bit north of that, we have
Wright-Patt Air Force Base, toxicology detachment there as well.

Then in the upper right-hand corner, all the way up, is the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory in Groton, Connecticut.

We gave you a little more complete version of that in your packet. I won't talk about that any longer, just to show you the versatility of the capabilities we have within the Naval Health Research Center.

Again, we just wanted to put out on our web page, we have a wealth of information out there for you. Please dial in, take a look.

I wanted to thank Commander Ryan and Commander Russell for all that they've done in helping put this together. Again, welcome to San Diego. It's a great time of year to be out here, as opposed to on the East Coast, for some of you. I hope you get an opportunity to enjoy some of that while you're here as well. So thank you.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much. For all of us it's a pleasure to be here.

I think what we're doing now is we're moving on to the preventive medicine update.

Oh, I'm sorry, return appearance by Commander Ryan first.

CMDR. RYAN: Again, in the interest of the board, I know they wanted to hear a little bit more about two of our
efforts here, the birth and infant health registry.

These are our collaborators. Toni Hooper from USIS is -- actually is in the audience. We're privileged to have her with us today. Then our local research staff and several consultants work on this project, Larry Edmonds from CDC, Dr. Jones from local UCSD and Dr. King from the Naval Medical Center.

The origins of the birth and infant health registry go back to the senate committee on veterans affairs recommending specifically the establishment of a birth defects registry for military service members. This was back in 1998. Again, there's some interest post-Gulf War for some of these efforts. Some of the wonderful epidemiologic work actually grew from the experience of the Gulf War.

Justification for birth registries or birth defect registries -- just quickly, birth defects are, of course, extremely common, may be represented in 15% of all conceptions. They're very costly. A quarter to a third of pediatric hospitalizations are related to birth defects. They're the leading cause of infant mortality. Of course, they're extraordinarily concerning.

Thirty-five states have birth registries or birth defect registries or birth defect monitoring programs. Each of those 35 states does the surveillance in a little bit different way, but all of them have the same concern.

It's interesting -- not everybody realizes that
not all 50 states do this. It's not an extremely easy thing to do surveillance for and to do it well.

They're very concerning things.

Occupational environmental exposures concern both parents and policy makers and, of course, Department of Defense. This picture from Life magazine brought it home again. It's sort of a Gulf War interest, but this is a Marine with his son, who has some severe congenital anomalies.

So what do we do in our birth defect surveillance work? The population under surveillance includes all Department of Defense beneficiaries, which is really a very large umbrella, so anybody who receives health care under the umbrella of DOD.

We capture outcomes from both inpatient and outpatient encounters in both military and civilian facilities. The capability to do this only became realized in about '98, '99, which is one of the reasons why we really didn't have a birth defect registry or surveillance program before that time. We're able to capture all that data to create the denominator, which is all live births in any given period of time, and then the numerator, if you will, the outcome of interest are ICD-9-coded birth defects from all of those health care encounters.

We use the ICD-9 code list -- it's nationally recognized and created by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Again, it's just ICD-9 coding, but it does allow comprehensive capture of the outcomes of interest. What we show,
then, is the prevalence of birth defects diagnosed in the first year of life for all infants born under the DOD umbrella.

These are acronyms that show the databases that are put together to do this. STR, SATR and HCSR are actually databases that include all of the inpatient and outpatient encounters both in civilian and military facilities. Again, all of that gets put together into the registry.

About 40% of babies are born at civilian facilities -- I'm sorry, are born at military facilities and 60% are born at civilian facilities, which is why it's extraordinarily important to capture the civilian health care encounters under the tri-care system, if you will.

There's complex algorithms that we have developed to account for duplication and miscoding. We're privileged that we have unique identifiers for all of our beneficiaries and all of the infants born to our beneficiaries, but still there's a lot of algorithms that are necessary to look at this data, to look at them well.

How strong are the data on outcomes? Well, we do active case validation at this large medical center that's down the road from us, the Naval Medical Center San Diego. They have about 3,700 births per year at that DOD facility. Again, this is a military facility. We look at every one of those births and see if the ICD-9 coding is correct, so to speak. We find that it's an extremely strong correlation between the actual infant
records and the ICD-9 coding.

This just shows you a little bit of this data.

Ninety-three percent have completely matched records. Most of the mismatches are slight miscodings. A classic example are some of the heart defects I've shown you down here -- patent ductus arteriosis is one of those diagnoses that's most challenging for all birth defect surveillance programs because the ICD-9 coding doesn't do justice to the kind of things that are most concerning to birth defects researchers, and we find the same thing that the civilians state registries find which is that's the most common source of challenge in the data.

REAR ADM. HART: What happened in '98 or '99? Was it policy or technology that gave us this capability?

CMDR. RYAN: To my understanding, technology but probably policy as well which drove that technology. It's the access to HCSR data -- Health Care Service Record data -- which is all the Tricare data -- was not available before about '98 or so.

LT. COL. RIDDLE: In addition, sir, I actually worked this policy. We funded from the P-6 research side of it -- the feasibility of doing it, based upon the feasibility study.

CMDR. RYAN: What we see in our surveillance system is about 90,000 births per year to military families. Nineteen percent of those babies are born to active-duty mothers,
and the rest are born to other beneficiaries, either dependent wives or other beneficiaries.

The basic demographics we see is relatively young population with mean maternal age of 26 years and a racial distribution that looks a little bit like the rest of the Department of Defense and not unlike the rest of the United States.

Sponsors are spread out much like the rest of the Department of Defense with mostly Army and the smallest proportion coming from the Marine Corps.

It's interesting that we can see DOD-sponsored births in all 50 states, whether there are military facilities there or not, and that's because, again, the civilian facilities are captured, and then we see births, of course, in foreign countries. There's more than 2,000 births per year in Germany and Japan, and then those are the largest states where we actually get data from this well.

What's cool about the birth defect registry and the Department of Defense is that we can link these data to things like occupational code, past duty station, past deployment, some occupational exposures of interest that are not necessarily easy for our nonmilitary counterparts to do, so we can actually say quite a bit about maternal and paternal exposures in the birth defect cases, and these are the attributes that make our system very attractive to CDC and the states who...
are doing birth defect surveillance.

This is a graph just to give you an example of something -- it's a little bit before the birth defect registry, but this is birth rate in the military facilities among active duty, and what it shows is a little baby boom after the Gulf War. In fact, right after '91, there's a little baby boom, and then the rate goes down.

This also illustrates that, if we could fill in the data, we would assume that the HCSR data or the Tricare data, the civilian facility data, actually makes up for a lot of that gap, if you will, in birth rate. There are more births at civilian facilities now than in the past decades.

So what do we see overall? We actually contribute to the annual national birth defects prevention program that 35 states contribute to, so in a way we're another state, if you will, and we see a prevalence of birth defects overall in about three to four percent of live births which is very consistent with civilian data.

The most commonly diagnosed defects are, again, some of the heart defects and hyperspadias epispadius which is also very consistent with our civilian counterparts.

It's important to talk about the limitations when we talk about the surveillance system, and it's the same limitations that others who are doing the same kind of registries or surveillance systems have to deal with.
Our surveillance is limited to live births, so we can't capture birth defects on early pregnancy losses, abortions or stillbirths. In those instances, the denominator would be pregnancy instead of births which is extremely hard to capture, and again this is an important limitation, but in terms of comparing data overall or comparing it to our peers, it's not a fatal limitation because that's really what all of the surveillance systems are able to capture.

And it may be the tip of the iceberg when we think about teratogens, but it's an important component to be able to fully capture the data on live births.

We can't capture anything diagnosed after one year of age, and this is important because certainly the diagnosis of developmental disabilities, autism and so on are becoming increasingly important and not diagnosed before one year of age.

The ICD-9 codes can't describe everything we'd like them to. They don't describe well constellations of defects. They don't describe well severity of defects, and really it takes a lot of chart review and case validation if you really want to look closely at those defects.

So we're limited to some extent when we look at these electronic data.

And, again, the active case validation at Naval Medical Center may not represent the entire Department of Defense or our civilian facilities that we're interested in. So that's
an important limitation as well.

The value, though, of the system is that the system does completely capture the data we intended it to capture, and our ability to link again to environmental and occupational exposures is really an exciting attribute.

We do think that the system complements our civilian counterparts doing this kind of public health research and surveillance, and we've been very well received by those folks who are doing this kind of surveillance.

That's the sublink on the website to the birth defects or birth and infant health registry page which is easily found on the NHRC website.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you. Dr. Berg?

DR. BERG: Bill Berg. Megan, as you've alluded to, the validation of the birth defect coding is critical, and you pointed out that just because it's accurate in San Diego does not mean it's accurate elsewhere.

Is it possible that the accuracy in San Diego has increased -- the scrutiny that you conducted it to -- which might speak a little bit to the accuracy reporting elsewhere? In other words, how long have you been coding -- scrutinizing the coding, and has it gotten better over that time?

CMDR. RYAN: We have that concern, about whether or not we have influenced the coding in San Diego. We don't
believe that we have. We call it the prime directive, if you will, the noninterference directive.

So we do our work as invisibly as possible at Naval Medical Center-San Diego, and the one full-time extractor we have there is literally in the basement of the hospital, looking at records -- he's not able to interact with the coders or the people who put in those ICD-9 codes into the STR system.

So we don't believe that we have influenced it.

The other thing that makes us feel good about that is in the feasibility study that Colonel Riddle alluded to -- the kind of agreement that was found there which was in the very genesis of the birth defect surveillance system is the same that we're finding now.

So Naval Medical Center may be doing a great job; we don't think we're influencing the great job they're doing, and we know that it may not represent the rest of DOD or the civilian facilities.

DR. BERG: What happens if your extractor finds a significantly different coding than the -- it stays in the record.

CMDR. RYAN: That's correct. Yes, ma'am?

DR. LEMASTERS: Grace Lemasters. I want to comment on a very intensive effort I know this setting must take to accomplish. I was just wondering -- it appears that you're gearing up for some analysis, and I was wondering what are your
first occupational analysis exposure groups. Have you made any
decisions along that line?

CMDR. RYAN: We have -- one first study is the
linking of Anthrax vaccine to birth defects outcomes among
active-duty women who received Anthrax vaccine, and some of the
board members have already been involved in discussions of this
work which is fairly interesting.

I may leave it to Dr. Ostroff to see if we want to
digress into talking about that. It's been a fascinating
analysis.

And then I spoke to you, ma'am, about a year and a
half or so ago about jet fuel exposure, and it's still an
interest or ours to use the jet fuel-exposed occupations as
something of interest and analysis in looking at the birth defect
outcomes.

So we have that ability, and it's really an issue
of which things rise to the top in terms of DOD priorities and
objectives, which things may get funded in competitive research
grants that we may put out, as things that we want to look at.

The Anthrax vaccine issue was not one that was
funded by a competitive grant. It was just of such high interest
to DOD that we were asked to specifically make that a priority.

DR. RUNYAN: Carol Runyan. I'm curious to know if
the registry is also capable of tracking other outcomes besides
birth defects. I'm, of course, particularly interested in trauma
and perhaps issues of child abuse.

   CMDR. RYAN:  It's a fascinating question. We actually have one spin-off study, if you will -- it's not so much a spin-off but a complementary study on infantile neoplasms.

   We think neoplasms, like birth defects -- there are sort of major ICD-9 codes that are relatively consistent and easy to capture. Now, there's not a lot of civilian counterparts for doing infantile neoplasm surveillance. There's certainly childhood cancer -- is of great interest.

   We have a little more trouble with childhood cancer because of the denominator's so moving for children and -- under the DOD umbrella. Children come in, and children go out at all ages of childhood.

   But infants -- that first year of life is relatively stable, so we're doing some basic surveillance in infantile neoplasms -- capable of getting anything that is -- right now in the first year of life is our limit in terms of the data we're collecting, but yeah, trauma, any other outcome of interest would be in there.

   DR. RUNYAN:  Do you know if the data are e-coded as well as having diagnostic?

   CMDR. RYAN:  E-coded -- I'm sorry?

   DR. RUNYAN:  E-code is external cause of injury. Right?

   AUDIENCE MEMBER:  They're not.
DR. RUNYAN: They're not.

(Side discussions in audience.)

CMDR. RYAN: So there are some V-codes for procedures and so on, but not that degree of granularity.

DR. NESS: Roberta Ness. We've actually discussed these issues -- the Anthrax and birth defects, and I wondered whether there had been any discussion at any point in the creation of this database with regard to the collection of biomarker data on even a subset of the infants born within the DOD.

CMDR. RYAN: Not so far. There's not any sort of set system to collect either blood or sera or something on infants or placenta samples.

It certainly could be written in as protocol in and of itself, but there's no archive or ability to do that right now.

We do have -- we do make use of a sera repository for active-duty members. Occasionally in studies when we have sera drawn annually for HIV testing -- gets kept in a sera repository, and that's been a wonderful asset in looking at things retrospectively like hepatitis-C and so on in the Department of Defense.

So for parental archives, there may be something there, but not for -- there's no archive of infantile biospecimens.
DR. NESS: Even if there are maternal data, there may be some opportunity to do some creative matching which may enhance the validity of some of the exposure numbers.

CMDR. RYAN: Absolutely.

DR. OSTROFF: Other comments? I have one question. Is there any thought being given to validate the type of validation here in San Diego and anywhere else -- even on a periodic, if not ongoing, basis?

CMDR. RYAN: Yes, and it's been an increasingly -- a topic of increasing interest to do the validation at other facilities. It takes some work to get into the facilities to do this work.

We have a letter from the admiral at the Naval Medical Center-San Diego that gave us sort of a five-year permission to look at records. It's certainly not easy to look at medical records, civilian or military.

So it would take some work to get in the door, and we're looking at that now, but whatever door we get into, we want to pick one that's important and fruitful, and it would seem like a civilian facility would be nice to really look at, but the civilian facilities are sort of onesies and twosies, if you will, compared to the military facilities for births. There's so many civilian facilities where births -- DOD births could happen.

So it's going to take some --

DR. OSTROFF: And there's also the issue of the
overseas births --

CMDR. RYAN: Exactly.

DR. OSTROFF: Of course, there's deployed personnel -- and there's always the issue about whether or not they have the risk factors --

CMDR. RYAN: Right, and the overseas births -- it actually can be complicated, too, because many high-risk births in members overseas are born in the United States.

When we look at birth defect prevalence in the overseas hospitals, it's much lower than in CONUS -- than in the United States because, of course, many high-risk pregnancies are sent back to the United States to give birth.

So the location of birth may not represent the location of pregnancy or conception or exposures of concern.

DR. OSTROFF: Or they may not be coding them right.

CMDR. RYAN: That's true.

DR. OSTROFF: Thanks.

CMDR. RYAN: Thank you, sir.

REAR ADM. HART: Megan, you mentioned the limitations of the birth registry. Do we just accept that as a fact of life, or do we need to address it? Do we need to lessen those limitations?

CMDR. RYAN: The primary limitation that all of us struggle with in birth defects research is this issue of only
knowing about live births, and epidemiologically we accept that.

To get the denominator to be pregnancies is an enormous amount of work, and you can do that in focused ways in cohort studies. It's an enormous amount of work. It's a very different epidemiologic surveillance system.

So the first one, you accept.

Diagnosing things after one year of age in the Department of Defense would be very difficult. As I was alluding to, children -- anytime we make the denominator bigger than about 12 months of age, children come in; they go out; it can be very complicated. So we -- if you're worrying about some exposure to children, you know, that may happen after birth, it can be very difficult.

So in the Department of Defense it's going to be difficult for us to do good epidemiologic research on things -- in children in this kind of surveillance system after one year of age.

But then, again, we're still consistent with civilian registries when we say birth defects -- the congenital anomalies are diagnosed before one year of age.

And then the other things, we can work on by doing the validation work at other facilities, just what Dr. Ostroff said.

So the last two bullets, I think, we can work on, yes. Yes, ma'am?
DR. LEMASTERS: Commander Ryan, just one -- Grace Lemasters -- I was wondering -- at least on a subset if you might be able to do something with the first item if you got a fetal death certificate and stillbirth certificates -- maybe not across the plane but on the group that you would have a lot of control over.

It seems like with fetal death certificates and stillbirths I think, after 20 weeks of gestation, there's supposed to be a fetal death certificate. You might capture a lot of important information.

CMDR. RYAN: That's true, and in substudies we could do that, and the states try to do that. States have different abilities to capture death certificate date.

