INTERNAL AUDIT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES REPORTING
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED 2018
AT THE
TEXAS ANIMAL HEALTH COMMISSION
(REPORT NO. TAHC 019-001)
Audit Committee
and Commissioners
Texas Animal Health Commission
Austin, Texas

We have conducted an internal audit (audit) of Reporting – Performance Measures (Measures) at the Texas Animal Health Commission for the fiscal year ended 2018. Specifically, our internal audit was limited to the following key Measures:

- **Outcome:** The Percent Change between the Number of Premises in the Non-systematic Area Infested with Cattle Fever Ticks in the Current Fiscal Year and the Average for the Previous 5 Fiscal Years

- **Outcome:** The Percent Change between the Number of Herds/Flocks in which Diseases and Pests of Animal Health Significance are Detected in the Current Fiscal Year and Average of the Previous 5 Fiscal Years

- **Output:** Number of Livestock Surveillance Inspections and Shipment Inspections

- **Output:** Number of Herds Evaluated for Determination of Presence or Absence of Disease and Pests

- **Output:** Number of Specimens Processed through the State/Federal Cooperative Laboratory System

- **Output:** Number of Compliance Actions Completed

The report that accompanies this letter summarizes our comments and observations. We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation the management of the commission showed during the course of the engagement.

Monday Rufus & Co., P.C.

April 24, 2019
Austin, Texas
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Performance Measures are an essential part of the State’s Strategic Planning and Performance Budgeting System, which combines strategic planning, performance budgeting, and performance monitoring into the appropriations process which are used as a resource in making state funding decisions based on whether state agencies are accomplishing expected results.

The Internal Auditor is assessing the accuracy and related internal controls of the following reported performance measures so that the Governor, Legislature and Commission’s Governing Body can determine to what extent they can rely on reported performance when making decisions:

- **Outcome:** The Percent Change between the Number of Premises in the Non-systematic Area Infested with Cattle Fever Ticks in the Current Fiscal Year and the Average for the Previous 5 Fiscal Years

- **Outcome:** The Percent Change between the Number of Herds/Flocks in which Diseases and Pests of Animal Health Significance are Detected in the Current Fiscal Year and Average of the Previous 5 Fiscal Years

- **Output:** Number of Livestock Surveillance Inspections and Shipment Inspections

- **Output:** Number of Herds Evaluated for Determination of Presence or Absence of Disease and Pests

- **Output:** Number of Specimens Processed through the State/Federal Cooperative Laboratory System

- **Output:** Number of Compliance Actions Completed

Using the Guide to Performance Measure Management (2012 Edition) published by the State Auditor’s Office, we performed audit tests to determine the accuracy of the reported results for the aforementioned measures. Each measure audited falls into one of the following categories.

- **Certified.** Reported performance is accurate within +/-5 percent, and if it appears that controls to ensure accuracy are in place for collecting and reporting performance data.

- **Certified with Qualifications.** Reported performance appears accurate but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy. A measure is also certified with qualification when controls are strong but source documentation is unavailable for testing. A measure is also certified with qualification if agency calculation of performance deviated from the measure definition but the deviation caused less than +/-5 percent difference between the number reported to ABEST and the correct performance measure result.
• **Inaccurate.** Reported actual performance is +/-5 percent or greater than the reported performance, or when there is a +/-5 percent or greater error rate in the sample of documentation tested. A measure is also inaccurate if the agency’s calculation deviated from the measure definition and caused a +/-5 percent or greater difference between the number reported to ABEST and the correct performance measure result.

• **Factors Prevent Certification.** If documentation is unavailable and controls are not adequate to ensure accuracy. This designation is also used when there is a deviation from the measure definition and the auditor cannot determine the correct performance measure result.

