

Vermont

healthvermont.gov/e_ready.aspx

All response begins at the local level. Being prepared to prevent, respond to, and recover from all types of public health threats requires that states and localities improve their capabilities in surveillance, epidemiology, laboratories, and response readiness. Facts on laboratories and response readiness activities appear below. See appendices 1 and 7 for a more detailed description of data points and data sources.

A healthy population is more resilient in public health emergencies. People with chronic conditions may require additional care such as specialized medications, equipment, and other assistance. To develop an effective response plan, a state or locality must consider the unique needs of its own population. In Vermont, 9.9% of adults reported having asthma, 6.4% diabetes, 5.8% heart disease, and 2.1% had a stroke. In addition, 21.3% reported a limiting disability and 58.5% were overweight or obese.* *CDC, ONCDIEH (NCCDPHP) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

Laboratories: General				Laboratories: Chemical Capabilities				
Maintaining core laboratory functions during an emergency	Status of continuity of operations State had a COOP that inc laboratory operation State had a standardized	plan (COOP):1 Iuded s		Participation in Laboratory Response Network for chemical agents (I RN-C)	LRN-C laboratories with capabilities for responding if the public is exposed to chemical agents ⁵ Note: There are three levels, with Level 1 having the most	One Level 2 lab		
Ensuring availability of Laboratory Response Network (LRN) laboratory results for decision making	electronic data system capable of messaging laboratory results between LRN laboratories and also	Yes			advanced capabilities. See appendix 1. Core methods successfully			
	to CDC ² Note: For a description of LRN laboratories, see appendix 1.			Evaluating LRN-C laboratory capabilities	demonstrated by Level 1 and/or Level 2 laboratories to rapidly detect chemical agents ⁵	6 out of 6 methods		
Laboratories: Biological Capabilities				through	Additional methods			
Participation in LRN for biological agents	LRN reference and/or national laboratories that could test for biological agents ³	1 reference lab		testing	by Level 1 and/or Level 2 laboratories to rapidly detect chemical agents ⁵	1 out of 1 method		
Assessing if laboratory emergency contacts could be reached 24/7	LRN laboratories successfully contacted during a non- business hours telephone drill ³	1 out of 1 lab		Assessing LRN-C laboratory capabilities through exercises	LRN-C laboratory ability to collect, package, and ship samples properly during LRN exercise ⁵	Passed		
Evaluating LRN laboratory capabilities	Proficiency tests passed by LRN reference and/or national laboratories ³	3 out of 3 tests			Chemical agents detected by Level 1 and/or Level 2 laboratories in unknown samples during the LRN	0 out of 2		
Rapid	Rapidly identified <i>E. coli</i> <i>O157:H7</i> using advanced DNA tests (PFGE) ⁴				Emergency Response Pop Proficiency Test (PopPT) Exercise ⁶	agents		
	 Samples for which state performed tests Test results submitted to PulseNet database within 4 working days (target: 90%) 	8 100%			Hours to process and report on 500 samples by Level 1 laboratory during the LRN Surge Capacity Exercise (range was 71 to 126 hours) ⁵	N/A		
of disease-				Desco				
by PulseNet laboratories	Rapidly identified <i>L. monocytogenes</i> using advanced DNA tests (PECE) ⁴			Respon	State public health	ion		
	Samples for which state performed tests	3			department had a 24/7 reporting capacity system that could receive urgent	Yes		
	 Test results submitted to PulseNet database within 4 working days (target: 90%) 	100%		Communicating emerging health	disease reports any time of the day ⁷			
Assessing laboratory competency and reporting through exercises	State public health laboratory conducted exercises to assess competency of sentinel laboratories to rule out bioterrorism agents ¹	Yes			Responded to Health Alert Network (HAN) test message within 30 minutes ⁸	Yes		
					State public health laboratory used HAN or other rapid method (blast			
	CDC-funded LRN laboratory ability to contact the CDC Emergency Operations Center within 2 hours during LRN notification drill ³	Passed		information	email or fax) to communicate with sentinel laboratories and other partners for outbreaks, routine updates, training events, and other applications ¹	3 times		
	Note: I here is one CDC- funded LRN laboratory in DC and in each state, with the exception of CA, IL, and NY, which have two.				Epidemic Information Exchange users responded to system-wide notification test within 3 hours ⁹	36%		

