

**Minutes
Safe Food Advisory Committee
4/2/09**

Welcome/Introductions

Present: Katie McCullough, Doug Voegeli, Beth Cleary, Courtney Ziemer, Tommye Schneider, Bill von Rutenberg, Carrie Brandt, Wally Borowski, Susan Bulgrin, Susan Quam, Glen Timmcke, Scott Podboy, Randy Holveck

The minutes from the Safe Food Advisory Committee meeting on 1/29/09 were unanimously approved.

Operator Issues and Updates

Sanitarians are being redistricted throughout the county, effective 7/1/09, bringing sanitarians previously inspecting in Dane County into the City of Madison, and vice versa. Sanitarian districts will be rotated every 3-4 years. The goal is consistency in the inspections done by sanitarians.

Some questions were raised regarding bare hand contact plans and how they need to be documented. Bare hand contact plans do not need to be submitted to the state, which is a change from how things were done in the past. Establishments can create the plan on their own, as long as it meets all requirements set down by the State of WI. The State of WI does have a template that can be used; the template is also available on the WI Rest. Assoc. website. The most important part of bare hand contact plans is that all employees are well trained and knowledgeable about putting the plan into action. PHMDC has a 1-page form with which the sanitarian will record the bare hand contact plan at the time of the annual inspection. If an establishment sees inconsistencies in how PHMDC sanitarians are handling bare hand contact plans, please contact Doug, Tommye or Beth to discuss the situation.

Operators brought up concerns about any changes that may be coming, now that PHMDC has merged City and County together. The format used for inspections has been the same for the past 2 years, so how inspections are done and documented will be the same. One difference is the implementation of reinspection fees for County establishments. Sanitarians discuss the possibility of a reinspection at the time of the inspection, and have a handout to give to operators explaining what prompts a reinspection. There has already been an article in *Foodfacts* explaining reinspections. Another difference is that in the County, it was difficult for sanitarians to enforce operator compliance for violations observed. Non-compliance cases can now be referred to the County Attorney, as has been the practice in the City of Madison with the City Attorney.

An operator brought up the concern about license fees being raised again. The State of WI reimbursement fees have been raised, but PHMDC may wait to implement this fee change until a later licensing year. The final decision on this is still pending. Reminder: the portion of a license fee reimbursed to the state is printed on the license renewal invoice.

Handwashing

Sanitarians will begin emphasizing the importance of handwashing when speaking to operators during inspections, as was done with emphasizing the importance of having employee illness reporting agreements. There will also be an article in the next *Foodfacts* on this topic, and information about handwashing will automatically print at the end of every inspection report.

E-mail List-serve

The list-serves that were created for licensed establishment operators are up and running, and will be sending out information that is pertinent to establishments in Dane County. Schneider mentioned that

there is a national committee in the process of forming to better coordinate national-level food recalls. Reminder: Sign up at <https://my.cityofmadison.com>. Sanitarians will begin handing out information on how to sign up when inspecting establishments, and the list-serve will also be mentioned in the next issue of *Foodfacts*. It was suggested that a spot for email addresses is put on license applications, with an 'opt out' option from being automatically added to the list-serve. PHMDC would like to be added to the WI Rest. Association's list-serve.

WI Rest. Association's Online Reporting Policy

A copy of the WRA's policy was emailed out to committee members. The WRA supports a searchable, 'pass/fail' reporting system, dependant on certain criteria. Operators are concerned over displaying exact inspection scores online, and would like the reporting system to point out high achieving and/or improving establishments. The information the public wants to know is not always a concern considered critical in an inspection. There must be education on what topics are the important ones to be concerned about, as the public continues to raise their standards and desires to know the details of an establishment they may dine at.

DHS Online Inspection Workgroup

The State of WI is putting together a workgroup to review online reporting systems in order to determine which one(s) to recommend to health departments. Schneider will keep the committee informed on progress made, as well as introduce SFAC feedback to the State's workgroup. There are concerns over how the State would ensure consistency throughout the state. The State does already conduct standardization with their agent health departments, but the departments cannot be forced to allow standardization.

Online Reporting

Website review:

Carrie: Likes the detail of Virginia; liked the Larimer County snapshot bar graph for past history and that one can find more details if interested.

Bill: Thinks that all sites we looked at are busy and difficult to navigate. He would score none of them above a "C" grade. The Virginia site showed critical violations but did not show violations corrected on-site. He also wants recognition for establishments doing a good job and working above and beyond, demonstrating best practices. Website should show how the number of certified food managers per establishment.

Susan Q: Likes Maricopa County—they show critical and non-critical violations, corrections made on-site and specific violation language. She did not like their award system—it is like grading on a curve. Raise the bar high for recognition—it motivates them.

Wally: Likes Virginia—easy to navigate, clear, easy link to inspection reports, violations defined. Wished there was a subjective view of their establishments. He thought this site was much easier than Milwaukee's. He said that Sonoma County had no information about why a license was suspended or re-instated and saw many inspections with 0 violations, which he thought was strange.

Susan B: Website needs to be basic, the less cumbersome, the better. She has no fear about putting inspection details of her establishment on the website. She does not want pages and pages of restaurant info. She likes the Virginia year-to-year results.

Glen: There will be three types of people who use the website. One will be trying to get quick info (Click, hit and go info). The second will want to know more detailed and accurate info. The third will be the dirt diggers. Let's try not to get lost in a quagmire of information.

What to Post for Online Reporting

Consensus was that all licensed food establishments should be included, not just typical meal-serving establishments. There is a possibility of categorizing the establishments, maybe as part of a search function.

The types of inspections posted should be inspections, reinspections, and any enforcement actions (attorney referrals) taken. It might be good to list a spot that says "operating under current ownership since ____." Cleary handed out two different examples of inspections where violations were referred to the attorney, so that committee members could see what sort of information might be an option for putting on the website.

The WI Rest. Assoc. supports listing risk-factor violations, which include violations that may or may not be critical, but if left uncorrected, would increase the risk of a foodborne illness outbreak. The consensus was that risk-factor violations are the preferred violations to list online, with the possibility of having a link connecting viewers to the other violations. The emphasis should be on the critical, risk-factor violations, with simple yet thorough explanations of the violations.

When listing violations, the consensus was that violations should be explained in detail, rather than kept too general (a la Larimer, CO).

Code violation numbers are not necessary for the online report.

If scores are posted, how would the score be best explained to the public? Would including a section that says 'the average score for this type of establishment is ____' help? Would a section summarizing the score (as currently on inspection reports) be desirable? This topic will be revisited at the next meeting.

Reports should be posted immediately after the inspection if no further follow-up is required. If the sanitarian will be returning for a reinspection, however, should the reports wait until those visits are complete as well? This may put a time lag of a month or more on report posting. This topic will be revisited at the next meeting.

Currently, there is approximately 2 years worth of good inspections data for the whole county. In the future, the consensus was that an establishment's past history would be displayed for 5 years. Also, if an establishment undergoes a management change that does not require a new license, should there be a comment section to help explain possible score/rating changes? The Norwich site has an 'operator's right to reply' section where comments can be made; is this something that should be on the PHMDC reporting site?

When searching reports, the viewer should be able to search by name, by location, or a general browse by letter. It would also be nice to be able to search within specific categories, i.e. grocery stores, then by name, location, etc. There is a concern that putting establishments in specific categories would pigeonhole them, which is not desired. There should be a type-in spot to enter information to search by. Milwaukee's site was easy to search. Reports should not be searchable by the number of violations.

The remaining agenda items are tabled for the next meeting, scheduled for July 30th, 2009, from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. at the Water Utility conference room.