**Internal Audit Results**

*Outcome: The Percent Change between the Number of Premises in the Non-systematic Area Infested with Cattle Fever Ticks in the Current Fiscal Year and the Average for the Previous 5 Fiscal Years:*

The result is **Certified with Qualifications.** The reported performance appears accurate but a portion of the source documentation for the performance measure was unavailable for testing since the report data is collected by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) systems and USDA staff. The monthly USDA report is received jointly by the Texas Animal Health Commission (Commission), the Animal and Health Inspection Services (APHIS), and the Veterinary Services (VS) Tick Eradication Program in monitoring current tick related activities. The Commission relies on the accuracy and integrity of the USDA processes, procedures, and information in the monthly USDA report received.

*Outcome: The Percent Change between the Number of Herds/Flocks in which Diseases and Pests of Animal Health Significance are Detected in the Current Fiscal Year and Average of the Previous 5 Fiscal Years:*

The result is **Certified with Qualifications.** The reported performance appears accurate but a portion of the source documentation for the performance measure was unavailable for testing since the report data is collected by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) systems and USDA staff. This monthly USDA report is received jointly by the Texas Animal Health Commission (Commission), the Animal and Health Inspection Services (APHIS), and the Veterinary Services (VS) Tick Eradication Program in monitoring current tick related activities. The Commission relies on the accuracy and integrity of the USDA processes, procedures, and information in the monthly USDA report received.

*Output: Number of Livestock Surveillance Inspections and Shipment Inspections*  
The result is **Certified.** The reported performance is accurate within +/-5 percent and it appears that controls to ensure accuracy are in place for collecting and reporting performance data.

*Output: Number of Herds Evaluated for Determination of Presence or Absence of Disease and Pests*
The result is **Certified with Qualifications**. The reported performance appears accurate but a portion of the source documentation for the performance measure was unavailable for testing since the report data is collected by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) systems and USDA staff. The monthly USDA report Foreign Animal Diseases (FAD) numbers are also obtained from a USDA database by TAHC personnel. The Texas Animal Health Commission (Commission), the Animal and Health Inspection Services (APHIS), and the Veterinary Services (VS) Tick Eradication Program are all monitoring current tick related activities. The Commission relies on the accuracy and integrity of the USDA processes, procedures, and information in the monthly USDA report received.

**Output: Number of Specimens Processed through the State/Federal Cooperative Laboratory System**

The result is **Certified**. The reported performance is accurate within +/-5 percent and it appears that controls to ensure accuracy are in place for collecting and reporting performance data.

**Output: Number of Compliance Actions Completed**

The result is **Certified**. The reported performance is accurate within +/-5 percent and it appears that controls to ensure accuracy are in place for collecting and reporting performance data.

**Summary of Management’s Response**

We will work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.
Detailed Observations

Outcome: The Percent Change between the Number of Premises in the Non-systematic Area Infested with Cattle Fever Ticks in the Current Fiscal Year and the Average for the Previous 5 Fiscal Years:

The performance result reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent. The reported data is collected by the TAHC Tick Tracker System and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Surveillance Collaboration Services Database (SCS). The data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal personnel. The data is maintained and updated by TAHC and USDA personnel staff. The TAHC relies on the accuracy and integrity of the USDA processes, procedures, and information in the monthly USDA report received. The TAHC has strong controls over input, processing, and review of performance data to ensure it reports the performance measure accurately. Auditors determined that the data from the USDA system was entered into the ABEST accurately. As a result, the reported performance measure appears accurate but the source documentation for the performance measure was unavailable for testing.

Results Reported in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST):
There was a 1% increase change between the number of cattle fever tick infested premises in the free area (outside the permanent quarantine zone) in the current fiscal year and the average for the previous 5 fiscal years. The TAHC performance goal was to decrease the last five years average of 68 tick-infested premises by 15% (10 premises) but instead they increased to 69 premises in fiscal year 2018. (An increase of 1 tick-infested premise in the free area.)

Performance Measure Purpose: Measure provides an indication of the extent to which the agency’s efforts have identified and reduced the incidence of fever ticks in the non-free areas of Texas.

Definition: The percentage change between the number of cattle fever tick infested premises in the free area (outside the permanent quarantine zone) in the current fiscal year and the average of the previous 5 fiscal years.