As you said, the fetal death certificates exist to varying degrees of coding and granularity in terms of diagnoses on those death certificates in different states, and so -- but you're right; there's room there for substudies.

DR. OSTROFF: We'll take one more question, and then --

DR. MALMUD: Are DOD hospitals as yet doing neonatal screens for deafness? If so, is that considered on a birth certificate?

CMDR. RYAN: Yes. Do we -- military facilities follow the same standards as civilians in terms of the auditory assessment of newborns, but no, it's not considered a congenital
anomaly or defect in the ICD-9 list.

There are many things, actually, that aren't in that list, and I didn't include that as a limitation because the list is what makes us consistent with the state and CDC surveillance programs, but things like congenital hearing loss -- if there's no physical anomaly of the year -- are not actually on that list.

So there are some things that are quite concerning that are not on the list, but the list is congenital malformations.

DR. OSTROFF: Keep going.

CMDR. RYAN: All right, thank you, sir.

The millennium cohort studies -- another large effort in our group -- really, the largest effort in our group, and I'm privileged that my co-investigators -- several of them are in the audience and -- Dr. Gray on the board today -- Dr. Amoroso, Dr. Hooper in the audience today.

The millennium cohort study evolved from issues of the Gulf War. After the Gulf War, there were multiple review panels, registry evaluations, over a hundred million dollars in research, risk management program by the Office of the Special Assistance for Gulf War Illness, and overall an expense of maybe a billion dollars from the government to these efforts of addressing Gulf War-related health concerns.

And the origins of the millennium cohort study
grew more specifically from the Strom Thurmond Act, the defense authorization bill of 1999, where specifically it was recognized that only a longitudinal study -- a prospective study -- would really be able to evaluate all of the issues of concern of our deployers.

And so in this authorization they said specifically we should do this longitudinal study.

Then there was an Institute of Medicine report that we also recognize as important in the origins of the millennium cohort, and specifically they said to capitalize a new and planned DOD surveillance and other data in the data systems growing by leaps and bounds in the decade after the Gulf War.

We could make use of these data and begin a prospective study and for the first time actually measure the impact of deployment.

Sort of a pictorial -- I think we've used this from the Office of the Special Assistance for Gulf War Illness -- in terms of describing what does a longitudinal health study mean? Well, it means sort of from cradle to grave, if you will, following our folks in the military, from the time they come in or just before they come in to even after discharge and all of the things that happen to them in between. If we could capture all of those data well, we could really say something about the impact of all of those exposures on people's lifetime in the military and afterwards.
The methodology of the millennium cohort is to enroll 100,000 members which is about three percent of the military personnel who were on duty in October 2000, hence the name "millennium", and to enroll them in a study that would be just over 20 years, every three years, to survey them, to have them fill out a survey which was their self-report of functional status and health status, and to link those data to important outcomes.

The schema that you see there is how we enroll so there is an introduction and then this is a modification of Dillman methods, of surveying folks so we mail out with an iteration of a series of mailings to try to enroll people in the survey.

And then in 2004 and 2007, we'll enroll more, so we'll begin with 100,000 just this past year -- the beginnings of the enrollment began in 2001, and 2004 and 2007 -- there's an effort to get an additional 20,000 members which will represent younger people or newer people in the military in those years because we'll be a little bit overrated into older folks from the military in the original cohort.

And this is a little bit complicated schema of how the enrollment was determined. So there's a little bit of extra weighting to make sure we have an adequate number of women and an adequate number of reservists and an adequate number of people who have a past deployment history to Southwest Asia or Bosnia or...
Casbo (ph) in the original cohort.

So it's a stratified random sample of folks who were on active duty in 2000 in the original invitation to join the cohort.

So the survey instrument itself includes standard measures of functional status and health outcomes and health-related behaviors, and we can link those data to important things like demographics and deployment history to occupational exposures, to immunization data, outpatient care, inpatient care, reproductive health data -- again, alluding to the birth and infant health registry -- some disability data and mortality data after service through the VA system.

How do we get people to enroll? Well, we're working very hard on this, and in the initial stages of the survey a lot of the work has gone into enrollment, so we pretested the survey with focus groups. We made a very simple mark-sense questionnaire; we telephone-interviewed nonrespondents to see what made people not respond so we could reduce the nonresponse bias as much as possible.

We have a toll-free number that people call with questions, and we have incentives -- the T-shirt incentive has been especially well received; I have a few samples that I'm happy to give you, and we have a website that allows people not just to get information but to complete the questionnaire over the Internet which makes it easier for folks; it's not a short
questionnaire; it's as short as possible, but it's not extremely short, and so the website is actually the quickest way to complete the questionnaire for people who enroll in the study.

Where are we now? Well, we completed the pilot study in the spring of last year -- almost a year ago, and the full survey was launched -- or the full study, if you will, was launched in August of 2001, so we're less than six months or just about six months into the mailing cycle.

We have almost 50,000 respondents; we're almost halfway there. Seventeen thousand have responded over the Internet, which is exciting for us; it's actually very cost-saving for us as well for people to enroll over the Internet.

We've had only 2,700 who specifically declined. We have 29 people who were invited who were actually deceased. We track that closely so we don't mail to people who have passed away.

We actually had several people who were invited into the study and were victims of the September 11th attack on the Pentagon, and we took great pains to make sure that we did not send any mailings to those folks after the initial invitation.

September 11th was important in another way, and that's when we drew an expected enrollment curve, after September 11th our enrollment was markedly less than we would have liked, and we think it was because of September 11th and the outcomes
after that -- people deployed, people moved, people had different priorities -- mail was markedly slow. We've had people who have just received surveys that we sent them months ago. So it really was quite an impact to have the September 11th tragedy happen this year.

The oversight of management of this study is really a -- very privileged to work with all of these folks and the expertise that we've been given.

Dr. Foster, DDR&E, funds the study, and we get external consultation in designing the protocol.

American Institute of Biological Science does external peer review on the original study and an annual peer review on how we're doing. We have a specific scientific steering and advisory committee made up of Actimissions (ph) as well as Veterans Service Organization representatives, and the research working group of the Military and Veterans Health Coordinating Board also provides an oversight.

And these are the list of the specific co-investigators that I'm privileged to work with.

That's the meeting of the Scientific Steering and Advisory Committee last year, and we'll be meeting again this spring.

And this -- a little bit of pictorial of how we're doing and what we're doing.

The millennium cohort logo -- I don't know if
you've noticed our logos, but I have quite a few creative people
who work in my group, and we've never paid for artwork because we
have so many creative folks in our group, and Bay Senuchi (ph)
actually designed this for our team.

That big warehouse-looking place is a big
warehouse that is actually packing piles of surveys, and all of
the white things you see in the room are papers that belong to
the millennium cohort mailing. It's just a massive mailing when
you mail to over 100,000 people.

That's one mailroom that you see in the bottom
corner there with some of my team with stacks of mail, and then
that's a picture of some of my team modeling our T-shirts.

This is just a little bonus slide showing website
enrollment after each invitation, if you will, after each mailing
has gone out.

You can see our very last mailing over
there -- we've had a nice spike after -- so the -- perhaps
September 11th was affecting us, and we may have recovered to
some extent; we've increased some incentive work and looked at
other strategies to potentially increase our enrollment, but it
may take us a little longer than planned to get to our hundred
thousand enrollees, but we will get there.

And that's all I've got on millennium cohort.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you so much. It's really a
fantastic effort. Let me open it up.
DR. WINKENWERDER: I have just a question and a couple of comments -- just so I understand -- was the millennium study developed in response primarily to concerns around the Gulf War, or was it more broad-based?

CMDR. RYAN: The Gulf War was the motivation for this study, but the concern is that deployments and other exposures that the military has will -- we will be faced with the same questions that are so difficult to answer from the Gulf War -- that is, were these exposures things that caused people to be sick or to have chronic multi-symptom illnesses so that -- we won't be able to answer a lot of questions for Gulf War deployers but much more for future deployers.

DR. WINKENWERDER: But it is meant to answer some -- possibly some of the questions associated with the Gulf War.

CMDR. RYAN: Yes, it may, because the people invited into the survey -- many of them include Gulf War veterans.

DR. WINKENWERDER: Good. And just a couple of comments. First, just on the millennium study -- when I first came to know about this -- not that long ago -- a couple of months ago -- I was delighted to hear about it because it's a landmark kind of study -- very important, I think, to the department and will be for years.

The fact that people don't know much about this at
this time -- only time will show that this very important study
that will produce information for at least the next couple of
decades -- so I commend all those involved with it, who work on
it, to make it the best possible study process.

And secondly, I just wanted you and others to know
that I am interested in finding answers to Gulf War illness. We
in the department continue to be asked about that and continue to
ask to testify to Congress about this issue and have indicated
that I want to pursue this agenda.

That said, I would like us to -- and I would
support continued efforts that are focused on high areas of
opportunity, so I think it's incumbent upon us to make sure that
research is targeted on to issues where we think we might get
answers.

And at some point in the future, I think it might
be valuable to have statements that have not been in the past
commented upon -- some of the sort of larger issues of the Gulf
War illness.

I think we need in that independent voice -- the
Institute of Medicine provided some of that, but we need that.

As I think some people know, there's a small army
of others, researchers, some funded by private citizens that are
determined that there are answers there that we're not finding,
so I think it's incumbent upon us to search agenda and to make
statements to the best of our knowledge from a scientific
And so whether there's association between service and illness or not. Thanks for all your work.

CMDR. RYAN: Thank you, sir. Yes, ma'am?

DR. LEMASTERS: Grace Lemasters. Commander, as an epidemiologist, I can fully appreciate having sent out 5,000 letters -- what it must be like to do 100,000. It's mind-boggling, actually, but I was thinking about your incentives and what we found to help increase response rate, and some research has shown that just enclosing a small cash incentive in your letter, sort of hooks the person into being a part of it, and I just wondered if you'd tried a cash incentive to increase response rate.

From the literature, it's pretty clear that that really helps.

The other thought I was having was -- is there any way that you could use this millennium data to cross-validate some of the findings of births and a birth cohort -- do you list any births, for example -- are you asking about births among the women in --

CMDR. RYAN: Yes. Let me answer the births question first. There are questions in the survey that particularly address pregnancy, and so that would be a wonderful way to collect a denominator of pregnancies in a subset of the cohort or in the cohort, so absolutely there's every intention to
look at reproductive health outcomes as a part of this cohort.

Cash incentives -- hotly debated among our co-investigators and research teams. We do know that it would likely help us to put cash incentives in the surveys, and I'm sorry if I didn't recognize Dr. Amoroso before as a co-investigator in the audience, but he's been wonderful in terms of helping us to figure out best ways to enroll people in the survey.

The Institutional Review Boards and some policy makers in DOD have said you can't do that with active-duty people -- entice people with cash. We're not so sure that we can't, but because of the challenges in getting over those hurdles of folks who thought that it may not be appropriate to do that with active-duty folks -- it wasn't included in the first round of inviting people in the survey. It may be something that we do add as we need to entice people to enroll in the cohort, especially for a 20-year commitment.

DR. HERBOLD: John Herbold. I'm reminded of a report of a former board member in 1985 -- Dr. Paul Densin -- the report that he gave me, I have a copy of it -- 1941 UMED report on the need for vital statistics, long-term follow-up of folks in the military setting.

So my question to you, Megan, might be a little bit unfair, but this is a fantastic study, but it's termed as a study -- it has an end date, 2002 -- the studies that I've been
involved in -- military have started and stopped -- do you think there's any possibility that at some time this would become part of the practice of occupational medicine and occupational health and it would become institutionalized in the operational funding --

CMDR. RYAN: Maybe that's a hard question for me, so -- I still intend to -- when the study is completed -- you know, in terms of operationalizing, the recruit assessment that we'll talk about tomorrow is one of those issues that likely will operationalize the collection of this self-reported data that we're interested in longitudinally, but right now there's not a current protocol on the table or policy on the table to operationalize collecting this kind of periodic data on all our forces except perhaps for maybe the HEAR surveys -- that's the health promotion, health assessment surveys, but they don't go past service; they don't go past people getting out of the service, which is a feature of this cohort -- Framingham-style cohort study which doesn't recognize a limit when people get out of the service.

So to answer your question, I think there's a lot of folks with those concerns that we need to operationalize some thing -- some pieces of this as what we will always do with all of our folks. Yes.

DR. OSTROFF: We have time for one or two more --

DR. CLINE: Barney Cline. I'm tremendously
impressed with the scope and the promise of this study, and I have one specific question about serum repository because it seems to me that could be exceedingly valuable in the long run.

Could you tell us a little bit more about that, and is that going to be linked? I understand the HIV screening is the driving point for the serum repository, but how does that link in with this, and are there plans for longitudinal and prospective collection of serum and banking?

CMDR. RYAN: The serum repository resides in the Washington, D.C. area, just north of D.C., and it is sera that's collected as -- because of HIV screening, so the sera that we have drawn when we get HIV testing close to annually is saved in this repository, and we have access to it for protocol-driven studies, so right now there's not a protocol on the table where specifically we're going to take those sera and do something to link them to the millennium cohort data, but absolutely those are things that are discussed as future protocols.

The limit of the sera repository is that it ends when people get out of the service, so there's no biologic specimens after that.

And right now there's no part of the millennium cohort that would specifically ask the invited participants to give a biologic sample outside of the sera repository that they do for the HIV work, but it's possible.

If there was an important question down the road,
then a subset of the study could be invited to give a biologic specimen or have a physical exam.

Currently, there's no protocol on the table, but we do recognize that as a possibility as we go forward.

DR. OSTROFF: Last one.

DR. POLAND: Greg Poland. My question -- it was actually very similar to that and extended beyond sera but also DNA samples.

I would urge you -- if there's any way possible -- to begin building those bridges, thinking about ways that that would happen, that would make this, I think, the most powerful prospective database bar none -- anywhere in the world.

The second question I had is it looks like you're going to get at some health outcomes and health-related procedures, and I recognize you have to be a bit careful with it, but are you going to be collecting any MMPI-like data or instruments that might give us hints or indicators for post-appointment breast illness?

CMDR. RYAN: Yes, and actually a large component of the survey part is on psychological issues, especially PTSD-like issues because that's a concern for deployers. It's not a full MMPI, and there's -- you know, it's sort of the limit of time and space to do those instruments well, but there are actually quite a few psychological-related questions, and the SF36-V which is functional status and so on folks -- interesting
outcome that we have put in there because that's something in the military that's been used quite a bit to assess functional status.

DR. OSTROFF: Thanks very much. One last, I guess, comment or question for you. When you're talking about trying to link this longitudinal data to potential exposure such as immunizations, et cetera, et cetera, to some degree that's dependent on how valid those databases are, and I'm wondering, knowing that what we're learning is that some of these potentially significant -- whether or not we're going to be able to do that -- I don't know if you want to comment on that.

CMDR. RYAN: Well, I completely agree. Some of the databases, I think, are extremely strong -- like the hospitalization database -- the outpatient care database is becoming strong, but I wouldn't rely on those data back in about '96 or '97, but in the -- they're becoming stronger every year.

The immunization database is also growing in strength and validity. You know, it previously only had Anthrax vaccines as part of the database and in the future should have all vaccines. So there's degrees of confidence that we have in the different databases, and every one we make use of, we need to bring in those experts absolutely and understand the limitations of what's in those systems.

DR. WINKENWERDER: I just want to make one other comment to the suggestion about -- that you weren't quite
comfortable answering regarding the future of this kind of work and whether it ought to be an ongoing thing. I think the answer is yes, from my view, and I believe that we've crossed a threshold in the last few years -- it's hard to pinpoint exactly when that threshold was crossed to the point that the way we look at deployment and issues that arise with respect to people's health and our ability to collect the information and to assess what, in fact, might have happened and make associations and thereby improve the protection of those individuals in the future.

I think it's really turned a corner and it's improving because of improvement of the databases, various different pieces and components in the infrastructure that's now in place to study the issues.

And without that, I think we couldn't be doing these things, so it's a lot of different pieces pulled together.

My sense is that -- not to suggest that I'm about to do this -- but that, if we went forward to Congress and -- you know, with a thoughtful, coherent plan and said, "We really need to make this part of a longer-term scheme," that we'd probably get a lot of support for that.

My belief is that people realize now we have the capability to do this and do the work effectively and thereby it ought to be just part of the way we do business, so I'm optimistic -- if that's the track we're already on, it's just a
matter of formalizing it.

