

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

WORKSHOP NOTES

Day 1 - 1/14/03

Workshop Expectations

Not sure, but enthusiastic!

Statewide program that everyone can understand

Level playing field

Share assets and expertise

Spend time looking at bigger framework of food safety

Lack of resources means need to find ways to work together more effectively
in the future

Learn more about food safety

How State Lab fits into activities the group is developing

Strategic Planning Process

Overview of process:

Desired Outcomes → Current Situation → Specific Actions → Implementation Plan

↑

↓

Group previously decided to focus first on retail issues and developed vision statement:

“To provide a collaborative forum to enhance awareness and promote food safety and security.”

The process used this week can be used as Task Force progresses in the future.

DESIRED OUTCOMES

A QUALITY RETAIL FOOD PROGRAM IS:

Educational #1 **

Science based – sound science #2 **

Manageable #3 **

Consistent

Public health based

Cultural- transcends cultural barrier

Informative

Verifiable

Communication

Provides safe food

Cooperative

Adaptable

Understandable

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

A QUALITY RETAIL FOOD PROGRAM HAS:

Training #1 **

Compliance #2 **

Results #3A **

Tools – Application #3B **

Human resources

No boundaries

Trained personnel

Commitment

Documentation

Good Info sharing between Stakeholders

Visibility

Good Public Relations

Measurable goals

Budget

Timely Reporting

Properly Designed Facilities

Political Buy in

State – wide Coverage

A QUALITY RETAIL FOOD PROGRAM RESULTS IN:

Delivery of Safe food #1 **

Decrease in illness and injury #2 **

Traceability #3 **

Control of Risk #4 **

Reduced liability

Increased Morale

Increased efficiency

Development of new concepts, technology and products

New solutions to food safety problems

Enhanced Consumer Confidence

Profitability for industry

No adverse publicity

Accurate reporting of Statistics and by media

Ongoing education and training

Consumer understanding

Public awareness

Limited risk within potential for foodborne illness

**** These items prioritized by group voting.**

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

Retail Food Program Elements and Desired Outcomes

REGULATORY FOUNDATION

Desired Outcome:

- Uniform science based laws written in clear and understandable form; Consistency of law and interpretation of law; Single set of standards agreeable and enforceable by all jurisdictions
- SOPs – for policies
- Authority – where it starts, who has oversight

TRAINED REGULATORY STAFF

Desired Outcome:

- Standardized training materials -curriculum
- Standardization; Interagency coordination of standardization; Consistency and certification of regulatory personnel to regulate and enforce state and local statutes
- Mandatory registration of EHS with State

RISK BASED PROGRAM

Desired Outcome:

- Industry and regulatory cooperation and accountability
- Inspection to focus on CCPs as related to CDC Risk Factors; minimize emphasis on GRPs; better focus/priority on risk; Consistent and well defined risk-factors

UNIFORM INSPECTION PROGRAM

Desired Outcome:

- State and local cooperation
- Uniformity – forms and approaches
- Need to implement and objective and measurable QA program; Procedures in place to assess the effectiveness the inspector taking into account the creative nature of individuals

FBI INVESTIGATION AND RESPONSE

Desired Outcome:

- State wide SOP; Establish a State-wide coordinating system; Better crisis management; eliminate PMs (pissing matches); Enhance communication and cooperation of FBI investigation and potential illness disease trends.
- Method for distributing existing information to other equivalent agencies utilizing existing technologies; Develop an information web-site.