Data Source: The reported data is collected by the TAHC Tick Tracker System and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Surveillance Collaboration Services Database (SCS). The data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal personnel. The USDA also sends numbered Tick Reports to TAHC every month and up total number of quarantines that were added and released in each county, both in the systematic and free area.
Calculation Method: A total of the number of free area premises with a status of infested is computed for the current fiscal year. The percentage change is calculated between this value and the average of the values from the previous 5 fiscal years.

the non-systematic area.

Recommendation

The TAHC should work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology in the future to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.

Management’s Response

We will work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.
Outcome: The Percent Change between the Number of Herds/Flocks in which Diseases and Pests of Animal Health Significance are Detected in the Current Fiscal Year and Average of the Previous 5 Fiscal Years

The performance result reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent. The reported data is collected by the TAHC Profiler System, Tick Tracker System, and the USDA Surveillance Collaboration Services Database (SCS). Data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal employees. The data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal employees. Both state and federal employees maintain and update the data. The TAHC relies on the accuracy and integrity of the USDA processes, procedures, and information in the monthly USDA report received. The TAHC has strong controls over input and review of performance data to ensure it reports the performance measure accurately. Auditors determined that the data from the USDA system was entered into the ABEST accurately. As a result the reported performance measure appears accurate but the source documentation for the performance measure was unavailable for testing.

Results Reported in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST):
There was a 28% increase change between the number of herds/flocks in which diseases and pests of animal health significance are detected in the current fiscal year and average of the previous 5 fiscal years. The Goal was to decrease the last five years average by (5%) (84 herds/flocks) but instead they increased by 28% (468 herds/flocks) in the 2018 year.

Performance Measure Purpose: Measure provides an indication of the extent to which the agency’s surveillance efforts have identified diseases and pests (will increase the percent) and eradication efforts have been successful in eliminating diseases and pests (will decrease the percent) in Texas.

Definition: The percentage change between the number of herds/flocks in which diseases and pests of animal health significance are detected in the current fiscal year and average of the previous 5 fiscal years.

Data Source: The reported data is collected by the TAHC Profiler System, Tick Tracker System and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Surveillance Collaboration Services Database (SCS). The Profiler System tracks summary information on herds managed under regulatory control due to a disease program. The data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal personnel. The Tick Tracker System tracks inspections and/or treatments of livestock, wildlife, and premises within the temporary preventive quarantined area and control purposes quarantine areas of Cameron and Willacy counties. The USDA (SCS) tracks individual animals and herds tested in national disease eradication programs. The data is
collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal employees. Both state and federal employees maintain and update the data.

*Calculation Method:* The total of the number of movement restrictions in Profiler System (i.e. hold orders and quarantines recorded with action codes of HO or QH, respectively); premises in the Tick Tracker System with a status of Infested, Exposed, or Adjacent; and restricted herds in SCS. Calculate the percent change between the total for the current fiscal year 2018 and average of the previous 5 fiscal years.

**Recommendation**

The TAHC should work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology in the future to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.

**Management's Response**

*We will work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.*
Output: Number of Livestock Surveillance Inspections and Shipment Inspections

The TAHC had strong controls over the input, processing, and review of performance data, and those controls were operating effectively to ensure the TAHC calculated and reported the performance measure accurately. Based on the auditor’s tests of supporting documentation and recalculation of the performance data the performance measure result reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent. Controls appear to be in place to ensure accuracy for collecting, calculating, and reporting performance data. As a result, this measure is Certified.

Results Reported in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST): Number of livestock surveillance inspections and shipment inspections reported in ABEST were 156,215 which is reported accurately within +/-5 percent.

Performance Measure Purpose: This measures the agency’s surveillance activities to identify signs of disease and compliance with interstate and intrastate animal movement requirements.

Definition: The number of livestock inspections conducted by TAHC personnel at livestock markets, slaughter plants, fairs, racetracks, feedlots, premises, import pens on the Texas and Mexico border and the number of livestock shipment vehicles stopped for inspection.