DR. OSTROFF: Let me commend you for all of your presentations and for the really -- I think speaking for all of the board -- tremendous work that you do. I think you're a credit to the Navy and Department of Defense -- I really thank you for both hosting it and for what you're doing.

I think now it's time to move on to the preventive medicine update so we don't get behind. Let's just get into it.

Colonel Diniega is not here at this meeting. He's in Atlanta at the ACIP, and so we have Major Balough is going to -- are we out of sequence?

(Side discussions.)

DR. OSTROFF: Okay. He's going to give the first presentation.

MAJOR BALOUGH: Good morning. I'm Major Brian Balough from the joint staff, and this is unusual. I've got to thank Colonel Riddle 'cause usually I'm the last preventive medicine representative to go, so instead of getting eight minutes to talk, I usually get about 30 seconds.

So I'm going to try not to shortchange my fellow officers who all outrank me, but anyways (sic), I've got six slides; I'm going to try to focus on three of them, talk about some current issues which is really what the joint staff focuses on.

This is a significant effort that the first bullet
talks about. We had a December '98 memo that talked about
deployment health surveillance. We spent the last 14 months
rewriting that.

I got to lead that -- now, that effort wasn't
solely my accomplishment. A lot of the officers that are in the
room -- Captain Yund, Colonel Gunzenhauser, Colonel Woodward,
Commander Ludlow -- or Ludwig -- they spent a lot of time
updating that memo.

And what we did is update all of the requirements.

It includes the pre and post-deployment health surveillance
forms that have to be filled out.

Probably the most significant aspect of that form
was the environmental appendix which in the '98 memo had about
one paragraph. In this memorandum, there is an appendix that's
eight pages. So that was probably the biggest change.

We updated some other things -- it
includes -- with HIV and TB.

We're working right now with Health Affairs on the
I&D protocols for small pox and botulism. Those are in staffing
right now. The suspense -- we've missed the suspense on when
we're supposed to get those comments done, but we're anticipating
the service is getting back to us the rest of their comments
sometime this week, and early next week I'll hopefully finalize
and get the information back up to Health Affairs.

What I want to focus on in the next two
slides -- this slide focuses on Operation Door on Freedom, the operations in Afghanistan, and the next slide focuses on Guantanamo Bay.

One of the nice things that happened as we were going through the rewrite of the December '98 memo and we were staffing it with the combatant commands, very timely because CENTCOM which is the sync that runs Operation Door on Freedom, took all of the requirements that were in the rewrite memo, even though it hadn't been signed yet, and they incorporated those into their operational planning. So that was great -- that was a very big initiative and undertaken from CENTCOM to do that.

They've got a very robust health protection plan. Their appendix for preventive medicine is about 20 pages long, which I haven't seen before. That was a very good undertaking they did.

Something that is working very well is, as CENTCOM moves throughout the theater and they have identified new locations where they want to put forces, they will coordinate with AFMIC -- the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center -- to do -- to gather the intel assessment, what's there, based off industrial hazards -- what's there -- any of the intel that they can gather.

That information is all going to CHPPM, U.S. Army Center for Health Preventive Medicine -- and they've been doing industrial health hazard assessments, so they're taking that
information, raw intelligence, analyzing it; that's going back to AFMIC. AFMIC -- or not AFMIC -- CENTCOM is placing that on their websites.

So all of the commanders that are out in the field on the classified web system can access that information, both from AFMIC and both from CHPPM.

Then we've got the deployed preventive medicine unit which is going in and revalidating all of the information, updating it and incorporating that in.

So from that aspect, we're doing a very good job.

They've got the pre-deployment and post-deployment requirements. We've had -- last count -- last time I talked with Colonel Rubertone (ph), they had about 20,000 forms -- the pre-deployment forms filled out or received.

The problem they were getting is all of those forms were going to the Brentwood facility which kind of slowed down all the mail, but hopefully that issue's being reconciled.

And they're doing weekly DMBI surveillance.

The joint staff memo requires weekly DMBI surveillance; they're doing that. AFEIRA is the one who's analyzing all of that data for CENTCOM.

Now, typically, all of that data would have to go to the Army Medical Surveillance Activity and incorporate it into our large database; however, the problem we have with this current operation is that data is classified. AMSA can't handle
classified data.

They're going to solve that because about 60 days after the operation's done the data will be declassified, and all that information will be pulled in.

But if we need any information on current trends, we can go to AFEIRA, and they will do that.

And right now -- unless one of the other representatives have better information, there's been only one potential case of a paratyphoid case, and everything else is just what we would expect to see, so we're not seeing any unusual trends.

This is Guantanamo Bay, and Captain Yund is going to be talking about the fleet hospital we have down there, so I'm going to not focus on that.

But what SOUTHCOM is doing is they've incorporated the requirements for the joint staff memo also. A lot of focus has gone into protecting the flight crews and the guards that are taking the detainees from Afghanistan to Guantanamo and then, once they're at Guantanamo, and making sure that they've got proper protection to prevent mainly spread of TB.

They've got guidance that they put; they're given protective equipment, requiring TB screening tests, three to twelve months after they've completed their operation.

They are also doing the medical surveillance.

Now, because this is a fixed facility, most of their
environmental surveillance is being focused on the entomology aspect. They've got -- the water aspect is already pretty well taken care of.

The next two slides -- these are just the DMBI slides that SOUTHCOM gave us -- I can't really go into detail. Probably the significance is this -- the ones for the detainee, and we see how -- they started out at about 40 percent, and they're down around 40 percent as they're getting improved health care.

And then the next one -- this is the rates for task force that's down there supporting the operation.

And I told you I'd keep it under eight minutes. Are there any questions?

DR. OSTROFF: Questions?

REAR ADM. HART: Short question. Is this data being reported consistent with or matched with the data for the millennium cohort study and other kinds of data we're collecting?

MAJOR BALOUGH: I can't tell you that, sir. I don't know.

REAR ADM. HART: Having been on the operational side, one of the frustrating things that leads to poor response rates is duplicate, triplicate, quadruplicate kind of reporting requirements of the data inputters, so I was just wondering.

MAJOR BALOUGH: The pre and the post-deployment forms -- they're two-page forms. They don't ask very many
questions, and basically on those forms, if you answer "yes" to certain questions, you have to go see a health care provider, and they're basically there to establish a baseline -- I think it's only about eight or ten questions that they ask, and it's just to determine whether you're fit to go on a deployment.

I don't really think -- I mean, I'm sure the millennium cohort study's got a lot more information than they ask in the pre and post-deployment forms.

LT. COL. RIDDLE: If I can, sir, probably one of the leaders on the pre and post-deployment form is really a go/no-go administered prior to and then on returning, but they probably play more into post-deployment health -- practice guideline, that if an individual does have a concern post-deployment, they would receive an evaluation on the clinical side -- but then the data capture and the data relation -- is anything that's captured (indiscernible T-1, 6711).

DR. BERG: Bill Berg. I would expect that there's a significant difference in the age of the eyeballs in the preventive medicine officers and the AFEB members. Would it be possible --

(Laughter.)

DR. BERG: -- to get some of these graphs a little bit larger?

LT. COL. RIDDLE: They'll all be on the AFEB website. Yes, sir, you'll actually be able to download the full
slide presentations.

(Side discussions.)

MAJOR BALOUGH: I'll be followed by Colonel Gunzenhauser.

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: Good morning. I apologize to Major Balough for any minutes I stole from him in previous meetings.

It's a pleasure to be here this morning to give you an update from the Army perspective. I've just got a couple of topics.

In public health practice, of course, there are three major functions: assurance, policy development and assessment, and usually we talk about policy development 'cause that's our main business at the Surgeon General's Office.

But I'm going to talk a little bit about ESSENCE, which is an assessment tool that we're using and also about some health information products, and how we're assuring that some of these things are being done.

I think that the AFEB received a brief on ESSENCE about a year ago or sometime in the past -- Major Pavlin (ph) talked about this, and so this has evolved somewhat. I'm going to give a little bit of a background.

ESSENCE -- you can read what the acronym stands for there -- is a global emerging infection system sponsored prototype system that was developed a few years ago, based in the
national capital region, to look for the development of outbreaks of communicable disease, and basically it relies upon encountered data generated through the Ambulatory Data System that's been referred to earlier.

These are sent, consolidated eventually on a single server at Denver under TMA, and on a daily basis -- or at least -- before they used to consolidate in the national capital region -- I'll talk a little bit more about some of the changes now.

What occurs -- there's a filter put on it; you just draw out the ICD-9 diagnoses that may be related to communicable diseases, and these are grouped into seven syndromes such as fever, respiratory, germ infection and so on and so forth.

And the system looks at historical data to determine whether or not at a particular location currently there's a higher-than-expected number of cases.

Since the system draws upon a pretty comprehensive amount of data through the Ambulatory Data System, there is an ability to actually drill down, then, locally and look at some pretty specific information about particular clusters, and this is all available through a secure Internet access on Johns Hopkins live physics lab website.

This is a slide that -- I think we might have missed a slide there -- or maybe they got out of order -- okay,
it's not in there. What I wanted to mention was on September 11th or shortly thereafter it was felt that this system which was implemented solely in the national capital region should be implemented throughout all of DOD so that we could detect if there was some type of BW event that occurred or some type of outbreak that was of concern.

So at the request of the Army Surgeon General, it was expanded to capture data from all MTF's worldwide, all medical treatment facilities. These include 121 Army facilities, 110 Navy, 80 Air Force, and two Coast Guard facilities -- over 300 medical treatment facilities, and on a daily basis this data is received and analyzed, looking at seven different syndromes occurring over the past seven days.

So you have literally thousands of possible combinations of locations and syndromes over that last week.

This is an example of the printout. You might wonder, geez, how can anybody possibly look at it? This first cut on how to analyze this data is pretty simplistic.

What occurs is that for each syndrome at each location it looks automatically at the historical average and the expected number of cases for that syndrome that has occurred there, determines the two-times-standard-deviation upper limit for that cluster, that location -- for example, the first up there, Annapolis Fever -- historical mean is .3 cases per day, and if you add two standard deviations, you'd expect up to 1.4.
And you can see on this particular day, January 25, there were seven events that fell into that, giving a ratio of 5.1.

And so what this output does is it puts all these location, syndrome clusters in order by the size of the ratio.

So you can quickly identify places that have a higher-than-expected number of cases in a particular syndrome at a particular location.

If you click on the blue hyperchecks link that's on the right -- what it does is it automatically generates a graph that looks like this, so you can quickly ascertain what that number means.

Here, for example, this was an outbreak of gastrointestinal illness at Fort Monmouth that occurred in January, and you can see on one particular day there was a very large spike.

When we went looking for information about this, we had found out that the local folks already had identified a gastrointestinal outbreak and were in the midst of investigating it.

We've had a number of small clusters of interest that we've identified. Most of them, local folks, have already known about -- in some cases, they didn't, so we've had some conversations about how to look at it.

One very interesting rather large cluster that
occurred simultaneously is we had a lot of gastrointestinal illness virtually simultaneously occurring at a number of training installations.

The local reports -- it sounded like this was a Norwalk-like type of outbreak. There had been anecdotal reports historically from training installations of the post-holiday gastrointestinal outbreaks, never clearly documented, but once this system was implemented, we saw multiple places had this occur.

Actually, we got a lot of help from the folks out here at the Navy, Marine Corps Recruiting Depot and from the Environmental Preventive Medicine unit here and confirmed through cultures that the syndrome was caused by a Norwalk-like virus.

So these are just some examples. One of the aspects that we're concerned about with ESSENCE is the timeliness of the data, and we've developed a metric whereby we look at each of the services and categorize for each medical treatment facility whether the data we're receiving from them is green, amber or red. This is an evolving process; we've identified some bottlenecks, and we're still working on improving this, and that's what this slide shows; we've briefed this occasionally to our Surgeon General, and we've made a lot of improvements. Actually, we've improved since here.

This is a summary -- ESSENCE is one of a number of tools that can rely on the Ambulatory Data System data, but it's
very powerful. It really is.

But there's a lot of experience that's going to be required to define how we use this -- for the various syndromes, you know, the same tool may not be exactly perfect, so for the kinds of things we're looking for, we're going to have to determine best how to use it.

Also, what I found is that all of a sudden we have access to data that the local folks don't, so this is really testing us in terms of developing our response capabilities, and probably we need to develop some corollary tools at the local level.

There are some other plans to augment ESSENCE with other types of data such as hotline call-in data, pharmaceutical usage, ICU cases and other things like that so that we can keep track of other important events.

Those conclude my comments on ESSENCE. I just wanted to talk just for a quick minute here about health information operations.

What we're talking about here is developing information products for deploying soldiers. I have a couple of booklets here, and if you just want to pass those around, Dr. Ludwig, and just show -- you can take a look at these, but we've developed a number of booklets -- for example, we have a rather large booklet on -- for health care providers deployed to the CENTCOM area.
We have a Staying Healthy guide for many locations, specific products about certain environmental exposures. We have NBC information.

And, of course, I think many of you are familiar with the blue, red and brown books that are put out by USAMRID (ph) and others on Cambayo (ph) Nuclear.

What our focus here -- is not just developing the products but getting them to the folks who need them. This is an assurance function -- and getting feedback on how useful they are.

So we have developed a metric that we track in our ops center at the Army Surgeon General's Office, looking at who the folks are that are actually deploying, getting a number, indicating that it's red unless we develop the product and ship it, and that'll make it amber, and it actually turns green when we have confirmation that the information products have been delivered to the providers, leaders or soldiers for whom they're intended.

This is run out of the U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion Preventive Medicine in Aberdeen, Maryland, and right now they're in the process of doing some comprehensive assessment of how good the products really are and trying to figure out the best way to deploy this information for future operations.

That concludes my comments. I'll be glad to take any questions.
DR. OSTROFF: Thank you, Colonel.

DR. POLAND: Greg Poland. One question on the historical means. Are those date or season-based, or is that a mean across a year?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: When we started this system in October, we did not have access to historical information, so the best we could do was go back to July, and we took the last six dates.

We are in the process of submitting a request to get all of the historical data that's in the Ambulatory Data System so we can look at -- back -- several years back and make better estimates.

DR. SHOPE: Bob Shope. Is there anything comparable to ESSENCE in the collection of laboratory requests or laboratory data?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: That is something that is being looked at, but right now in this system we don't have access to that.

The laboratory data could be consolidated, but it's not accessible centrally -- all the kinds of lab tests that we would like to look at, so I think that's -- I'm pretty sure that's a product that's being looked at not only by ESSENCE -- the staff that's working on it, but some of the other folks that are developing other products as well. Currently, no.

DR. OSTROFF: Dr. Patrick, Dr. Ness.
DR. PATRICK: Kevin Patrick. Two
questions -- one, actually, on this ESSENCE system. Very
impressive. It's really exciting for surveillance.

My question is: Are you doing any exploration or
partnering with local, nonmilitary health departments in
communities to aggregate data in a graphic area within the
ESSENCE project?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: There was quite a bit of work
in the national capital region when this was originally stood up,
and there's still some talk in the national capital region to do
that.

I think that the reality is -- at least for this
outpatient data -- we're of a very unique system in having access
to this kind of information across a wide geographic area.

Some other places have expressed interest. I know
some other MTF's have talked about working with their local
partners, civilian partners. I know in New York City, for
example, there's a number of surveillance tools which they use
there, and we have tried to make some efforts to compare what
we're seeing with them.

For example, with this gastrointestinal
information, we asked the folks up at New York City whether they
saw a comparable outbreak there, and they did not at the time.

But currently it's not integrated -- certainly not
electronically.
DR. PATRICK: It would just seem -- Mr. Chair -- that this would be a wonderful opportunity to do some partnering -- and define pilot projects in a few local areas -- this is an exciting area, very important area of public health.

The second question relates to the health information -- is there a -- I notice that these are largely print-based materials. Is there any exploration that -- CHPPM -- is that what that's called?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: Correct.

DR. PATRICK: That they're doing with computer-based learning media as well for these areas?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: I know that's something they're very actively thinking about now is how to use the Internet to get products to folks and how to use the right educational venue so that learning actually occurs.

DR. PATRICK: But a lot of data to support that -- again, this generation of folks that are coming along -- really learn quite well these kinds of things in a non-print-based approach.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: If I may, a lot of those products are available at the CHPPM website.

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: Correct.