¹APHL; 2008 ²CDC, OSELS; 2008 ³CDC, OID (NCEZID); 2008 ⁴CDC, OPHPR (DSLR); 2008 ⁵CDC, ONDIEH (NCEH); 2009 ⁶CDC, ONDIEH (NCEH); 2008 ⁷State data; 2008 ⁸CDC, OPHPR (DEO); 2009 ⁹CDC, OPHPR (DEO); 2008

Vermont

Response Readiness: Communication (continued)		Respons	Response Readiness: Exercises and Incidents			
Improving public health information exchange	Participated in a Public Health Information Network forum (community of practice) to leverage best practices for information exchange ¹⁰	Yes	Natifician	Pre-identified staff notified to fill all eight Incident Command System core functional roles due to a drill, exercise, or real incident ¹⁴ Note: State must report 2 and could report up to 12 notifications.	2 times	
Response Readiness: Planning			emergency	Pre-identified staff acknowledged	1	
Assessing plans to receive, distribute, and dispense medical assets from the Strategic National Stockpile and other sources	CDC technical assistance review (TAR) state score ^{11, 12}	2007-08:	operations center staff	notification within the target time of 60 minutes ¹⁴	times	
	Scoring Note: A score of 69 or higher indicates performance in an acceptable range in plans to receive distribute and discense	93 2008-09:		Conducted at least one unannounced notification outside of normal business hours ¹⁴	Yes	
	receive, distribute, and dispense 98 medical assets. 98 Cities Readiness Initiative (CRI) location and 2007-08 TAR score ¹¹ 98 *Cohort I: No sites *Cohort II: No sites *Cohort II: No sites *Cohort III: Burlington, VT: 70 See Scoring Note above. CRI locations can consist of multiple jurisdictions, some located in more than one state. See appendix 6.		Activating	Public health EOC activated as part of a drill, exercise, or real incident ¹⁴ Note: State must report 2 and could report up to 12 activations.	2 times	
			the emergency operations center (EOC)	Pre-identified staff reported to the public health EOC within the target time of 2.5 hours ¹⁴	2 out of 2 times	
				Conducted at least one unannounced activation ¹⁴	Yes	
	*Cohort I, II or III refers to the year when the		Response Readiness: Evaluation			
Enhancing response capability for chemical	Iocation was added to CRI. See app CHEMPACK nerve-agent antidote containers ¹¹	endix 1. 6	Assessing response	AAR/IPs developed following an exercise or real incident ¹⁴ Note: State must report 2 and could report up to 12 AAR/IPs.	2 AAR/IPs	
events			capabilities through after action report/ improvement plans (AAR/IPs)	AAR/IPs developed within target time of 60 days ¹⁴	1 out of 2 AAR/IPs	
Meeting preparedness standards for local health departments	Local health departments meeting voluntary Project Public Health Ready preparedness standards ¹³	0		Re-evaluated response capabilities following approval and completion of corrective actions identified in AAR/IPs ¹⁴	Yes	

¹⁰CDC, OSTLTS; 2008 ¹¹CDC, OPHPR (DSNS); 2008 ¹²CDC, OPHPR (DSNS); 2009 ¹³NACCHO; 2008 ¹⁴CDC, OPHPR (DSLR); 2008

In addition to the activities listed above, CDC supported other projects and activities to enhance preparedness efforts. Snapshots of these CDC efforts are provided below.

Research, Training, Education, and Promising Demonstration Projects							
Project	Location/Project Name	Amount					
Centers for Public Health Preparedness ¹⁵	_	N/A					
Preparedness and Emergency Response Research Centers ¹⁵	—	N/A					
Advanced Practice Centers ¹⁶	_	N/A					
Centers of Excellence in Public Health Informatics ¹⁷	_	N/A					
Pandemic Influenza Promising Practices Demonstration Projects ¹⁴	_	N/A					
Additional CDC Resources Supporting Preparedness in States and Localities							
 Epidemic Intelligence Service Epidemic Intelligence Service Field Officers¹⁷ Investigations conducted by Epidemic Intelligence Service Field Officers¹⁷ 	1 3						
Deployments Type of Incident (number of CDC staff)¹⁸ 	_						
Career Epidemiology Field Officers ¹⁵	1						
Quarantine Stations ¹⁹	_						

¹⁴CDC, OPHPR (DSLR); 2008 ¹⁵CDC, OPHPR (OD); 2008 ¹⁶NACCHO; 2008 ¹⁷CDC, OSELS; 2008 ¹⁸CDC, OPHPR (DEO); 2008 ¹⁹CDC, OID (NCEZID); 2008