Data Source: The TAHC Work, Fleet, & Travel System (WFT) tracks information inputted relating to the work performed by the agency employees, travel reimbursement amounts, and fleet costs. The data can be analyzed by area, employee, location, disease, activity and project. The TAHC personnel maintain and update the data.

Calculation Method: The calculation totals the unit/herd recorded using the three WFT activity codes 003 (sample collection), 008 (inspection), and 016 (livestock shipment inspection).
Output: Number of Herds Evaluated for Determination of Presence or Absence of Disease and Pests

The performance result reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent. The reported data is collected by the TAHC Profiler System, Tick Tracker System, and the USDA Surveillance Collaboration Services Database (SCS) and Emergency Management Response System 2 which TAHC has access in obtaining numbers for the foreign animal disease (FAD) monthly report. Data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal employees. TAHC relies on the accuracy and integrity of the USDA processes, procedures, and information in the monthly USDA report received. The TAHC has strong controls over input, and review of performance data to ensure it reports the performance measure accurately. Auditors determined that the data from the USDA system was entered into the ABEST accurately. As a result the reported performance measure appears accurate but the source documentation for the performance measure was unavailable for testing.

Results Reported in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST):
In fiscal year 2018 there were 1,900 herds which were determined to have been infested/infected by or exposed to disease or pests, or adjacent infested/infected herds, or requiring foreign animal disease (FAD) herd investigations. The 1,900 herds were 200% of the fiscal year 2018 performance goal of 950 herds.

Performance Measure Purpose: This measures the agency’s efforts to identify animals which may be infected with or have been exposed to disease.

Definition: The number of herds determined to have been infested/infected by or exposed to disease or pests, or adjacent infested/infected herds, or requiring foreign animal disease (FAD) herd investigations.

Data Source: The reported data is collected by the TAHC Profiler System, Tick Tracker System and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Surveillance Collaboration Services Database (SCS), and Emergency Management Response System 2 (EMRS2). The data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal personnel. TAHC personnel maintain and update the data. TAHC and USDA personnel maintain and update the data.

Calculation Method: Total the number of index herds and adjacent herds in Profiler, restricted herds in the Surveillance Collaboration Services database (SCS), infested and exposed herds in Tick Tracker system, and the number of foreign animal disease herd investigations.
**Recommendation**

The TAHC should work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology in the future to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.

**Management’s Response**

We will work with the Legislative Budget Board and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy to modify the performance measure definition and methodology to clarify the source of data and how it is collected.
Output: Number of Specimens Processed through the State/Federal Cooperative Laboratory System

The TAHC had strong controls over the input, processing, and review of performance data, and those controls were operating effectively to ensure the TAHC calculated and reported the performance measure accurately.

Based on the auditor’s tests of supporting documentation and recalculations of the performance data the performance measure result reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent. Controls appear to be in place to ensure accuracy for collecting, calculating, and reporting performance data. As a result, this measure is Certified.

Results Reported in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST): Specimens processed and reported in ABEST were 967,699 with the number of actual specimens processed per audit were 967,684. The overstatement of 15 specimens reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent.

Performance Measure Purpose: Measures the TAHC’s efforts to identify and/or confirm infection and infestation.

Definition: Number of specimens processed- tests include brucellosis and/or pseudorabies tests conducted on blood samples collected at livestock markets or slaughter plants; brucellosis or pseudorabies tests to meet movement requirements, private sale, or herd certification requirements; brucellosis milk tests; brucellosis, pseudorabies, Equine Infectious Anemia, and tuberculosis tests conducted collected from animals or herds because they are adjacent to infected animals and/or are at increased disease risk; and the number of ectoparasite samples submitted for evaluation.

Data Source: The TAHC Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) software/database tracks all samples tested. The data is collected on a variety of USDA and TAHC forms completed by state and federal employees and private practice veterinarians. The TAHC laboratory personnel maintain and update the data.