COL. GIBSON: Colonel Gibson from Health Affairs. I wanted to echo the issue on the Washington, D.C. area. There is an ongoing effort there that's being led by the American
Public Health Association to build an early-detection model in
the Washington, D.C. area, and we're at the table with those
folks.

DR. NESS: Roberta Ness. I just wanted to point
out -- you may very well be aware of this, but there's a very
unique system being built also -- it's a collaboration between
the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University which
uses not only laboratory-based information but, in fact, text-
based information from physical diagnosis and utilizes fairly
sophisticated computer algorithms with respect to text mining.

And if you're not aware of that system, I'd urge
you to -- I can certainly put you in contact with the folks that
are working on that, but it's very unique and, in fact, so unique
that just a couple of weeks ago we were lucky enough to have
President Bush come down and highlight the activities that were
going on in that area.

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does the ESSENCE system -- how
does that compare to the EWAR system which Captain Corwin has
developed and implemented in Southeast Asia? It is a similar
system, or is it a different system?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: I'm somewhat familiar with
that system. I think that's somewhat different. The main focus
here is that we're using all encounters, and we're using existing
ICD-9-coded data and pulling that electronic -- I think EWAR's is
more MT -- clinic-based and coding in certain syndromes. It's a little bit different implementation, but the intent is the same -- to look at certain syndromes and identify them early, but they're really different infrastructures in how they're created.

I'm sorry -- there may have been one other question that you'd like to have answered.

DR. CATTANI: Jacqui Cattani. Obviously, surveillance right now is "the" hot issue affecting particular biological terrorist events, and there are lots of different systems out there. Some of them are developing so quickly that the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing.

My question is: If your system -- well, one of the limitations of ICD-9 codes is the timeliness with which you can identify an event, and the more real time a surveillance system can be, the more effective it is.

I was wondering if you would like to comment on that. Several other -- McDill, for example, is implementing an Internet-based system that they can enter data directly on the web in -- from emergency rooms and nurse call stations and hopefully from clinics, and we'll be able to identify events within a -- less than a 24-hour period, basically, and they are linking with -- I might just add -- in the Tampa Bay area there are nine hospitals on an emergency room surveillance system, looking at syndromes, that will link with this McDill system which is slightly more flexible.
And I wondered how you see this system based on ICD-9 codes in the context of real time surveillance. It seems like this is a very comprehensive system that over time you can look almost retrospectively that these things have occurred, but as you yourself pointed out, the local area identified many of these outbreaks before the system, so how do you see this system fitting in with these more real time surveillance systems coming out?

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: I think it's a good question. I'm not sure we have a good feel for exactly how near real time we can make this system.

Our green category up there for timeliness was over 50 percent of the data received from an MTF had been generated within the previous three days.

At an individual treatment facility, some systems use paper forms; the provider probably fills that out at the end of the day. Sometimes these are fed in batch mode maybe a day or two later.

Some systems are all computer-based where the provider actually enters the diagnostic code that day and it is electronically available.

Even once the data's entered, it's still a stream of nodes until it's consolidated on the Denver server, so there is a delay, and we've looked at all of those, and we certainly do see that, when the SAS routines are run overnight, we do see data
from the day before, and we're looking at that to see how near
real time it can be.

Agreed in certain situations where you don't have
a system -- maybe like this one where you can't get the data
immediately -- you may need to set up some other system where
maybe folks -- I guess there's a tradeoff in some of the other
systems having staff available, particularly in a crunch
situation, to enter the data.

I understand in New York City they deploy a small
team of EIS officers up there at the emergency rooms in order to
ensure that data got entered so they could use another tool to
monitor that. So there is a tradeoff, and that's why I agree
it's probably important that we have several different systems
that we can apply that fit the needs of a situation.

DR. OSTROFF: Thanks. I think we're going to have
to move on, but let me just comment that I think one of
the -- don't overlook the fact that one of the most impressive
things, at least to me being an old-fashioned epidemiologist,
that most of the time you saw something on the system, they
already knew about it. That means that people are watching --

COL. GUNZENHAUSER: Yes.

DR. OSTROFF: -- where they need to be watching.

Let's move on to Colonel Woodward, a new
representative taking over for Colonel Bradshaw and tough shoes
to fill, but welcome.
LT. COL. WOODWARD: Thank you.

Good morning; it's a pleasure to be here representing Air Force preventive medicine.

This morning, I'm going to touch on two areas very briefly. First, I'm going to use an example of how we've derived benefits from our immunization registry system, and then second talk about -- just mention a couple of hot issues in Air Force preventive medicine today.

I'm going to use an example of a recent recall of hepatitis -- certain lots of hepatitis-A vaccine by the manufacturer -- put us -- gave us a problem to deal with in the Air Force, and that was how do we identify, in responding to this vaccine recall, how do we identify the magnitude of the problem in the Air Force and then come up with a remediation plan to assure that people are protected against the hepatitis-A virus?

Our approach was to use our Population Health Support Office to mine the Air Force Complete Immunization Tracking Application which is our immunization registry system to find out just how big this problem is, was, and identify the individuals impacted.

And what we found was that our Population Health Support Office -- the analysts there were able to go into the database and within six hours of asking them to look at the data, they had actually scoped out the problem for us and the results that I'll show you on the next slide.
What we found in our immunization tracking system is that we had about 113,000 Air Force people -- people in our system had received a hepatitis-A vaccine from the manufacturer.

Of those people who -- from this particular manufacturer, of those who had received the vaccine, about 10,000 of those had received vaccine from the affected lots.

We then further refined -- they further refined this to identify people who were still -- people who we could actually tell where they lived and where they were located and identified by name and got down to about 9,000 adults and children who had received affected lots of the hepatitis-A vaccine.

We thought that this -- we think that this database proved to be fairly robust because we only had about 150 people in the database who did not have a recognizable lot number, so people had been incredibly -- our technicians and people out at our clinics have been very fastidious in putting in all of the relevant vaccine-related information in the system, and we think this is a very powerful thing.

Also, the Population Health Support Division was then in a couple more hours able to actually identify -- generate for every clinic in the Air Force a list of individuals who were affected by -- who had received vaccines from the affected lots.

What we then did was we then developed guidance to send out to the field to tell them how to respond both
logistically and clinically to the vaccine recall, and then through a secure website provide it to every MTF -- the list of by-name individuals and what their present location was, according to the database, and everybody was able to access that and download that and then actively reach out and touch people who we knew had been affected by this recall and, of course, also have a pass system around as people came in who might not have been identified by this recall, though we think that number is quite small.

Just a little bit about our immunization tracking system -- AFCITA -- it's a system that started in about 1997 and is currently used in all of our active-duty facilities, 98 percent of Air National Guard facilities and about 88 percent of reserve installations, and currently we have records on over 600,000 active guard and reserve Air Force members and an increasing number of other beneficiaries. It's used not only for active duty but all immunizations provided to dependents and retirees in our military health system. It is our sole documentation system for immunizations in the Air Force.

It also is -- dovetails into our readiness tracking system, so we use it to improve performance in terms of coverage of vaccinations amongst all of our populations but also to support our readiness monitoring so that we know that troops are ready to go and immunizations is a critical piece of that, and our immunization system feeds directly into our overall
readiness tracking system.

I think this case for us demonstrated a sort of second order benefit from immunization registries and responding to this recall.

Of course, our system has also been very helpful in having us improve vaccine coverage levels for active-duty people as well as for children and other beneficiaries.

For example, in terms of improving coverage, we now know that -- we can now demonstrate in our system that over 90 percent of active-duty Air Force people have completed the hepatitis-A vaccination series, so we think it's also very helpful in the performance feedback mode.

I'll just mention two hot issues. First and foremost, prevention has long been the foundation of force protection. It is now -- we are now having an increasing proportion of work in our preventive medicine areas that is targeting countermeasures for biological, chemical and nuclear agent threats.

Also, the recruit assessment program is a growing initiative in the Air Force, and we'll talk extensively about that tomorrow, but I do just want to mention that the priorities for the Air Force are to have a system that not only supports the lifelong longitudinal assessment of the health of our members but also one that has relevancy and immediacy to impacting the health of our youngest troops.
So you'll hear tomorrow that that's our area of emphasis with the recruit assessment program.

And that's all I have prepared. Thank you.

DR. OSTROFF: Any quick questions?

DR. GRAY: This is Greg Gray. I'm wondering about your immunization registry validation strategies. How do you know your data are accurate?

LT. COL. WOODWARD: We are just now actually exploring that. It's been a system where we have been -- since it's been implemented in '97, we have gone back in and had people have to transcribe back immunization records as far back as they go as well as real time -- include information in there, and what we have found is there are some problems in validation, and we are now -- just now exploring that, and this is one example of what prompted us to say, "Well, we need to start exploring the validity of the data," because its original intent was to improve immunization coverage, and therefore it was really used as an individual-level and unit-level feedback mechanism to say, "Kelly Woodward had all of his immunizations; everybody in the unit had all of their immunizations." And so it was the feedback loop, quite honestly, to the people inputting the data in -- was to get Kelly Woodward right on his immunizations.

But you're asking the question we're now asking -- and that is, "How do we know it's all accurate?"

One of our -- we thought it was very powerful to
see that, out of 113,000 records of people who had hepatitis-A vaccine from one manufacturer, only 150 of them -- the lot number didn't seem to make sense. The rest of them either matched exactly the lot numbers of the manufacturer of the affected lots or was a very close match, which at least suggests some pretty rigorous attention to data entry.

DR. GRAY: It sounds like you folks are ahead of the other services, and I think what you find in your validation would probably be very useful to other services who attempt to do the same, and I want to encourage you to share that.

LT. COL. WOODWARD: Absolutely. Yes, sir.

DR. OSTROFF: Dr. Gardner?

DR. GARDNER: Just a comment of -- hepatitis-A vaccine in general -- the -- I wonder if you thought about -- I was on the Advisory Committee for Immunization Practices during the introduction, and the first approvals for hepatitis-A were for three-dose in kids, and then, based on serologic data, it went to two-dose, but there's a lot of epidemiologic evidence -- using it in epidemic situations -- that one dose is quite effective, and we consider people protected after the first dose while they're waiting for the second dose, and there's excellent immune memory with booster responses, even far down the line.

So I've always sort of felt -- and there's never -- and we don't have to worry about chronic infection in
hepatitis-A, so we're just trying to prevent the spread and the immediate illness.

So I've always been the gadfly saying, "Do we actually need more than a single dose to provide real protection?" The second gives you a higher antibody level, but you are going to get an anamnestic response after -- if you see the virus and probably get very good protection.

So I would have been willing to settle for a single good dose.

How many -- were most of these folks -- had received a full-strength dose and then got the -- another dose that was subpar and now there's recall, or -- and if that were the case, you might not have had to do anything.

LT. COL. WOODWARD: Yeah, and part of the response to this recall was recommended by the manufacturer that, if people had received -- had received two doses of hepatitis-A vaccine with one or both being from the affected lots -- was to actually do serologic testing before reimmunizing.

We were actually talking with the manufacturer about whether we'll have enough of our people choose serologic testing to be able to do some sort of analysis of the seropositivity rate, if you will.

DR. GARDNER: Thanks. That would add some light to the debate.

LT. COL. WOODWARD: Yeah.
DR. OSTROFF: Thank you. The preventive medicine update -- that is, I think we're going to modify the schedule a little bit. Dr. Winkenwerder has to leave fairly soon, and what we'll do is we'll move on to the adenovirus presentation and make sure we get that in before he has to leave.

We have Mr. Bill Howell who is deputy director for acquisition and advanced development who accepted our invitation to give us an update about an issue that's been of great concern to the board for a long time. Thank you for coming.

MR. HOWELL: Not a problem. Thank you. In fact, I've been able to leverage a couple other meetings, one of which is at 1:00 this afternoon in the north side of San Diego, so I appreciate moving me forward as well.

Okay. I don't want to talk too much about background. Most everybody here probably is familiar with adenovirus and how we got in the dilemma that we're in, but just to make sure we're on the same playing field, Wyeth was the original manufacturer of the tablets that we use, both for set 4 and 7 adenovirus, two separate oral tablets which they use for the vaccine.

In time, as the FDA does, they go through and they look at your projection methodologies and such and in many cases will force you to do an upgrade to your facility to be able to maintain to whatever GMP standards that are there.

They came through -- this particular vaccine is a
fairly old vaccine -- they came through the manufacturer back in the '90s, said, "You have to upgrade." Wyeth was not making a profit to speak of on this particular vaccine, so they came to the service and said, "Okay, I need y'all to fund this upgrade," and in fact then we got stuck with a bill that none of us had anticipated, and in the end the dollars -- I don't want to get into the political game -- the earlier administration did not support it, and so the actual vaccine -- Wyeth discontinued it and went away.

We used up the last of the vaccine in '99, and as we saw quickly thereafter, the outbreaks followed.

That got the attention of the administration, and since then we have some dollars. We had 14 million originally in '99; we've had another seven million offset to that.

We spent a great deal of time -- I have to tell you -- there was an effort about three years ago to get Wyeth to pass that particular technology on to Greer down in North Carolina, and we worked for about three quarters of a year trying to make that pass. It failed.

In so doing, Wyeth became very hesitant to get back in the game at all. They say, "We spent about a million dollars of our time and effort trying to pass over to Greer for DOD," and at that point in time they said, "We've done our best offer, and we're just out of the business. Goodbye." And so it took us awhile.
If we were going to actually go to the quickest and most efficacious way to get a vaccine, going out and getting a new manufacturer and starting from scratch wasn't the way to get there 'cause it would have cost a heck of a lot more in time and money.

So we went back and we basically, you know, cooled our heels and went over to Wyeth and sucked eggs and tried to plead to them to come back in, and in fact, after about three quarters of the year, working actually with the president of their vaccine division, we finally got them to come back and say, "Okay, we will work with whoever you contract to. So, once you have a contract and you're firm, you're going to somebody, we will come back, we will sit down with them, we'll give them our production methodologies, we'll give them all the formulary and the rest so that they can make it, but until that time period we're going to sit on the sidelines and watch."

At this point -- at the same time we were doing this, we also had Wrair doing some work to try and help out to reduce the risk for whoever the new manufacturer would be and trying to pre-do some workup that would assist them in their process of getting FDA approval, and you can see the list of things there; I'm not going to go through all of them individually.

The bottom line is what we tried to do is -- by getting this effort in Wrair, we wanted to try and show whoever
the prospective manufacturer was going to be that we were in the long haul with them, and in fact we were willing to take on some of the effort to try and reduce their risk in getting this vaccine used and approved.

As I noted before, we got another seven million dollars this last year. The reason we needed that is because the actual first proposals that came in when we finally got to the contracting stage were over the 14 million dollars. We had to get to about 18 million dollars to get somebody in.

And we did award back on September 1 to Barr Laboratories. Now, those who are not familiar, Barr is a generic drug manufacturer.

We had about three different bidders. All of them were combinations of different people.

Barr has a great deal of knowledge in the tableting process and the production process which, of course, that's what this is, and that was one of the problems we had with the Wyeth process to start off was the tableting methodology they had was almost a World War II vintage tableting system.

And that's why -- one of the reasons why Barr Laboratories and Best Value Contract was looked at as a valued partner in this.

Also, they have combined themselves with VaxGen. VaxGen actually has an offshoot -- is an offshoot of Wyeth and has hired some of the people who were involved in the actual
production of the product, so it has been somewhat insidious in
the sense they moved over from one manufacturer to another, but
that is certainly something that we can leverage, and we're all
in favor of.

So our strategy, then, was obviously to pursue the
quickest means of getting back into remanufacturing with any
reasonable cost. That sounds like motherhood and apple pie.

But in so doing, we wanted to maintain our
relationship with the FDA. We had talked with the FDA certainly
up front as to what was the best methodology for us to get there
and would they accept the old one with an -- old vaccine with an
upgrade if we did bridging studies and things of that nature that
would try and expedite it, and they've been pretty good, the FDA,
so far.

We wanted to make sure the contract was with an
established manufacturer.

When we first did an RFI two years ago out on the
street -- and how we ended up with Greer three years before is
nobody else wanted to touch it. It just didn't have a profit
motive in it. There's just so little manufacturing involved in
this and so little use of the product outside of the services, it
was not worthwhile.

So we tried to get the contract in a manner that
we could get to someone who was fairly established -- obviously,
keep Wyeth in the process as best we could, and the other two I
already talked about.

So where are we at the moment right now? Barr is in the process of doing -- or in the process of getting whatever their agreement they need with Wyeth to be able to gain the information to be able to build their production plant.