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

COMPLIANCE

Desired Outcome:

- Checks and balances between operations and regulatory; Establish consistence compliance protocols with full implementation; Uniform compliance and enforcement procedures with stake holder buy-in during development
- Compliance with arbitration

INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Desired Outcome:

- Statewide mandatory education requirements; Encourage open continuous communication in the promotion of education and training in the control of FBI at all levels;
- Regulatory / Industry working together to establish rules and regs; Improving industry involvement in the legislative and regulatory processes
- Shared PSA Material; Better informed consumer; Central library on information web site
- Gaining more involvement by the consumers; Citizen Involvement in food safety planning – encouraged.
- Media to proactively focus on promoting food safety

PROGRAM SUPPORT AND RESOURCES

Desired Outcome:

- Legislative / Political understanding of food safety issues.
- Industry and regulatory working together working together to seek legislative support
- Fee for service program fairly applied – increased time = increased cost

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Desired Outcome:

- Decrease in noted violations of critical risk factors
 - A total reduction or decrease in amount of FBI as compared to quantity of people fed; Decrease in FBI incidence.
 - Fewer consumer complaints which improves consumer confidence.

CONSUMER RESPONSIBILITY

Desired Outcome:

- Educate high risk consumers on what foods are unsafe
- Food safety tort reform to delineate when consumers and/or industry is responsible. Better legislative involvement
- Provide consumer awareness information to the public understanding freedom of choice including accountability

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

Day 2 – 1-15-03

CURRENT SITUATION – ASSETS AND BARRIERS

REGULATORY FOUNDATION

- Assets:
- Have a state code
 - State code is in place
 - The code works well from large to small facilities across the industry (wholesale, dist., retail)
 - The statewide minimum requirements are met
 - There is a process to easily change regulations
 - Carson has a lot of Industry participation
 - Extensive knowledge base statewide
 - Easy accessibility to legal advice/representation
 - The code has been in place for a long time
 - Vast working knowledge
 - Industry and Agencies work well together
 - Diverse cultural background
- Barriers:
- The code is not current
 - The regulations are not always risk-based
 - Statewide uniformity is a problem
 - Code not uniformly enforced
 - Jurisdictional differences
 - Lack of political understanding
 - Inflexible/Inconsistent interpretations of regulations

TRAINED REGULATORY STAFF

- Assets:
- Desire for cooperation among state & local agencies
 - State has incentive for training
 - Counties are starting to standardize
 - There are satellite facilities available for training
 - Desire for continued training
 - NEHA (Nevada Environmental Health Assoc.) and REHS
 - Recognized need for training
 - Nev. EHA provides a forum for education of EHS
 - EHS program in NV
 - Quality of staff is great – professional
 - Trained staff helps train industry
 - Trained staff in place (to some degree)

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

Barriers: Training is not standardized
No standard minimum level of education/registration for entry level EHS
No clear mandate for professional registration
No uniform training curriculum for apprentice EHS
No \$ for training [1st thing cut from the budget]
Limited resources for uniform training
Staff Limitations
Geographical Challenges
EHS Program needs to be re-evaluated
Enhanced/required training in retail needed for regulatory staff

RISK-BASED PROGRAM

Assets: Inspection forms do contain some risk-based elements
Industry and Regulatory moving toward risk-based focus
“Out-of-Control risk factors” concept is in place
Industry awareness is increasing
Continuous growth of knowledge base on CCPs
Industry well informed on CCPs
Active Managerial Control

Barriers: No system in place to assign inspection frequency based on risk
Movement towards risk-based inspections is SLOW
Staffing
Limited times for training during inspections
Cultural and Language barriers
Need an upgrade of knowledge for inspector in relation to inspections
Develop better working relationships between Industry & Reg.
Smaller operations have difficulty managing risk-based
[i.e. paperwork, monitoring, follow-up, etc.]
Consumer perceptions

UNIFORM INSPECTION PROGRAM (QUALITY ASSURANCE)

Assets: Standardization system is in place
Awareness/desire for uniformity
Uniform inspection tools are available
Regulatory staff collaboration
Task Force

Barriers: Inspection programs isn't really uniform
QA programs not well established
Limited continuing education for regulatory staff