Calculation Method: The sum of total number of samples submitted for testing or identification by the TAHC Lab.
Output: Number of Compliance Actions Completed

The TAHC had strong controls over the input, processing, and review of performance data, and those controls were operating effectively to ensure the TAHC calculated and reported the performance measure data accurately.

Based on the auditor’s tests of supporting documentation and recalculation of the performance data the performance measure result reported is accurate within +/- 5 percent. Controls appear to be in place to ensure accuracy for collecting, calculating, and reporting performance data. As a result, this measure is Certified.

Results Reported in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST): The Compliance Actions Completed on ABEST were 1,067 with the number of compliance actions completed per audit were 1,100. The understated difference of 33 compliance actions completed is 3% which makes the performance measure accurate within the +/-5 percent.

Performance Measure Purpose: Demonstrates the TAHC’s commitment to insuring statewide compliance with regulatory requirements. The compliance action request forms document the type of violation and identify the participants. The information shows the agency has undertaken an appropriate response to insure compliance.

Definition: Compliance actions include legal correspondence by sending demand letters, warning letters, penning letters, and informational letters; investigations by agency field personnel; filing complaints with a Justice of the Peace; injunctions filed by the Attorney General, initiating administrative proceedings with the State Office of Administrative Hearings, and assessing administrative penalties.

Data Source: Legal and Compliance Access Database developed by the TAHC tracks violations of agency regulations and actions taken. Data is collected on forms TAHC Form 98-44 (Compliance Action Request), Form 98-42 (Livestock Shipment Inspection) and other paper source documents which are completed by TAHC and USDA personnel indicating a violation of agency regulations has occurred. The TAHC Legal Coordinator maintains and updates the data.

Calculation Method: The Legal Coordinator enters all TAHC Forms 98-44, Forms 98-42 and paper source documents received into the Legal and Compliance Access database and runs a summary report to obtain the number of completed compliance actions.
Appendix 1

Objective and Scope

Objective

The objectives of this audit were to determine whether the Texas Animal Health Commission (Commission):

- Compliance with policies, procedures, laws, and regulations
- Safeguarding of assets
- Economical and efficient use of resources
- Accomplishment of established objectives and goals for operations

Scope

Our audit scope included six key performance measures the Commission reported for fiscal year 2018.

1. Outcome: The Percent Change between the Number of Premises in the Non-systematic Area Infested with Cattle Fever Ticks in the Current Fiscal Year and the Average for the Previous 5 Fiscal Years
2. Outcome: The Percent Change between the Number of Herds/Flocks in which Diseases and Pests of Animal Health Significance are Detected in the Current Fiscal Year and Average of the Previous 5 Fiscal Years
3. Output: Number of Livestock Surveillance Inspections and Shipment Inspections
4. Output: Number of Herds Evaluated for Determination of Presence or Absence of Disease and Pests
5. Output: Number of Specimens Processed through the State/Federal Cooperative Laboratory System
6. Output: Number of Compliance Actions Completed

We also reviewed each measure to determine if the TAHC is accurately reporting its performance measures to the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST and has adequate controls (manual and/or electronic, as appropriate) in place over the collection, calculation, and reporting of its performance measures. Our procedures included interviews with the appropriate staff, reviewing and using the Guide to Performance Measurement (March 2012 Edition) published by the State Auditor’s Office, a review the operating policies and procedures, laws and regulations, and testing of compliance with these operating policies and procedures (including tracing performance to the original source whenever possible), laws, and regulations.

Methodology

The audit methodology consisted of auditing reported results for accuracy and adherence to performance measure definitions, evaluating controls over the Commission’s performance
measure calculation processes and related information systems, and testing of original source documentation. and assessing the reliability of the data obtained from the Commission’s information systems that support the performance measure data.

The internal auditors assessed the reliability of the data by:
1.) Determining population completeness and reasonableness,
2.) Reviewing calculations of the performance measures
3.) Interviewing Commission employees and information technology staff knowledgeable in the systems generating the performance measures reports.
4.) Reviewing source documentation for performance measure data when possible.