Now, two pieces in that. One, many of you may know that the adenovirus is actually a very good carrier for other particular means.

So they don't want to give it away free. There is -- in the sense they will do it free -- rephrase -- but they do have proprietary rights -- Wyeth does -- and they have to make sure from a legal standpoint they've got those agreements in place before they can pass it. But they're doing that at no cost.

They're in the process right now -- American Home Products owns Wyeth now in the new conglomerate of vaccine manufacturers, so Wyeth has already forwarded that legal packet up to American Home Products, and so we're working now with American Home Products -- and hopefully get that packet out and get the disclosure -- the information there all done.

In the meantime, we're working -- WRAIR is working also to continue that support for the next three, four years.

The important piece out of that is not only the expertise that WRAIR has in the science behind it but also when we get into clinical trials -- many of you know that we'll be
doing the clinical trials, actually, with military people.

And so to have a military institute to help Barr get in and do their clinical trials, I think, is pretty essential.

Here sort of shows you the schedule as it was laid out as to how long it will take.

Barr does not have to build a whole new facility for this. It's just an offshoot that they're -- basically a little wing that they're going to build to be able to do this.

That was one of the things that stopped us with Greer. Greer wanted to build a whole manufacturing plant for it, so we would have taken on a lot of the infrastructure costs that we will not have to take on in this particular contract and why the cost is less.

But you can see all the way through -- unfortunately, we will have to do clinical trials because as a new manufacturing process -- we will have to get, of course, the facility through FDA. That just takes time. They have to build it, so we're looking at an 18 -- really, an 18-month-to-24-month window to get the manufacturing piece built and through the FDA to get GMP standards to be able to go into the clinical lots -- clinical trials that will follow thereafter.

But our plan today would have an O-7 adenovirus production that we could then start to put back into the troops -- into the trainees.
So you can see the bottom end -- the responsibility -- Barr is obviously the overall contractor that we're working at, and they will do the final tablet production.

VaxGen is actually going to make the virus itself -- excuse me, Bioreliance is actually going to grow the virus -- that's another affiliation they have -- pass to VaxGen who will then put it into a lifelyzed (ph) form who will pass it to Barr who will then actually put it into its final form.

So, unfortunately, it's sort of a convoluted way in which we've got to go about it, but sort of the only way that we saw -- and a reasonable one -- rational manner to get there.

I think that's it. Oh -- excuse me.

Funding -- this is the good news. If I would have sat here 18 months ago, I would have told you I didn't have any money, and then through time we got about 18 million dollars or 20 million dollars to get it started, and this is the money that came down in PDM recently and the last bill that came across.

So we have a fully funded program, and if you look at the 10 million in FY07, better than half of that is actually making product -- actually into field.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much.

MR. HOWELL: Sure.

DR. OSTROFF: I continue to be amazed at what a tragedy this entire story is.

I appreciate when you say you're making a diligent
effort to be able to obtain the vaccine at a reasonable production cost.

I guess my question to you was what might potentially be an unreasonable production cost to truncate this schedule somewhat? I mean, here's a situation where you basically had the perfect product. It worked great.

And now you're stuck with a situation where you're coming up with a new product that's going to take five years to produce.

Many of us have difficulty understanding why it takes so long.

MR. HOWELL: By and far, the largest piece of that is -- even though it may be the same product, it has some new -- it will have some nuances because of the way the FDA is rated, but largely it's -- the fact that we've gone to a new manufacturer and you've got a new production piece.

The old production line's gone -- actually, Wyeth took it and is making something else there, so we don't have a production plant that we can go back to.

So you've got at least a 24-month window bringing that particular piece up.

Then the time limit to do clinical trials -- even though it's the same product again -- the time period -- or very close to the same product -- the time period to get through three phases of clinical trials will unfortunately eat up a good two
and a half years.

And then you look at the time period in between
with the FDA discussions and the rest, we get to five years
pretty quick.

DR. WINKENWERDER: Let me just add my voice here.

This is one of the most disappointing facts and stories that
I've learned upon coming into my position, and I was extremely
disappointed to hear about this, really -- and I don't want to
cast aspersions on anybody who had responsibility in the past,
but to be blunt this is a major screw-up, and, you know, I am
committed to trying to accelerate this.

So what I've heard is not acceptable, as far as
I'm concerned.

MR. HOWELL: Sir, we can certainly go back and
talk to Barr and see what means --

DR. WINKENWERDER: Well, we will, and I'll
be -- and Ms. Embrey will be meeting with whoever we need to meet
with to accelerate this because we've got to make it -- we've got
to make things move more quickly than this -- and, you know, I
understand how the FDA works, but the FDA on the other hand is
going to make, you know, the process work with a small pox
vaccine in, you know, one fourth of the time. So if it can be
done there, it can be done here.

MR. HOWELL: Certainly -- I would agree with you.

As a minimum, we should anticipate that we'll get into a fast-
track sort of situation with them.

DR. WINKENWERDER: Right.

MR. HOWELL: And we would -- I'll be honest with you, sir. The thing that's been driving this timeline to a certain degree has always been dollars as well. I mean, we haven't even gotten to the table till we got to the dollars.

DR. WINKENWERDER: It's very simple to me. If you believe that this is something that we should do, then we should do it and do it well.

If we don't, then we shouldn't do it, and we shouldn't complain.

But I think the decision has been made that we do believe this is important, and we do believe that it prevents morbidity and mortality.

MR. HOWELL: Yes, sir.

DR. WINKENWERDER: And we need to do it, so we need to get it done.

DR. OSTROFF: Here -- and then Greg.

DR. PATRICK: Kevin Patrick. Among my other roles, I direct a student health center that services 32,000 students -- college students. It's hard for me to imagine that there's not another market here --

DR. WINKENWERDER: Yes, sir.

DR. PATRICK: -- for this vaccine or drug, and I just wonder if there's an opportunity --
MR. HOWELL: That area has been approached. In fact, that was one of the things we tried to stretch with Wyeth, and it was also part of the demographics certainly that Greer was looking at -- is could they sell in another location.

Historically, no, there's been no market there. Does that mean that with a good marketing program you could bring a market there? It's certainly possible.

DR. PATRICK: Well, I think with a good marketing program, in fact, they could, and our recent experience with the pneumococcal vaccine, for example, amongst college students and directed to consumer marketing and approaching parents has generated a tremendous interest.

So I think, if there's an opportunity to pull in a marketing expert on this and work with the population of folks that serve these 15 million people who are college students, it might help accelerate this process.

MR. HOWELL: Very good. Yeah.

DR. OSTROFF: Dr. Gray being an expert on this particular issue -- and I know you're doing some studies, looking at viral illness and a new college population in Iowa -- maybe you want to comment.

DR. GRAY: Well, thanks. Yeah, in addition to the estimated 1,200 to 1,400 unnecessary medical encounters that we're seeing from this loss in the military, there's strong evidence now that this -- some of these strains have changed.
In fact, there is a paper in press, *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, that's due to come out either in March or April, led by Dean Erdman (ph) of the CDC and Dr. Ryan and I, showing that new genotypes of adenovirus-7 have been associated with 27 deaths in various U.S. civilian populations since 1996. I strongly endorse the concept that there would be other markets. I think we need to try to figure out ways to partner the military interests with the civilian interests and special populations that might benefit from these vaccines.

DR. BERG: Bill Berg. I have two questions. In what appears to be a press release from Barr Laboratories, there's a statement among potential problems, outcome of legal proceedings including Eli Luway's (ph) appeal to the Supreme Court. What's that all about, and how does that impact the adenovirus --

MR. HOWELL: To be honest with you, we don't know ourselves what that means. I have not even heard that before.

DR. BERG: My second question is --

MR. HOWELL: Sorry.

DR. BERG: -- in your description you said that we have to go through all of these hoops regardless of the fact that it's an old vaccine, and then you also interweave that with "but we're making some changes in it". Could this be speeded up if we exactly duplicated the old process and then refined it later on?

MR. HOWELL: I think that's the whole problem is
we can't exactly duplicate the old process, because that's what the FDA said wouldn't come up to standard. There's a tavening (ph) piece and a growth piece within the virus that we have to change from the old process that was there.

So we do have to make some manufacturing changes, but the -- I have to tell you, I don't think that's a great -- it's going to take a little time, but from a technical risk, there's very, very little technical risk there. The problem is going to be is that we're going to have to do the trials, but we may not have to do them in the size and the number that you'd have to do an initial piece. We're looking at hopefully a bridging study, for example, in a phase 3 trial that would give us a smaller sampling that would allow us to look at the efficacy against the old one and therefore go forward.

So there's some means in which I think we can lower the normal standard time, but at least in talking with the FDA at this point, they're not willing to give up the normal standard pieces.

DR. BERG: Thank you.

MR. HOWELL: Yeah. Dr. Winkenwerder, before I leave, I think it would be of great usefulness if, in fact, you or Ms. Embrey wanted to get involved in the conversation directly with American Home Products -- would work to break that legal stranglehold we've got at the moment to get them forward.

DR. WINKENWERDER: Well, the -- we will and
with -- not only for the Barr side but also Wyeth is -- we've got another issue with -- you know, they're the owner of the DRYVAX vaccine.

    MR. HOWELL: Right.

    DR. WINKENWERDER: So we've got two wonderful topics to talk about. You know, I want action.

    MR. HOWELL: Yes, sir.

    DR. WINKENWERDER: I want results. That's what we're here about. I was just saying to Dr. Ostroff that the irony is that -- and all of our worry -- and there is real worry about using the small pox vaccine and the possible mortality associated with that. Just on the back of the envelope, the numbers that you might calculate for mortality associated with that or morbidity for the military population is no different, no worse, in fact, probably less than the mortality and morbidity that we're incurring because we don't have this vaccine right now. That's just -- you know, it's unacceptable. So we've got to make this thing move. We will be in touch. It's the top priority.

    MR. HOWELL: Great.

    DR. OSTROFF: Can I ask one quick question? Do you have any sense as to what the track record is of Barr in bringing products to market within the time frames that they say they're going to bring them to market?

    MR. HOWELL: I think that's one of the reasons why
we selected them, because two other people were nowhere near as experienced. Again, they're a generic drug manufacturer. So they do the back -- they're not necessarily a discoverer, but they are able to bring things to market in a manner that they've been able to crack into the market for those generic drugs.

So I feel really pretty secure that they'll be able to get it. In fact, I think the five years -- between me and y'all, I think the five years might be a little bit extreme, because that was based upon prior to knowing could they get into a fast track mode with the FDA and what would the time periods be and the turnaround of the paperwork with the FDA and things of that nature.

So there is some potential to do some shrinkage in there, not -- it may be somewhat marginal, but I think that's a relatively decent timeline. Anything earlier than that -- we were originally talking three to four years before that. I think that was pretty optimistic, to say the least.

DR. BERG: Bill Berg. The -- Merck recently announced a shortage of MMR vaccine. How often is that -- to what extent is that given to recruits? It used to be standard issue, but cohorts who got a second dose may have reached the point where the military no longer needs to do it. So, in other words, is the shortage of MMR impacting the immunizations we give the recruits or is that a past issue?

MR. HOWELL: I'm not sure I'm the guy that should
be answering that.

DR. OSTROFF: I think what we're going to do is -- was there --

COL. STAUNTON: I just wanted to raise one other issue on the international front as to what the status is now of the adenovirus vaccine with two potential outcomes. One is (indiscernible) speeding up the process, which obviously is of extreme importance, and the other is actually the potential for partnering in arrangement, say, with the (indiscernible).

MR. HOWELL: Traditionally, unless there was some -- how do I say this diplomatically? Unless there was some technology or some mechanism that you were going to bring to the table that we didn't already have in hand, that would certainly increase our capability and then, therefore, shorten it. I would be all in favor of it.

In this particular piece I think we've got it all together. It's just going through the -- you know, going through all the numbers.

Does that mean we wouldn't share our information and our findings and the rest of it? Certainly we can do that. But I'm not quite sure at this point, without seeing what it is you could bring to the table, where's the differential we're looking at at the moment? Unless you already had an adenovirus that was there and a production plant already there, but we -- I'm unaware of -- if there is, I'm unaware of that.
COL. STAUNTON: You're quite right. As far as I'm aware, that's -- your information is correct. What I was particularly referring to, the fact that we're -- when we speak of such issues, it seems to me -- and I'm speaking personally here (indiscernible) it seems to me that the importance of the work, the importance of -- the importance of the work that you're following, the programs that you follow don't stop or stay within the United States. They actually have implications which are of extreme importance. I know very well that the information is very readily shared, and we're extremely grateful for that.

The aspect of actually pushing the envelope a bit further in terms of using the vaccines with other services, with other forces internationally, I think is worthy of exploration.

MR. HOWELL: Certainly. I have to tell you, sir, I'm not smart enough to know what, if any, incident rate there is overseas. Certainly if there is, any way you can crack a CE mark as well as doing the FDA, I'm sure they would be in favor thereof, but I'm not knowledgeable enough of that overseas usage or requirement.

COL. STAUNTON: Thank you.

CMDR. RYAN: We have a little bit of overseas data from the collaboration we did with the UK in the Royal Navy Basic Training Center. About one third of their respiratory specimens grow adenovirus. That compares to about 60% of the specimens we get from CONUS, but still, a large proportion of their recruit
febrile respiratory illness is adenovirus.

MR. HOWELL: Great. Bad, but great.

CMDR. RYAN: And they're -- it's -- type 4 is what we got in the low number.

DR. OSTROFF: Let's take one more. Captain Yund?

CAPT. YUND: Captain Yund. I have a partial answer for Dr. Berg's question. I'm the person at UMED who usually gets the frantic calls from Great Lakes when they're having trouble getting a hold of something. I recently got a call about Baryvax (ph) from Great Lakes. I haven't received any calls about MMR. So it may be next week when I get back, but so far I haven't heard anything about Great Lakes having trouble getting MMR.

DR. BERG: But Great Lakes is continuing to give it to all recruits?

CAPT. YUND: Yes, sir.

MR. STUERKE: My name is Stacy Stuerke. I'm with the Merck vaccine division. I just wanted to echo the comments in your question about MMR.

We are making military first priority for any new releases that we have. Last week I understood we got over 500,000 doses released. The same with varicella. When we got that call I think it was a 600-dose order. We made military top priority. Otherwise it's always first in, first out as far as the orders, but military does have first crack at any new
releases.

We are still making the vaccine. It's coming. It's just not as fast as what the orders are right now. So we hope we'll get this solved in the short term, but at the same time the military will get first priority.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much. I think what we're going to do is take a break.

Before we do, let me just thank you for coming to give us this presentation and, in particular, let me thank Dr. Winkenwerder for his support on this particular issue. It's one that we will continue to watch very closely and look forward to hopefully seeing a better timeline in the not too distant future.

MR. HOWELL: If I can conclude, I'm taking two taskers home with me. I will certainly get with Ms. Embrey about who at American Home Products -- on that end. We will also sit down with Barr and see if there's any way that they can speed up and what the costing differentials or whatever would be involved in that. We'll shoot that to you as well.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you so much. Let's take a 15-minute break and then we'll come back and get the rest of the updates.

(A break was taken.)

DR. OSTROFF: Let's go ahead and try to get started, because we really do have to be out of here at about 11:30 so that those of us who are heading up to the Marine...
Recruit Center will make it there in time for the wonderful lunch that we have up there.

I guess the next one on the schedule is Captain Yund. It's really good to see you looking well. For those of you who don't know, he had some health challenges over the last couple of months. So it's good to see you here.

CAPT. YUND: Can people see this slide well enough? Do we need to close some of these?

(Side discussions.)

CAPT. YUND: Dr. Ostroff, I'll say that, when you're the recipient of some of these high-tech miracles of modern medicine, it changes your perspective a little bit.

Okay, I have two presentations in rapid succession here. First, the preventive medicine update and then another follow-up from a previous board meeting.

I'm, again, Captain Jeff Yund from the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. I work for Admiral Hart and a number of other admirals.

Two main topics. I'm going to tell you a little bit about Guantanamo Bay, what's going on down there. Then -- there's a little bit of preventive medicine in the Guantanamo Bay segment. Then the preventive health assessment, which is pretty much purely preventive medicine.

After September 11th, Navy Medicine was involved in many places in New York, of course, also at the Pentagon.
Staff from Bethesda were very involved in all of the Anthrax response in D.C. and Capitol Hill.