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

Stakeholder perceptions vary on what QA program is

Political considerations

Turf battles

FOODBORNE ILLNESS SURVEILLANCE

- Assets:
- Resources exist to conduct comprehensive investigations
 - Resources easily available
 - Have EPI surveillance in place
 - Working relationship between Industry and Reg.
 - Communication Alert System between Industry and Reg.
 - Protocols for investigation, tracking, and surveillance
 - Have functioning state lab
 - Centralized laboratory
- Barriers:
- Need to develop a clearing house to disseminate info statewide
 - Lack of communication between the jurisdictions
 - Improved central information is necessary
 - Lack of standardized training statewide
 - No standard investigation procedures/implementation
 - Personnel not adequately trained in procedures for FBI investigation
 - Effectiveness hindered by lack of resources \$
 - Physician participation is not good
 - Medical community needs to be better informed about FBI

COMPLIANCE

- Assets:
- Laws are in place
 - Compliance structure is effective
 - Inspections are being done
 - Rules and regulations set forth NRS and local codes
 - Industry is trying to be proactive
 - Agencies are interested in education about methods of compliance
 - Good industry & regulatory relationship
 - Timely compliance
 - Better consumer awareness – incentive to comply
- Barriers:
- Enforcement actions not uniformly enforced
 - State and local agencies use and enforce different standards
 - All inspectors are not standardized
 - Agencies not accountable to assure compliance
 - Lack of standardized compliance
 - Media/Adverse publications
 - Agency management is a hindrance

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

- Assets:
- More information exchange is happening
 - Food safety and educational opportunities for Industry available
 - Serve Safe/HACCP training available
 - Open door policy [open training to all, for example]
 - Community Relations [outreach programs]
 - Good Communication between Industry and Reg.
 - PIO [Public Information Office] is a good resource in each industry
 - Food Safety Task Force
- Barriers:
- Media sensationalism
 - Lack of media involvement
 - Cultural and language barriers
 - Over regulation of Industry
 - Lack of positive media
 - Lack of understanding in the community
 - Lack of informational clearing house

PROGRAM RESOURCES

- Assets:
- Program is in place and doing good work with existing \$
 - Programs available
 - Minimum equipment is provided to all EHS
 - Industry/Reg. interest in improving food safety programs
 - Training programs are in place
 - NRA and NHL have programs in place for training for both I and R
 - Educational materials are readily available
 - FDA
- Barriers:
- Budget shortfalls drive hiring practices
 - Funding is reactionary
 - Inconsistent – need consistent and reliable funding sources
 - Insufficient funds and staffing to expand training
 - Lack of communication between regulatory agencies
 - Lack of standardization of training for reg. staff and Industry

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT (PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS)

- Assets:
- Annual report is in place
 - Some systems in place to set goals and objectives
 - “How are we doing?” surveys [ex. Carson City]
 - Training and certification programs are in place
 - Training and Train-The-Trainer re-certifications are measured
 - Industry documentation and monitoring and documentation

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

Barriers: Lack of tools for measuring outcomes
 Assessment is reactionary
 No uniform objective system is in place
 Inspection frequency vs. risk-based
 Program evaluation is based on quantity not quality
 Lack of info on FBI trends
 Lack of regulatory monitoring of food safety training
 Lack of regulatory monitoring of inspector training

CONSUMER RESPONSIBILITY

Assets: Consumer
 Consumer awareness
 Industry and agency awareness of consumer view
 Public intolerance for law suits
 Increased awareness
 Required consumer advisories
 Zero Tolerance Society

Barriers: Consumer
 Media driven
 Lack of accountability
 Lack of knowledge and understanding
 Buyer Beware
 Lawyer driven

RESULTS OF MULTIVOTING OF TASK FORCE
MEMBERS ON THE TOP 4 DESIRED OUTCOMES FROM
THE 10 PROGRAM ELEMENTS:

Each member was asked to discuss and consider the assets and barriers identified, as well as the desired outcomes identified for each of the 10 Program Elements from the first day. Keeping these in mind, each person was asked to use 4 sticky dots to identify the top four desired outcomes that this task force could and should begin to work on as a group. The task force will likely want to consider looking at the remaining desired outcomes at a later date.