Information collected and reviewed included the following:

- Performance measure data stored in the Commission’s information systems and spreadsheets.
- Supporting documentation retained in hard-copy for all six key performance measures tested.
- Information technology system quarterly and annual performance measures reports.
- Commission written policies and procedures for the collection, calculation, review, approval, and reporting of performance measures.

Procedures and tests conducted included the following:

- Interviewing Commission staff to gain an understanding of the processes the Commission used to document, calculate, and report performance measures.
- Selected Performance Measures as per Risk Assessment and Audit Plan for fiscal year 2018.
- Selected the Commission’s four key performance measures listed in the 2018-2019 Legislative Appropriation Act.
- Interviewing information technology staff to gain an understanding of the information systems the Commission used to collect and calculate its performance measures.
• Evaluating the sufficiency of the Commission’s policies and procedures to determine whether they were adequate to help ensure the correct calculation of the performance measures.

• Auditing performance measure calculations for accuracy and to determine whether the calculations were consistent with the methodology agreed by the Commission, Legislative Budget Board, and Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning, and Policy.

• Testing a sample of supporting documentation (using the SAO Performance Measure Guideline 2012 Edition) to verify the accuracy of reported performance and effectiveness of controls.

• Tested for supervisory and executive management review of information that supports the performance measures data.

• Assessing performance measure results in one of four categories:

  1.) Certified
  2.) Certified with Qualification
  3.) Inaccurate and
  4.) Factors Prevented Certification

Criteria Used included the following:

• ABEST performance measure definitions

Other Information

Our internal audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our internal audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our internal audit objectives. Our internal audit also conforms with the Institute of Internal Auditor’s (IIA) International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.
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Background Information

In 1893, the agency was initiated to fight the Texas Cattle Fever epidemic, which had created a nationwide problem. Since then, the Texas Animal Health Commission (Commission) and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) have worked cooperatively with livestock producers on animal health issues. In recent years, the agency’s primary objectives have been to control and eradicate livestock diseases, such as: Brucellosis in cattle and swine, tuberculosis in cattle, goats and cervidae; hog cholera in swine, pseudorabies in swine; scabies in cattle and sheep, Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis (VEE), and equine infectious anemia (EIA) in horses.

The Commission’s enabling statutes are in Chapters 161 through 168 of the Texas Agriculture Code, Vernon’s Annotated Texas Statutes. The Commission is vested with the responsibility of protecting all livestock, domestic animals, and domestic fowl from diseases stated in the statute, or recognized as maladies by the veterinary profession. The Commission is authorized to act to eradicate or control any disease or agency of transmission for any disease that affects livestock, exotic livestock, domestic animals, domestic fowl, exotic fowl, or canines, regardless of whether or not the disease is communicable. In order to carry out these duties and responsibilities, the Commission is authorized to control the sale and distribution of all veterinary biologics, except rabies vaccine; regulate the entry of livestock, domestic animals, and domestic fowl into the state; and control the movement of livestock.

To carry out its mission, the Commission is supported by the veterinary community, competent laboratory system and epidemiology activities which oversee the diagnosis of diseases, and assures appropriate tracing of the movement of exposed and infected animals to determine the origin of infection and minimize the transmission of disease.

The Commission is composed of thirteen members who are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Governor designates the Chair.

The Commissioners appoint an Executive Director who supervises the Commission’s activities. The Commission’s operating budget is prepared and approved by the Commissioners on an annual basis, whereas the State legislative appropriation request is determined every two years. Both the budget and appropriations are reviewed and approved by the State Legislature.

The Commission is funded by a combination of state general revenue funds, federal funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and fee-based revenue. For fiscal year 2018 the Commission has an authorized workforce of 220.2 full-time equivalent employees (FTEs). The Commission’s staff is comprised of field inspectors, veterinarians, veterinary epidemiologists, laboratory personnel, emergency management planners, field investigators, and administrative staff.
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