Eventually it became clear that Guantanamo Bay was going to be receiving detainees. I want to tell you a little bit about what's happening at Guantanamo Bay.

There's a small naval hospital there serving a population of about 3,000 people. The CO, Captain Shimkus, is now the Joint Task Force 160 surgeon. As of January 31st, his population had popped up, increased by about 60%. This additional 60% was a somewhat different population from the other 3,000 that he had in his population and has necessitated some changes in business.

One of the first things the CO did was start up a six-bed detainee advanced care unit in the hospital. This had the staff that you see there. Interestingly, all of the detainees travel with two MPs in addition to their shackles. The next change to business was an echelon one for sick call and some emergency medical care at Camp X-ray, very close to -- right where the detainees are being housed.

Also very early on, a preventive medicine team from EPMU2, including a preventive medicine doc and EHO and IHO and microbiologist and also four technicians showed up to help deal with a number of anticipated preventive medicine issues in dealing with detainee health.

A couple of other things, a joint aid station was
for health care to be provided to the joint task force personnel.

This was kept pretty strictly separate from the aid station, if you will, at Camp X-ray.

Also, a SPRINT team, special psychological rapid intervention team, was brought down to -- primarily to assist the staff at the hospital and also the JTF -- deal with the issues -- significant issues that were anticipated that might be -- might surround dealing with such a different patient population from what they were used to.

Fleet Hospital 20 was rapidly organized as a subunit of the full fleet hospital and brought down -- the size of a full fleet hospital is up to 500 beds, but in this case it was pared down a little bit to 20 to 36 ICU and other acute care beds, capability for two surgical suites. The staff you see here -- and a great CQ-riety.

(Laughter.)

CAPT. YUND: I'm going to have to talk to my secretary about that.

A lot of security issues that the hospital and also the fleet hospital are having to deal with.

One of the very early decisions that was made was that the quality and level of detainee care was going to be equal to the care that U.S. troops receive there or anywhere. One proviso is that it will all be done at Guantanamo Bay. So this level of care that we normally provide is considerably more
difficult when the patient is in shackles and there are two MPs around -- and they're very close around. They're not off at the periphery.

In addition, there was going to be a need for long-term rehabilitative care, which is not usually in the mission of a fleet hospital, but in this situation, it was an added mission.

The number of infectious disease and preventive medicine issues -- I'll just mention malaria. A number of the detainees arrived with malaria parasites in their blood. There are two issues. Certainly you want to treat the malaria that the individual detainee has, but another issue is that malaria has been absent from this part of Cuba for -- or maybe from all of Cuba for quite some time. So another big issue is doing what's necessary to prevent malaria from becoming endemic in this area again.

A number of medical legal issues surrounding care with -- of the detainees. Informed consent is absolutely practiced. There are translators. Informed consent is probably more strictly applied in this situation than for our own folks. There are some times when there are procedures that are required to save a life that, even if informed consent is not obtained, the procedure is carried out.

There is a great deal of medical photography going on in order to document the before and the during and the after.
Mortuary affairs is an important but hopefully small aspect of the activities of the hospital. A number of the detainees have died of the wounds that they arrived with. So there's attention being paid to doing the things with the body that would be appropriate for their culture.

These are just a few of the Navy boots on the ground down there.

Now, we're going to move on to the preventive health assessment. I just wanted to give you a brief glimpse of Guantanamo Bay. If there -- I suppose there might be some questions about that. If anybody has any questions about Guantanamo Bay, I might be able to answer them.

Sir?

DR. CAMPBELL: Doug Campbell. What kind of surveillance did you do for the health issues that detainees had when they arrived there?

CAPT. YUND: Well, one thing that's ongoing in the detainee camp is disease and non-battle injury surveillance, the same type of disease and non-battle injury surveillance that our troops have applied to them on a deployment. In addition, every detainee received a complete history and physical examination when they arrived.

So there was -- we learned quite a bit -- our people down there are learning quite a bit about their health and about what sort of conditions they have when they arrive.
DR. OSTROFF: One quick question. I know that TB has been a particular concern from the very beginning. Is there any suggestion that any of them have had active tuberculosis?

CAPT. YUND: I have heard that up until a couple days ago there had been no active cases of tuberculosis.

DR. CATTANI: Jacqui Cattani. This may be a bit of a detailed question, but you mentioned malaria and the prevention of reintroduction of malaria into Cuba. Can you tell me what you're actually doing, or is that a level of detail too sort of far down?

CAPT. YUND: No, I don't think that's too far down. If we had somebody -- the main thing that you want to do is --

DR. OSTROFF: If I can ask you to talk into the microphone.

CAPT. YUND: Oh, sorry.

DR. OSTROFF: Otherwise we can't record.

CAPT. YUND: The main concern is while you're treating someone who's parasitemic is to guarantee that vector mosquitoes can't get to that person. So, in order to do that, there are -- I mean, you can use insect repellants, both permethrin and Deet. Other ways to go about that are adulticiding and larviciding for mosquitoes in the area to cut down the number of mosquitos.

DR. CATTANI: I guess the point was are you
treating them with primaquine as a gamenocidalcidal (ph) agent? That would be more effective in most cases than just trying to do vector control or limitation.

CAPT. YUND: Right. Yes, ma'am, I think they are receiving primaquine.

DR. BERG: Bill Berg. Jeff, what is being -- can you give us a bit more detail on the diagnosing and ruling out tuberculosis? I was the JTF surgeon there when the Cuban refugees were there. There were two challenges. One, we had to get a technician in Gentmo (ph) who knew how to do AFB smears and then, because there were no AFB culture capabilities there, they had to be sent up to the Naval Hospital Portsmouth. What is in place to address that, that a diagnosis is not missed in an area that normally does not have much to do with TB?

CAPT. YUND: What I'm going to tell you is a guess, but there's a microbiologist there with the EPMU team. So that brings additional capability as far as smears. I doubt that they're doing cultures on site there, but that may be -- they may be doing that. So I don't really have a definitive answer for you.

DR. OSTROFF: Other questions?

(No audible response.)

CAPT. YUND: Okay, we'll move on to the next series of slides.

I wanted to tell you about a new initiative in
Navy preventive medicine or preventive health assessment.

Forgive me for just reading these couple of lines here.

The purpose of the preventive health assessment is to consolidate medical occupational health and risk screening services, medical record review, preventive counseling and risk communication under the umbrella of an annual assessment for all active duty men and women.

This is in effect now, as of 5 December. It carries the signatures of both the Navy Surgeon General and also the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps. It is based primarily on the United States Preventive Services Task Force recommendations. I know that everybody in this room is probably pretty well familiar with that, but I'll show the next slide.

This is not an exhaustive list, I don't think, of the things that are covered by the preventive health assessment but just some of the big items. So what we have here is a system to sort of codify into a recurring system of actually documenting the preventive measures that are taken and the counseling that's given in a yearly fashion, what is needed for all of our active duty folks, regardless of their age -- age appropriate tools.

So it's new and we don't know exactly what the impact is going to be, but we'd like to think that it's going to be a significant contribution to the health of all of our active duty men and women.

DR. OSTROFF: Any questions?
DR. HERBOLD:  John Herbold.  For the preventive services screening, how are you going to aggregate and manage the data for population inferences?

CAPT. YUND:  Well, initially this will be kept track of on paper.  We do not have a -- we don't have a system that will capture all of this electronically yet.  It's coming.  People often -- as a matter of fact, twice today already people have snickered when I mentioned that this is a capability which will be included in CHCS-2 because CHCS-2 seems -- every time a month goes by, CHCS-2 seems two months farther off.  There has not been a specific electronic system designed to keep track of this data.  It would certainly be short-lived -- at least, we hope it would be short-lived.  So, initially, it will be paper data.

DR. FORSTER:  Jean Forster from the University of Minnesota.  I didn't notice tobacco use or alcohol use on your list of screening questions.  Maybe they're aggregated under some larger categories, but --

CAPT. YUND:  They are specifically included.

DR. FORSTER:  Okay.

CAPT. YUND:  I didn't have them up there on the slide, but they are specifically included in the instruction which guides the preventive health assessment.

DR. OSTROFF:  Let's take two more.

DR. PATRICK:  Kevin Patrick.  I'm particularly
excited about the notion that it includes not only screening but
counseling -- preventive counseling and risk communication. I'm
wondering how that is going to be evaluated, how the impact of
that over successive years will be determined.

CAPT. YUND: I think that a full evaluation of how
successful that's going to be is going to have to wait until we
have an electronic system to capture all of this data. The
study -- I think it's an important step that we move forward and
take direct action to be doing all of these things for each of
our active duty folks. It's an important additional step to be
able to look at the data across the population and across time.
That part of the nut has not been cracked yet.

DR. PATRICK: If I can just do a follow-up on
that. This is for those -- I do work in risk communication,
health behavior modification. This is potentially as exciting as
the millennium study overall in terms of following -- if, in
fact, this is now in place and will be a going-forward process.
So there's a wonderful opportunity here to do sub-studies, to do
evaluation tests to see what works, what doesn't. I think this
is, again, an incredible infrastructure that's being built that
would be a gold mine for researchers to look at.

DR. OSTROFF: Last question.

DR. NESS: Roberta Ness. This is actually a
related question to Dr. Patrick's comments. I just wanted to ask
you if you could try to explain to us briefly what is the process
by which you go from screening to prevention. How does this process work by which you gather the information and then move to counseling? What does that consist of? How does that process work?

CAPT. YUND: Well, there are a number of ways that this screening can be done. One of the ways is to have people come in for a specific visit that is intended to accomplish the preventive health assessment, a dedicated visit to go through all of the items that are applicable for that person of that sex, of that age and to accomplish both the screening that's required and the education, risk communication that's required under each of these rubrics in the instruction.

The instruction does not mandate that this must happen at a single visit. It allows the possibility that the sum total of these screening and educational events can happen during the course of the year as long as they all happen over the course of the year.

I hope that answers your question a little bit.

DR. NESS: So is there -- so, given the fact that we all know that behavior change can happen slowly, is there the opportunity to have -- is this a repetitive process?

CAPT. YUND: Oh, yes, ma'am, this is annual.

DR. NESS: But -- okay, but I'm saying you identify somebody who is a smoker, and is there a process by which there is the opportunity for repetitive visits or
if -- with regard to counseling, with regard to smoking cessation, et cetera?

CAPT. YUND: Yes, ma'am. If someone is identified as a smoker and they're willing to consider quitting, one of the things that might very well happen as a result of the preventive health assessment is for them to be referred to a tobacco cessation program within the clinic. That wouldn't all happen within the umbrella of the preventive health assessment, but certainly referrals could be made to other capabilities within the clinic to perform what additional services are needed.

DR. OSTROFF: Last quick question over here.

LT. COL. GOODRICH: Hi, Captain Yund. Lieutenant Colonel Goodrich. I'm working at TMA. I'm just wondering, sir, how you envision this working with some of the other projects that are underway such as the health evaluation assessment review. Is this sort of a complementary type of product or project, or is this meant to augment what we're going to be doing with the HEAR survey in the near future?

CAPT. YUND: I think that the HEAR and the preventive health assessment would be complementary and that, when the new, improved HEAR hits the street and we start using it, certainly the output of that questionnaire could simplify and streamline some of the screening and questioning that would happen along with the preventive health assessment. So I see them as definitely complementary.
LT. COL. GOODRICH: Thank you.

DR. OSTROFF: Okay, I think, Jeff, while you're up there, you were going to do your other presentation just for efficiency.

CAPT. YUND: I was.

DR. OSTROFF: Good.

CAPT. YUND: If that's okay.

DR. OSTROFF: Yeah. For the board members who don't know, there's a history here in that, when data was presented at previous meetings, there was some question about why the Navy data seemed to be lagging behind some of the other services. So we asked Jeff to give an update.

CAPT. YUND: And I have a partial update, but we'll move ahead with it.

At the last meeting, some data was presented indicating that the Navy in particular had some difficulty getting a high percentage of conditions on the reportable event list into the AMSA system, the defense medical surveillance system.

If we go on to the next slide, this, some of you may remember -- I remember it especially well because it was a painful experience to be sitting with the AFEB and see this data go up, but this is the data indicating -- now, this deals with inpatient data, because there's fairly complete, accurate collection of inpatient data. Over these different years, this
was reported to be the percentage of those reportable conditions that actually showed up at AMSA as a reportable condition.

If we can go to the next slide. We did a couple of things. First, we started a working group to look into this to, first of all, try to figure out exactly what the problem was and pinpoint specific trouble areas and recommend what we could do to change this.

More specifically, what we did recently is get a line listing from AMSA of all of the reported reportable conditions from inpatient data, and we matched the medical event reports against that list to see which ones had been reported and which ones hadn't.

If we go to the next slide. Okay, and then I went back and queried the NEHC database -- actually, Captain Bunker did the querying for me -- to see if there were additional cases that were in the NEHC database that somehow had gotten lost in the translation and not ended up in the AMSA database. We found precious few of those.

The next slide is the previous slide with the new numbers superimposed. So, for --

(Laughter.)

CAPT. YUND: So, for '98, '99 and 2000, the numbers that I calculated, based upon AMSA's data, were significantly higher but certainly not as high as we'd like to have them.
Now, the last data point, which was for a partial year, really didn't bump much from the previously reported information.

So next slide. First, I don't think there's much data being lost in between NECH and AMSA since, when we went backwards, we didn't identify additional cases.

There are a number of other possible problems. We have not finished the diagnostic -- the troubleshooting here yet, but certainly a likely candidate is true non-reporting, where the reporting of reportable conditions doesn't always happen, for one reason or another.

That reporting goes from the MTF or the operational unit to the Navy environmental and preventive medicine units. It's possible that there's some data lost within the EPMUs. The sailing with our Navy disease reporting system and access-based electronics system has not been smooth over the two -- well, three or four years that it's been in existence.

It's possible that more data -- that there's data lost as the data is transmitted from the EPMU to NEHC. It's possible, although very unlikely, that there's any data actually lost at NEHC.

So I just want to tell you where we're going from this, because obviously what I'm presenting now is only an initial look and a starting point only. The working group is going to continue. This working group is going to be part of a
new program, an ongoing and recurring self-assessment of Navy preventive medicine, of which disease reporting with NDRS is going to be a major focus.

Upcoming next month is the 42nd NEHC occupational health and preventive medicine workshop. Preventive medicine personnel from all of the EPMUs and also from MTFs are going to be spending some time in a sub-workshop planning this ongoing self-assessment and specifically brainstorming, looking at the disease reporting issue to, number one, do some further diagnosis about what isn't working and, number two, come up with some ideas about what's the best way to fix it.

I think that's the last slide.

DR. OSTROFF: Thanks for the presentation. It strikes me this is such a core, fundamental public health responsibility that it baffles me as to why you see data like this. I'm wondering, is there anybody that's doing it well or is this system-wide?

CAPT. YUND: Well, if we went back to that slide, which I don't think we need to do --

(Laughter.)

CAPT. YUND: The Army's numbers are considerably higher.

DR. OSTROFF: No, I mean in the Navy.

CAPT. YUND: Oh. Well, within the Navy, there --

DR. OSTROFF: I mean, maybe you'll have some model
to have the others aspire to.

CAPT. YUND: Yes, sir, and we do have some data about that. There are certain MTFs that do an excellent job of disease reporting. I can't break it down MTF by MTF here.

There are other -- probably not MTFs, but there are a number of reporting sites, operational units -- there are reporting sites that don't ever send a medical event report into the NDRS system.

DR. OSTROFF: Hopefully Guantanamo isn't one of them.

CAPT. YUND: No, sir, I'd be very surprised if that were the case.

DR. OSTROFF: Good. Are you going to be audacious enough to set a target for 2002?

CAPT. YUND: Oh, for the percentage compliance?

(Laughter.)

CAPT. YUND: Well, they say you should start small and build, right? So we've started small. It would certainly be great to get it well above the 50% range, but I'm not going to suggest that I think that we can fix it all at one time.

DR. OSTROFF: Any other comments? Bill, this was your issue.

DR. BERG: Yeah, this reminds me of one of the classic military quotations in military preventive medicine, General Slim in World War II in the Pacific, malaria
chemoprophylaxis was a big problem and Slim said, "I had to sack two or three of my generals. After that, the rest got the message and the problem went away." So maybe including that quotation appropriately in Navy medicine might help a little bit too.

I have an unrelated question. What has been the -- how much cooperation is there between the detainees and the medical system in Guantanamo? Are they being cooperative with getting the care and answering the questions?