16 VOTES - Have all staff trained and standardized and a consistent application of rules and regulations.
From “Trained Regulatory Staff”

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

14 Votes – Have an objective and measurable criteria for conducting a quality assurance review to assess the effectiveness of employees carrying out the SOPs of the agencies.

From “Uniform Inspection Program”

10 VOTES – Have rules and regulations uniform and based on current science.

From “Regulatory Foundation”

8 VOTES – Have a coordinated method of disseminating information related to FBI investigation and reports, including trends.

From “FBI Surveillance”

7 VOTES – Have a uniform compliance and enforcement protocol that has been developed with input from all stakeholders.

From “Compliance”

6 VOTES – Have an inspection system that focuses on significant FBI risk factors.

From “Risk Based Program”

5 VOTES – Have a retail food program that has a performance measurement of effectiveness that is based on a) Reduction of FBI risk factors b) reduction of FBI / #meals served c) reduction of consumer complaints.

From “Program Assessment”

4 VOTES – Have a forum where Industry and Regulatory work together to establish rules and regulations.

From “Industry and Community Relations”

2 VOTES – Have a food safety training program for industry employees at all levels.

From “Industry and Community Relations”

2 VOTES – Have a mechanism where industry and regulatory work together to seek legislative funding, resources, and support for food safety programs.

From “Program Resources”

The other desired outcomes did not receive any votes.

** Each person was asked to decide between the top 4 desired outcomes, which one they would be willing to work on. Although “Having an objective and measurable criteria for conducting a quality assurance review to assess the effectiveness of employees carrying out the SOPs of the agencies” received 14 votes, members felt that this could not be developed at this time UNTIL some of the other items were in place so only 3 of the top 4 were selected for development by the task force.*

Each of the 3 subgroups then brainstormed objectives for their desired outcome.

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

OBJECTIVES FOR TOP 3 DESIRED OUTCOMES

CODE REVISION

1. Identify Agency Structures- agencies impacting food safety
2. Stakeholder Buy-in
3. Task force vs. review group
4. Master Plan for rules and regulations
5. Review all existing codes
6. Identify differences
7. Subcommittee on emerging science
8. Funding

TRAINING

1. Assess current training program
2. Decide on program formats
3. Justification
4. Who will be involved to approved initiative
5. Assess target audience (#'s) and delivery system

FBI COMMUNICATION NETWORK

1. Identify people/agencies involved
- 2a. Survey to find out who will use it and what info will be useful to them
- 2b. Identify models already in existence.
- 2c. Develop performance measurements
3. Determine what is shared and with whom
4. Determine who will be the Communication Information Agency (CIA), where?
- 5a. Determine method(s) of delivery
- 5b. Determine format to use

**NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003**

SPECIFIC ACTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

CODE REVISION

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY 15	JUN	JUL 15	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN
	Model Master Plan		FSTF Meeting April 15 8:30 – 11:30	ID reg. agency structure/ relationships of all agencies that impact food safety	Master Plan Review FSTF Meeting June 11 9:30 – 5:30	Develop a task force master plan						Contact stakeholders to influence \ obtain buy - in
				D. Evans D. Winkelman	All NV FSTF	All NV FSTF Members						V. Hefner and Reg. Foundation Sub Group

TRAINING

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN
	Kinley will confirm availability for role in sub group	a)Assess current programs b)Kinley to establish where all 4 jurisdictions and FDA ARE -what is currently in place? "protocols"	FSTF Meeting April 15 8:30 – 11:30		Kinley to send gathered protocol info to workgroup to members of workgroup to review and decide what is useable and send back to Kinley		All returned group reviews to be gathered and a group census established - useable baseline material					Establish baseline format based on previous info and data gathered
		Kinley ALL			Kinley ALL FSTF Meeting June 11 9:30 – 5:30		ALL					ALL

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT

RENO, NEVADA

JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

FBI COMMUNICATION NETWORK

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NO V	DEC	JAN
ID who is missing – State Epi, State EHS		Contact State Epi and EHS	Meeting April 15– 8:30 – 11:30		June 11 NV FSTF mtg 9:30 – 5:30	ID people involved as contributors / receivers	Contact contributors /receivers for ideas	Develop survey for contrib.-tors / receivers				Conduct survey Convene mtg of core group to ID info and method
DONE!												
All		Stan	All									