CAPT. YUND: We recently heard from Captain Shimkus at the tri-care meeting. He had a number of anecdotes dealing with the detainees' interaction with the medical staff. They were all surprisingly positive anecdotes. He did not relate significant difficulties, major roadblocks that the detainees threw down in the medical staff's way. They have, on a number of occasions, expressed gratitude and appreciation for the care that they have received. One of the problems down there is that it's important for not only the medical staff but also the MPs not to trust that too much. I mean, these are people who, with a little bit less restraint, might just as well be trying to kill us.

One of the anecdotes that I found touching, if I can use the word, one of the detainees required an annucleation (ph) for a chronic eye injury that had been sort of festering for quite a few months and agreed that that was needed, had the
annucleation. After the annucleation, the detainee asked the
surgeon if he would come share tea with the detainee. He
appreciated the care -- I think it's clear to them that they
are -- I mean, they're not living in the Guantanamo Hilton. It's
a spartan existence, but I think it's clear to them that they are
getting high-quality medical care under otherwise adverse
circumstances.

DR. OSTROFF: I think just one more. Admiral?

REAR ADM. HART: A partial question -- answer, Bill, is the data inputters are already highly taxed. If we
don't start making the information reporting system easy to use
for the provider that puts the data in, we can just keep firing
people till there's nobody left.

I think the answer is probably non-reporting. If
the operator doesn't see the benefit, immediately clear the
benefit, then you have to have an information system reporting
process that's easy. If the operator has neither, then you've
got an overtaxed data input source. I don't know the solution to
that.

So we're going to get back to CHCS-2. CHCS-2,
however, doesn't work for the operators. So one third of our
population isn't going to be able to use the system anyway.

If I could just comment on an earlier thing on
PHCA. In some ways, it ought to be named PHI, Preventive Health
Intervention. There's two metrics that are going to be attached
to this thing, an individual medical readiness metric and an individual health metric. The DOD, TMA has assigned primary care managers to every single person in the DOD system. They will be held accountable for improving these metrics.

So we have various assessment systems. This is an assessment system that is actually going to be used for intervention. The providers will be held accountable for improving the preventive health. It's a major step forward.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you. I think we're going to have to move on so we can keep on schedule.

Jeff, you look great and it's good to see you back.

CAPT. YUND: Thanks.

DR. OSTROFF: Captain Schor is not here and has a report in your briefing books. We certainly wish him well. I don't know if you have any comments to make or --

LT. CMDR. CONNER: He actually just asked me to relay that the Marine Corps does have a significant response right now to muscular skeletal injury and prevention. This is something that's getting three-and-four-star-level support. It's, as you can see from his report, actually something that has a two-pronged effort, not only in the medical and clinical side of things but also the policy on how they are approaching training.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you. It's great to hear.
Let's move on to Commander Ludwig.

CMDR. LUDWIG: Good morning -- I think it's still morning.

Just one comment about disease reporting, remembering that in some ways this is a passive system. Even though in the military we mandate it, it still is a passive system. It just so happens that we have very good tracking of hospitalization data so that we can compare the data, the reporting to the hospitalization data. There aren't too many other systems that have that good of data. So I dare say any passive system is fraught with difficulties. I think, if the Navy comes up with some great interventions, I'd like to know what they are, because we have the same problem.

Okay, I am the Coast Guard preventive medicine officer. I just want to remind, for the new members especially, that although the Coast Guard is not part of the Department of the Defense but part of the Department of Transportation, we are the fifth -- one of the five military services that is an armed force. We do work frequently with the DOD, in fact, almost continually with the DOD, especially in operations with the Navy.

The first thing I want to talk about is the Anthrax cleanup. The Environmental Protection Agency, which I didn't list up here, was actually the ones who were tasked with cleaning up the Anthrax-contaminated sites. They were activated under Superfund or CERCLA authority. The Coast Guard strike
teams, which have a great deal of experience cleaning up environmental kinds of Superfund activities, were notified by the EPA and requested to assist with the Anthrax cleanup.

  Anthrax was classified as a disease-causing pollutant or contaminant. Of course, as you know from -- in the Superfund Act, that's one of the categories of environmental contaminants that are cleaned up. However, our strike teams had no experience with biological cleanup in the past. So this was a new and exciting experience for us.

  We had 53 members of three different strike teams and at two different sites, both in D.C. and in Florida.

  Our folks showed up in level B protective gear. What we found was that we were the most -- in the highest level of protective gear of anyone who showed up at the sites, including the EPA, who felt that level C was adequate. Because we were in level B, we were -- the strike teams; I say "we" collectively -- were sent into the hot zones preferentially although not exclusively.

  There were, however, significant breaks in protocol. I won't go into those. They were largely accidental, of course, but they were of concern. We offered our strike team members the standard postexposure prophylaxis that all the cleanup members were offered. That is 60 -- I'm sorry, it should be 90 days of antibiotics. Sorry about that.

  Then they were offered the Anthrax vaccine under
IND protocol. As you know, it's offered under IND protocol because the use of it, as opposed to exposure, prophylaxis, three doses, as opposed to six doses for pre-exposure use, is not included in the licensing. Therefore, it has to be under IND protocol.

Unfortunately, a fairly sizable majority of our strike team members refused the postexposure IND protocol participation, even though it's becoming fairly obvious that we will all be participating in the vaccine program again. Actually, our percentage was probably lower than, say, for instance, the D.C. postal workers, but we still had a significant number of personnel refuse.

To try to get a handle on why that happened and what were the various factors, I think a lot of us can guess at what they are. We did decide to send out a questionnaire, which I have included in your packet. I'd be glad to talk to people off-line about this if you have comments or questions. We haven't gotten any responses back. Our mail is going through irradiation before it gets to the building. So all the mail coming to Coast Guard headquarters, unless it comes by overnight delivery, is taking a long time to get to us, but I expect we'll have a fairly good response. The people in these teams are very motivated, highly motivated.

So that's the extent of what I wanted to report on the Anthrax cleanup.
The other topic that I wanted to talk about was a few activities of the STD prevention committee. I mentioned at our last meeting that I would try to devote some time in my reports to this prevention committee, of which I am an active member.

The surveillance subcommittee, I reported, was working on a report, which we are still working on, but I didn't really present any data, which I'd like to just present a little bit of data -- you've got some handouts -- well, one handout, really, with more data. You can draw your own conclusions. When our report comes out, you'll see what our conclusions are. I've already alluded to them in previous presentations.

The reportable event -- this is sexually transmitted diseases -- are based on the tri-service reportable events list that Captain Yund was just referring to. They are collected through a variety of service-specific systems, which are named up there. The Coast Guard doesn't have a name. I'm open to suggestions for a surveillance system.

All of them are passive surveillance. What we find is the diagnoses may or may not be based on lab tests, which means that in the reportable disease surveillance system, if they're not based on confirmatory lab tests, they're set aside in a separate category.

We have no way, really, of determining which
diagnoses, if any, are based on any lab test or what the result might have been.

We also don't have antibiotic susceptibility data on any large scale in any of the services.

Actually, these are out of order. I meant to present this one first. It doesn't really matter.

Chlamydia. There are a number of studies -- I have a summary list of results of targeted studies in the military. There are quite a few, but this is the best we can do for prevalence data is these targeted studies. There's no program, no overall arching program that directs what studies need to be done. They're done at the determination of the research facility or the researchers on what looks like it's going to be an important issue.

Anyway, chlamydia in recruits -- you have female Army and Marine Corps -- that is, as they came into the service, with 9 to 11 percent with chlamydia. Male Army, 5%. These, remember, are from a variety of targeted studies. Some other studies show female Navy -- this is post recruit training, sometime in their Navy career -- a 3-to-7-percent prevalence. Army personnel -- females who are asymptomatic, it was found in one study, had a 7% prevalence of chlamydia. Males in the Marine Corps, a 3-to-5-percent prevalence.

There are other studies, other sexually transmitted diseases, but I think you can see that, not
surprisingly -- well, perhaps surprisingly to some people -- we really do have a sexually transmitted disease problem in the military. It hasn't been under a lot of discussion for a number of years, although this committee has addressed it. I just wanted to present some of the data we have.

Subject to your questions, that concludes my presentation.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much. Let's take one or two questions.

I will say that this issue of the -- what to do about the people involved in the environmental cleanup with the Anthrax has been a sustained problem because these are individuals that have potential repetitive exposures. We have, not only in the Coast Guard but also in some of the other federal agencies that have been involved in the cleanup -- but in particular, people in the private sector that literally have gotten stuck on antibiotics for months or more already and have lots more yet to go because they've been involved in all this cleanup. That's why we were -- I mean, if there's any group that really needs to get the vaccine, these are the people.

DR. POLAND: I agree. I do wonder, since you are going to do a survey, will you have any idea of compliance with the antibiotic recommendation?

CMDR. LUDWIG: If you take a look at the survey, if I remember correctly, I did ask them when they finished taking
their antibiotics -- yes, question number 8, did you take antibiotics and, if yes, what date did you stop? Question number 9, if you stopped -- and then I have why. Then I have the same question repeated, it looks like. Anyway, I am trying to get at that.

Fifty-three members -- I mean, we'll have a sense of what's going on with this population. I'm not sure we can say anything about the postal workers or the other federal employees who -- or private --

DR. POLAND: And when you said your rate was lower, the rate of refusal of Anthrax vaccine?

CMDR. LUDWIG: Yes, I think our rate of refusal was quite a bit lower than the post office.

DR. OSTROFF: It was low everywhere.

CMDR. LUDWIG: It was very low in the post office.

Ours was probably -- I think about 25% took the vaccine.

DR. OSTROFF: Oh, then you're --

DR. POLAND: Okay, so the office --

CMDR. LUDWIG: The rate of --

DR. POLAND: Seventy-five percent refused the vaccine, in other words.

CMDR. LUDWIG: Right.

DR. OSTROFF: Let's take one more question and then we'll have to move on. Otherwise we'll never --

DR. CATTANI: Jacqui Cattani. I wondered if you
can still change this questionnaire. It seems to me that it's
good to ask whether people stopped taking antibiotics because of
side effects, but one of the issues that has occurred, I know, in
Florida and some of the individuals that have been on prophylaxis
is the incidents and type of side effects that actually occur.
There may be a significant number of people that continue to take
the antibiotics but experience side effects. I can't see that
you would actually pick it up from this questionnaire. So you
might ask them, yes, if you stopped, why did you stop but also,
if they continued taking them, did they experience any side
effects or what side effects they experienced.

CMDR. LUDWIG: Yes. I can't change this
questionnaire, but it's a small enough population I can get the
question out there to them.

DR. OSTROFF: Yeah. Let me just point out very
quickly -- I mean, we are monitoring and doing a two-year follow-
up of all approximately 10,000 people who were placed on 60 days
of chemoprophylaxis. So we actually do have all of this
information. It's more than we want.

Let's move on. I think we next have the British
medical liaison, Colonel Staunton.

COL. STAUNTON: Ladies and gentlemen, good
morning. Firstly, I'd like to introduce myself so that you know
who I am and, very briefly, my background.

My name is Michael Staunton. I started working
here in the United States at the office of the Army Surgeon
General at the beginning of September.

My background has been in family medicine, also
public health medicine and command and staff work.

It's my privilege to convey to you today the
greetings and gratitude of the United Kingdom Armed Forces
Surgeon General and also the directors general of the medical
services. That's General Bob Menges (ph), Surgeon Admiral
Jenkins, General Joliff (ph) and recently appointed to the Air
Force, Air Vice Marshal Warrick Pike (ph).

Now, during my brief time here, I've had the great
privilege of visiting many establishments and seeing the day-to-
day work and cooperation that goes on between our armed forces.

I know we've worked particularly closely on the
Gulf War illness issues. Now, our language can sometimes be, it
seems to me, a barrier and a hindrance rather than a help,
because although Captain David Brown, who works on the Gulf War
Syndrome, is not here today, I noted that he refers to himself as
the Gulf War health officer. Now, it seems to me there may be
some conflict in terms of how we sometimes look at things. So my
job is actually, in some ways, to smooth out some of these
differences and to help with the translation.

The area I've been particularly, I have to say, on
a personal level -- I will be pushing very hard -- I would like
to endorse the millennium cohort study. I think here is perhaps
even an area where we could work well together.

The other areas of concern that I have are very simple. I wish to be a conduit, if you will, for our own studies, for our own concerns, for insuring that our military personnel on both sides of the Atlantic receive quite the best treatment that we can give, the best health surveillance.

So I will invite all of you -- and this is my main message today -- to inquire of me or to contact me regarding any areas which you believe that I can be of assistance in insuring that we work as closely together as possible. Thank you.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much. Any questions or comments?

(No audible response.)

DR. OSTROFF: We appreciate you being here very much. We definitely look forward to working with you.

COL. STAUNTON: Thank you.

DR. OSTROFF: Colonel Fensom, who usually gives the update for Health Affairs Canada is not able to attend. We have Dr. Jeff Whitehead to do her update.

DR. WHITEHEAD: Good morning. Colonel Fensom couldn't make it. I work in the epidemiology cell of Force Health Protection. So I was invited to come down here because I have some projects which are very similar to some of the ones you have on your agenda.

So I'm just going to go through those briefly and
then we can ask questions later on.

So these are the ones. The first one, prospective health data analysis capability, that has some similarities to your recruit assessment program. The second one, the Anthrax vaccine long-term safety study -- by "long-term" I should say we mean beyond the short-term effects of, let's say, redness or swelling in the arm. Then the last two are linkage projects, which I'm going to talk about, which are attempts to try and get some grasp of some of the health effects on people after they've left the Canadian forces. I'm sure that's a problem that you have in this country as well.

So let's talk about this one first. It's called the capability because this is something that's going to stay in place forever. There's three parts to this. All three parts share one thing. The underlying objective is to try and get some idea of what the risk factors are for post-deployment illnesses.

The first one, the recruit questionnaire, you'll find there are significant similarities to your recruit assessment program. That isn't by chance. We're actually -- we're very grateful for the assistance we've gotten from a number of people here who have kept us in contact by e-mail, fax and phone.

Let me just talk a little bit about the recruit questionnaire. At this point it actually serves two functions.
There's a research side in terms of we're asking about risk factors for post-deployment illness -- possible risk factors, I should say. There's also a health surveillance side to it. We're asking about things like smoking, alcohol intake, use of seatbelts.

Now, our legal advice was that we had to get informed consent to collect this data and to use it for research and to link it, actually, to the medical record. We'll also be linking it to personnel and environmental records.

We don't see that as a problem. In fact, we have more of a concern that recruits will tend to sign anything because of the peer pressure. So we're still in discussion, how do we make sure that they don't feel that they have to sign it, that people around there aren't going to give them a hard time?

We're aiming for a questionnaire about 45 minutes. We'd like to have them in the first three days of recruit training, before they even get their uniforms, but it looks like we're probably stuck at the end of the first week, by which time they're starting to get into sleep deprivation. That's a problem. They fall asleep while we're doing the survey sometimes.

Of course we're asking about health risk factors, a number of psychological scales. We tend to try and use questions from Canadian population health surveys that so we'll be able to compare recruits with the population from which
they're drawn. Now, if we don't have that, then what we're doing
is the next closet thing, which we think are American recruits.
So that's why we're trying to use some of the same questions that
you have on your recruit assessment program.

We did a pilot last month in English and French.
It's still a little long. It has to be cut down to size. I
think I was having a good day when I gave that implementation
date there. I haven't had that many good days since then. So I
think we're probably looking at April, May, if we're lucky, if
everything goes according to plan and, of course, it never does.

The second part of this prospective project is
really an existing medical questionnaire which is not optional.
This is one that you have to fill out with a periodic health
exam. As it exists now, there's a symptom checklist. There's
questions on smoking and alcohol, things like that. What we've
done is we've expanded the area on psychological health, and also
we've asked specific questions about deployment history, because
our administrative records are not very accurate in that area.

Another thing we're doing, of course, is we're
making it into a machine-readable input so we can put it into a
database easily.

The last part we're just getting started on.
That's the optional periodic health exam questionnaire. What
we're trying to look at there is organizational and social
factors. So we're going to be looking at stuff like unit
cohesion, unit morale, family discord. That may be an area where we get into problems with consent. As people get into the military, they're less likely to agree to this type of thing.

Now, the Anthrax vaccine long-term safety study, that's simply a chart review of symptoms and diagnoses of those who received the Anthrax vaccine. It was in 1998. They were going to the Gulf. This was compared with a group that was deployed to the Balkans. We planned to revisit this group at five-year intervals. We've contracted this out to a university research group. They should be completed by the end of this year.

Now, the Gulf War linkage project. This is a plan we have to link our Gulf War cohort, which I should mention is quite a bit smaller than yours and the U.K.'s, and link that in a comparison group to the Canadian cancer registry and the Canadian mortality database.

One thing we've learned from this, though, is it's a very lengthy process. The data may be held centrally, but it's actually all the provinces that own it. So we had to go and get their approval. So we're now two years into this and we won't -- we probably will have the results this summer, but that's a long time. I'm sure you're all aware that, when someone comes after a deployment and raises a concern about an increased risk of cancer, it's not good enough to say, "Well, I'll get back to you on that two years from now." That just doesn't fly.
So, if we can go on to the next slide, that's what's led to the last thing I want to discuss, which is what we call the omnibus record linkage project. Our idea here is just to pre-link all members of the Canadian forces that were in from 1990 on to these two databases, these nationally held cancer registry and mortality databases. Then the idea is that, if a concern is raised, you can quickly pull up this information and you can answer some of those key questions. Of course, you have to redo the linkage, but it's always the administrative burden in front, getting the okay, that takes the time. So we should be able to do that quite quickly once this is okay, because the linkage takes no time at all.

That still leaves us with a gap in terms of people, once they do get out of the military, we have no idea what symptoms they have. We have no idea what their hospitalization is like, because once they're out there into the provincial health care systems, they're very hard to track at that point. We have no system in place. In fact, we're even limited by contacting them by things like privacy legislation. Those are things we're going to work on for another day.

That's the things I wanted to tell you about just in case you have any interest in what we're doing and we can compare notes.

The next slide is -- the last one is just contact information. I'm the point of contact for any of these probably
for the next little while. We only have one other epidemiologist
in this cell. She's going on maternity leave anytime now. So,
at least until the end of this calendar year, it's probably best
to contact me if you want any information on these things that
we're doing. Thanks.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you so much. I'm intrigued
that there's an Alta Vista Drive in Ottawa.

Any questions?

(No audible response.)

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you so much. What we're going
to do now is move on to Colonel Egerton to give us an update on
the survey that was discussed at great length at the last board
meeting of the September 11th events at the Pentagon. Thank you
for coming.

COL. EGERTON: Good morning. I'm pleased to have
this opportunity to present the progress of the Pentagon post-
disaster health assessment that was developed at the United
States Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine
and administered to Pentagon personnel shortly after the events
of 11 September.

This was a complete team effort. Two team members
are here today, Lieutenant Colonel Jim Wells and Nikki Jordan.
They're in the back. Please direct all questions to them.

(Laughter.)

COL. EGERTON: This slide describes the CHPPM
responsibilities in the survey process. The primary responsibility for deploying the survey was delegated to the North Atlantic Regional Medical Command. The operations plan called for NARMC to conduct a pre-survey campaign throughout the Pentagon using printed as well as electronic media to advertise the survey. Tri-service teams were trained by CHPPM personnel under the direction of Lieutenant Colonel Greg Black and Major Tony Cox and then released within the Pentagon and throughout satellite locations containing Pentagon personnel.

A total of 19,450 personnel were contacted until NARMC concluded their operations on 16 November. The custodial responsibility of the survey then moved to the DeLorenzo (ph) Tricare Health Clinic. Those personnel took charge of the survey until it closed on 15 January of this year.

An interim report was published in established Pentagon communications and through e-mail in December. A total of 4,764 persons completed the survey online and in paper format. Response rates were probably affected by a variety of reasons, like the ongoing deployment, the Anthrax situation and increased operations tempo within the Pentagon.

The web-based format that we used was developed by PKC and used problem knowledge coupler technology.

This slide summarizes the demographics of the respondents. The median age of respondents was 43 years age. The mean age was 42.8 years. Respondents ranged in age from 17
to 88 years of age. 38.4% of the respondents were female. Active duty response was more heavily Army and Air Force. Four thousand six hundred and eighty-seven respondents indicated their location at the time of the attack and 3,608 were actually able to quantitate their distance from the point of the attack. Thirteen percent didn't know how far they were from the collapsed portion of the Pentagon, and 15% reporting that they were within the collapsed area is most likely an overestimate due to the subjective nature of the question that we asked.

This slide describes the respondents' answers to the questions dealing about potential exposures. A majority of the respondents reported exposure to light smoke. Sixty-four percent of respondents reported smoke exposure for 30 minutes or less.

Questions were asked relating to health status, and a majority, 79%, rated their health status as very good to excellent prior to the attack. Respondents reported on new health problems, old health problems perceived to have been made worse since the attack, and they also responded to health problems at any time since the attack.

Sixteen hundred ninety-two respondents answered yes to either having an old health problem that was made worse or a new health problem or they may have indicated in the course of the survey that they had a problem, a health problem that resulted as -- since the attack on 11 September.
hundred and seventy-two of those respondents actually were able to describe their problems; 220 didn't answer. Three percent who were at or near the Pentagon indicated that they were injured during the blast. A hundred and fifteen of those were able to describe how they were injured.

Now, it's noted that 20% of those respondents gave some conflicting information, that is, that they might have answered that they were injured early but then reported that they were not injured later on in the survey.

Also, a lot of respondents seemed to indicate that smoke inhalation and depression and anxiety were injuries as opposed to health problems.

Of the 118 respondents who answered that they were trapped during the attack, all but three were able to quantitate the amount of time that they were trapped. A majority of these respondents were trapped for less than ten minutes. Causes for being trapped are shown in the third bullet.

The survey asked respondents about the amount of time it took to evacuate the building. A majority of the respondents were able to evacuate in ten minutes or less. The reasons for not evacuating were also noted, like not knowing that an attack had happened, the lack of awareness or assisting with rescue efforts.

Of 114 respondents who noted injury during the evacuation, 109 were able to describe the cause of their
injuries. Nineteen respondents had conflicting responses, and many injuries that were reported were not physical.

This slide describes the self-reported functioning since the attack on September the 11th. Over 20% of respondents reported that daily functioning was at least somewhat impacted by personal or emotional problems. Twenty-eight percent of respondents reported symptoms associated with a high risk for PTSD depression, panic attacks or alcohol abuse. We asked specific questions in the mental health portion that were -- that correlated with high risk for these particular conditions. We also used problem knowledge couplers in the web-based version that linked these questions and also gave messages to respondents who answered these positively, cluing them that they might want to seek assistance.

Over 862 respondents expressed that they had some concerns, and of that group, 414 of them actually asked to be contacted. We were able to group their concerns into the categories that are listed. To give you an example, the mental health category included stress, sleep or eating disorders and anxiety, among other things. The building safety category looked at emergency response preparedness, building security. People expressed concerns about that. The administrative category, people expressed concerns about complaints on admin decisions, for instance, being told to go back to work too soon, things like that. Family member concerns were particularly of note. People
were concerned about the attack of the -- I mean, the effects of
the attack on their family members.

Four hundred and fourteen referrals were passed to
the mental health response team. That's Operation Solace. The
breakdown of those referrals is listed here. To date, most of
those persons have been contacted either personally, by phone or
electronically.

We learned a lot of lessons in doing this. We had
a very short timeline to get this survey deployed. Some of the
lessons learned I'd like to discuss now. We solicited input from
a variety of sources and showed the survey to a variety of
persons, this board included, to get input. Trying to coordinate
that in the short amount of time that we had in order to get the
survey deployed was an adventure. We're looking at maybe
institutionalizing a more streamlined version of being able to do
that.

There were difficulties with the web-based version
of the survey. Once we deployed it within the Pentagon,
unforeseen difficulties -- incompatibilities with the networks
and the browsers within the Pentagon. There is absolutely no
uniformity of informatics within the Pentagon.

(Laughter.)

COL. EGERTON: It's literally a tower of Babel.

The standardization of the systems in the building, as I said, is
virtually nonexistent. That made the web-based version not work
in a lot of areas. That probably cost a lot of participants because of frustration with making the survey work online, which was our preferred method of having the survey completed.

We were able to get an expedited approval through OMB with the help of the Tricare Management Agency's Department of Health program analysis and evaluation.

We're attempting to chronicle this process for institutional memory for those who would attempt to do something similar to this in the future.

We wanted tri-service participation in this effort. We were able to achieve this in development and the review process of implementing the survey; however -- and we received report from the three surgeons general -- three service surgeons general; however, when we deployed the survey, the deployment teams were decidedly Army and Air Force. We didn't have very heavy Navy participation.

This was a voluntary survey. As such, respondents were not contacted about results unless they specifically requested to be contacted. That was one of the rules that we had to agree to in order to get the survey deployed within the Pentagon.

This is the future direction of the survey. Of particular note is that we plan completion of the technical report by the end of April.

That concludes this presentation. We're ready for
any questions.

DR. OSTROFF: Thank you very much for that presentation. I concur with you that this was not an easy thing to accomplish.

I have one question for you. In terms of -- and maybe Colonel Engler would weigh in as well. In terms of the mental health issues, is there any way to separate out how much of the mental health burden is directly related to what happened on September 11th versus all this stress of the war effort that's occurred subsequently?

COL. EGERTON: That is a very good question, and I'm not sure that I can answer that completely to your satisfaction. I'm not sure that we can do that based on the types of questions that we asked, but it's definitely a consideration. So, when we do the complete analysis, that would be -- and with the help of the mental health team that helped us formulate the questions, that would be a consideration to look at.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can speak to that a little bit by saying that the mental health questions -- many of the mental health questions that we rolled into this survey came -- are those that are PHQ or prime MD questions that are used in the millennium cohort study. One of the goals that we had since we felt the millennium cohort study had a nice set of mental health assessment questions -- they weren't entirely complete from our
perspective as it related to this particular event, but since a lot of them were previously validated questions and so on, that we wanted to make it as much as possible overlapping with that so that we would eventually have normative data to compare it to, normative military data to compare it to.

At this moment, I don't think that we could say how much reflects an added burden -- just how much of a burden there is at that moment in time, but eventually, as we have millennium cohort study data to compare to it, I think we may be able to sort some of that out. It also speaks to the need to do, as Colonel Egerton was saying earlier, develop sort of a standardized package of these kinds of questions.

DR. RUNYAN: Carol Runyan. I appreciate the difficulties in doing this kind of work, although the 25% response rate is concerning in terms of drawing conclusions.

I wonder if, at the very least, if you could do some analyses to examine the extent to which the 25% who responded are representative of the population queried, at least in terms of their location in the building or other variables that -- to give some reassurance of the extent to which they may be representative.

COL. EGERTON: I appreciate the question now. I believe Colonel Wells can probably speak to that a little bit more directly. We are looking at that.

COL. WELLS: We have a good GIS section at CHPPM.
They're working with us to locate in the building little dots by floor where the respondents were. So that helps that standpoint.

As to the average demographics of our respondents versus the employees at the Pentagon, we haven't gotten a breakdown of employment records from Pentagon -- Washington headquarters service that runs the Pentagon employees yet.

DR. RUNYAN: Well, I guess the other issue is whether there is still the possibility of doing some follow-up. I suspect that memory of the events is not as major an issue as in a lot of surveys and that maybe you could still increase your response rate.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you want to address the follow-up issue?

COL. EGERTON: One of the other conditions that we needed to agree to in order to get this survey rapidly implemented was that we wouldn't go back and do follow-up. It cripples us to a great degree, but that was -- the concern was that we would over-survey personnel.

DR. RUNYAN: It wouldn't be resurveying. I didn't mean to resurvey the people you've already surveyed but to try and increase the response. It would still be the first time those individuals responded. I may not have made myself clear.

COL. EGERTON: Okay. We did try to attempt to increase response by going back to personnel within the initial
implementation phase. We sent teams back to try to encourage people to do this. We did have endorsement throughout the leadership within the Pentagon. We also sent out reminders electronically. We sent out reminders in hard copy to persons. Given the nature of the Pentagon, I'm sure that the -- pretty much postulating things here, a lot of folks who either felt that they weren't directly affected didn't see the need to do the survey, were far removed from the actual affected area in the Pentagon, just chose not to do the survey. We pushed the envelope as far as we could within the time limit that we were given in order to get the survey done.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think there may be some administrative issues around this that I don't fully appreciate, but there seems to be a false dichotomy that plays out in the military, in any case, around the difference between surveillance and research that has implications for the question.

The false dichotomy is that surveillance doesn't necessarily require human use review and research review and surveillance entails surveying everyone involved, as opposed to, if you get into using smaller representative samples, then it falls into a research rubric. I think these are -- like I say, I'd call it a false dichotomy, but what it -- my sense is -- I felt this way early on -- was that, if they had gone with a smaller, more systematic sample, perhaps over-sampling for some of the more affected groups, that they could have done -- it
would have been possible to do a much more intensive follow-up
effort and possibly even a longitudinal study and still have it
serve the purpose of population surveillance in population
indices.

You know, for whatever reason, like I say, my
sense is that, if it went that direction, then it would have
fallen out of the realm of surveillance and then there's other
associated sort of bureaucratic issues that rise up around that.

DR. OSTROFF: Other comments? I'd just make one
comment in response to what you said, which is that -- you know,
the definition of surveillance, per se, is ongoing systematic
data collection. It's not a onetime survey. It would be hard to
consider this surveillance.

The difference, you know, where we work, we do a
lot of this emergent response of this nature. We don't consider
it research. That's the main difference. We consider it part of
the public health response. We don't usually route it through
the human subjects.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think you're preaching to the
choir.

DR. OSTROFF: Yeah.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just an observation that I had
as a relative outsider who's consulting on just the medical
health portion of this survey is our feeling -- those of us who
are thinking about the mental health part of it, our feeling from
the beginning was that this really needed to be longitudinal and that, if we focused only on a survey that tried to do this in the whole population of people at the Pentagon, you were going to end up with just what we see, an exceedingly low response rate, unable to say anything about the larger group of people (indiscernible).

DR. OSTROFF: One more -- we'll take two more and then we'll have to stop.

DR. SHANAHAN: I just wanted to comment. You know, this has been an impediment for as many years as I can remember in the military. I think that eventually we could take some action, maybe encourage through HA to try to address this head on. I know that there's been a lot of research that's been attempted over the last decade or two that's been thwarted by some of these administrative snafus that exist for other reasons. Because there are a lot of regulations in place which regulate these kinds of surveys and surveillance mechanisms, it takes fairly high-level action to get some of it turned around. If we could generate interest within HA, it may be something that we could take on as the board.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I completely agree, and that's why I said this.

DR. OSTROFF: Let's let Dr. Berg have the last word.

DR. BERG: I just want to endorse what Dennis
says. This is a problem that has been ongoing. It is getting worse. CDC is working on a white paper, sort of drawing the distinction between public health surveillance and research. That might be a useful starting point. I think in any case, as Dennis suggested, calling this to the attention of HA may help set some guidelines that will have some teeth to them.

DR. OSTROFF: Greg's taking notes.

DR. BERG: He always does.

DR. OSTROFF: I think Commander Russell has been gracious enough, so that we can try to stay on time, to defer his presentation on the pneumococcal vaccine until tomorrow morning.

So we're now ready to take the break. I'm going to turn it over to Colonel Riddle to give us a couple of comments about how we're going to organize ourselves to get up to the MCRD.

LT. COL. RIDDLE: We have a few other folks that signed up out there on the holding list. I did call. We increased our reservations at the Bay View and I talked to Captain Hann. We'll make do. So I think we're bumped up to about 39 or 40 people. So what we're going to do is, if we could meet everybody over in front of the lodge that's going to go on the tour and we'll carpool to MCRD. We'll go into the Bay View Restaurant. We have reservations there at the Bay View, a very nice setting. Then we have to be over at the clinic at 1:30 to catch the bus for the tour. We're going to tour MCRD, look at the Marine Corps recruit training process and then come back to
the clinic and have about 30 minutes at the clinic to go over the actual execution of the recruit assessment program that they're doing over there.

So the drivers are going to be myself, Dr. Ostroff, Dr. Gunzenhauser, Major Balough, Dr. Ludwig, Dr. Berg, Dr. Shanahan and Dr. Gray. So we'll all have ID cards and that should facilitate our entry.

So, if I could meet with the drivers when we adjourn here and then, if we could leave from in front of the lodge in five minutes.

(Meeting recessed for the day.)