TASK FORCE MAINTENANCE AND PROPULSION

TASK FORCE ORGANIZATION OPTIONS

1. No leader
2. Chair – volunteer or elected
3. Co-Chairs
4. 3 Chairs: 1 regulatory, 1 academia, 1 industry
5. 1 Lead Chair with 3 reserve chairs awaiting turn

Geographical consideration would need to be taken into account for multiple chair models.

Group unanimously choose option 5.

Nominations

Lead Chair – Anna Vickrey
 Industry Reserve Chair – Van Hefner
 Academia Chair – Stan Omaye
 Regulatory Chair – Daren Winkelman

Group unanimously agreed, chairs elected.

WORKGROUP ORGANIZATION OPTIONS

Taskforce will have ad hoc committees that report back to entire task force.

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

Meetings

Jerry Caird volunteered to work with Mary Spoon on the availability of satellite facilities.

Daren will provide staff for meeting minutes, recording. Stan may also be able to provide assistance.

Anne will draft some by-laws

Van will seek funding option via USDA in Washington DC, would like to plan meeting with Dan Vitello - John Marcello will help to set up meeting.

Allen Gelfius will send sample by-laws/strategic plans to Chairs, et al.

Meetings will be held on a quarterly basis, schedule below.

Funding / Resources

FDA Task Force Grants announcement will be out in early spring.

FDA Partnership grants; A. Vickrey has developed and will submit grant request for the Code Revision Workgroup.

FDA Innovative Grants will be available in the spring or summer for up to 50,000.00.

USDA
CDC

MEETING SCHEDULE for 2003

1. Tuesday, APRIL 15th, 8:30 am – 11:00 am
Jerry Caird will check the availability of satellite facilities and coordinate the meeting location with the Chairs.

2. Wednesday, JUNE 11th, 9:30 am – 5:30 pm
This will be a face to face meeting.

NEVADA FOOD SAFETY TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT
RENO, NEVADA
 JANUARY, 14-16, 2003

PARTICIPANT LIST

John Roberts	sierrasan@renonevada.net	775/322-0171 or 332-3171
Stephanie Van Hooser	sernaga@med.unr.edu	775/688-1335 x 225
Kinley Goodman	kgoodman@nvhd.state.nv.us	775/687-3787 x 1261
Robert Sobsey	rsobsey@mail.co.washoe.nv.us	775/328-6171
Jim Pierce	jimpierce@sierrahorizons.com	775/267-9548
Stan Omaye	omaye@unr.edu	775/784-6447
Mark Bergtholdt	bergtholdt@cchd.org	702/383-1251
Van V. Hefner	van@nvhospitality.com	702/878-2313
Greg Moran	gmoran@primmvaleyresort.com	702/679-7560
Jimmy Vigilante /Billagio	jvigilante@bellagioresort.com or foodsafetytrain@aol.com	702/693-8188
Dave Evans, NSHD	dse@phonewave.net	775/423-2281
Jerry Caird, NSHD	gcaird@govmail.state.nv.us	702/486-5068
Jamie Frank	jfrank@med.unr.edu	
Anna Vickrey	avickrey@dairy.state.nv.us	775/68-1211
R. John Poulson	John.poulson@sfdc.com	801/522-6428
Dustin Boothe	dboothe@ci.carson-city.nv.us	775/87-2190
Pat Marble	pmarble@washoe.kiz.nv.us	
Mickey Riva	mriva@msn.k12.nv.us	
Mark Smith	nvanimal@govmail.state.nv.us	
Anette Rink	arink@govmail.state.nv.us	
Kelly Burnett	kellycburnett@aol.com	
Daren Winkelman	dwinkelman@ci.carson-city.nv.us	775/8872190
Arthur Schermerhorn	aschermerhorn@modeldairy.com	