

**Conference for Food Protection  
2014 Issue Form**

**Internal Number: 102  
Issue: 2014 II-007**

<b>Council Recommendation:</b>	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
<b>Delegate Action:</b>	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

*All information above the line is for conference use only.*

---

**Title:**

Report - Standardized Data Collection/Electronic Reporting of Inspections

**Issue you would like the Conference to consider:**

The Conference will acknowledge the work of the committee and submission of the final committee report.

**Public Health Significance:**

During the 2012 Biennial Meeting, Issue 2012-II-035 resulted in the following charge:  
*The Conference recommends that a committee be created to study how health department inspection data can be collected more uniformly through the use of standardized formats to enhance public health. Utilizing Food Code Annex 7, Form 3-A (Food Establishment Inspection Form) and Guide 3-B (Instructions for Marking the Food Establishment Inspection Report, Including Food Code References for Risk Factors/Interventions and Good Retail Practices) as the starting point, the committee is charged to consider:*

- (1) Uniform violation categories/types, by utilizing the FDA inspection form,*
- (2) Consistent scoring methodology, and*
- (3) The best means of electronically collecting, analyzing and sharing inspection data.*

*These activities should be undertaken with the intent of eventually creating a national database to warehouse inspection data from contributing states, local jurisdictions and other sources.*

*The committee will report on its findings, along with implementation recommendations at the 2014 CFP Biennial Meeting.*

The committee is submitting their final report of its findings to the 2014 Biennial Meeting as charged.

**Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:**

acknowledgement of the Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections Committee Final Report and the IT Subcommittee Report;  
thanking the committee members for their work; and  
disbanding the committee as its charges are complete.

**Submitter Information:**

Name: Ann Marie McNamara, Ph.D. & Sheri Morris, Co-Chairs  
Organization: Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections  
Committee  
Address: C/O Jack in the Box, Inc.9357 Spectrum Center Blvd.  
City/State/Zip: San Diego, CA 92123  
Telephone: 858-571-2280 Fax: 858-571-2116  
E-mail: annmarie.mcnamara@jackinthebox.com

**Attachments:**

- α "1. Standardized Data Collection/Electronic Reporting Committee Report"
- α "2. Attachment B - IT Sub-Committee Report"
- α "3. SDCERIC roster"

*It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name  
or a commercial proprietary process.*

# Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

**COMMITTEE NAME: Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections**

**COUNCIL or EXECUTIVE BOARD ASSIGNMENT: II**

**DATE OF REPORT:** November, 2013 (revised February 16, 2014)

**SUBMITTED BY: Co-Chairs: Ann Marie McNamara and Sheri Morris**

**COMMITTEE CHARGE(s): Issue #: 2012 II-035**

Charge: The Conference recommends that a committee be created to study how health department inspection data can be collected more uniformly through the use of standardized formats to enhance public health. Utilizing Food Code Annex 7, Form 3-A (Food Establishment Inspection Form) and Guide 3-B (Instructions for Marking the Food Establishment Inspection Report, Including Food Code References for Risk Factors/Interventions and Good Retail Practices) as the starting point, the committee is charged to consider:

- 1 (1) Uniform violation categories/types, by utilizing the FDA inspection form,
- 2 (2) Consistent scoring methodology, and
- 3 (3) The best means of electronically collecting, analyzing and sharing inspection data.
- 4

These activities should be undertaken with the intent of eventually creating a national database to warehouse inspection data from contributing states, local jurisdictions and other sources.

The committee will report on its findings, along with implementation recommendations at the 2014 CFP Biennial Meeting.

## **COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

I. Progress on Overall Committee Activities:

### 1. **Sub-committee Structure and Approach**

- a. The Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections Committee (hereafter referred as SDCERIC) is a very large committee comprised of 37 members from state, local, and federal government agencies; consumer groups, academia; the retail and food service industries; and computer software companies. This large number of members is indicative of the importance of this committee to its members. Members are very passionate to see this enterprise succeed. No one who requested to be on this committee was excluded from membership.
- b. Initially, the entire SDCERIC participated in the series of conference calls to develop the pro's and con's for health departments in developing electronic databases for health inspection results reporting and to determine whether Form 3-A could be used for standardizing data elements in a national database. SDCERIC then split into two subcommittees to better make use of our member's expertise toward accomplishing our goals as follows:

**Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections - (revised February 16, 2014)**

# Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

- i. The IT Subcommittee was led by co-chairs Darryl Booth and Ann Marie McNamara.
- ii. The Scoring Subcommittee was led by co-chairs, Sheri Morris and Ann Marie McNamara.
- iii. All committee members were invited to participate in any subcommittee activity.

## 2. Executive Summary

- a. The SDCERIC is confident that a national database of health inspection reports is feasible. We have identified several projects that have accomplished at least some of the goals we have considered.
- b. We encourage state and local health departments to adopt a uniform method of data collection such as Form 3-A, but we do not require it for a successful outcome. Neither is a uniform scoring method a necessity.
- c. We recommend a “pull” method that gathers information from state and local health department’s inspection forms rather than requiring them to “push” data to a centralized database.
- d. The IT Sub-Committee recommends the commissioning of a computer system (software and hardware) capable of discovering, collecting, transforming, storing, and reporting inspection results in either 1) a non-standardized format (e.g. publically posted inspection results), or 2) a yet-to-be-specified standard file format. While the standard data streams should be preferred, the non-standard data streams are still of value.
- e. The minimum requirement for a national database to succeed is that state and local health departments publish their health inspection reports on a website.

## 3. Outcome of Each Assigned Committee Charge (*Note: SDCERIC determined that to effectively discuss the charges, it was best to do so out of order as listed in the original charge*)

### II. **Charge (3) - The best means of electronically collecting, analyzing and sharing inspection data**

This SDCERIC began deliberations using a very traditional database development approach of trying to develop

- a consistent data standards of violation types/elements for a database, consistent scoring method, and

## Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

- b. building the database around those elements. This approach would require state and local health departments to voluntarily standardize and publish their health inspection data according to a documented standard. Adoption would be slow.
- c. This approach, although attractive to corporate brand owners, policy makers, consumers and academia, is not particularly attractive to local health departments. The motives to establish and maintain the data-flows from the local to the consolidated database system are not that compelling. It places higher costs and responsibility for compliance to data standards on the health departments, which would need to send electronic data to a national database (The “push” strategy of data management). Without a national requirement and financial remuneration, this traditional approach is likely to struggle or fail at the local level.
- d. A recommended approach to quickly populating a national database is to “pull” data from existing (likely non-standard formats) as well as those data streams made available according to a published standard, which the agency and/or its vendor must choose to support.
- e. In this model a centralized database “pulls” many health inspection results reported to the web into the database. This flow does not require a health department to conform to a data standard (such as Form 3-A). Health departments would simply publish their existing health inspection results to the web. The centralized database then scours the internet, searching for key data elements to add to the database. This is the model currently being used by Google, the University of Maryland, Yelp, and some private databases for mining inspection data.
- f. At the same time, the committee advocates a published standard, which, if adopted, provides a superior data stream.
- g. A “pull” approach would garner greater adoption and would require fewer resources of each health department. It would not require health inspection data to conform to a national standard. In a model cost analysis (IT Subcommittee Report, attached) the cost to a state or local health department for publishing their current health inspection reports to the web would be minimal (\$0 for health departments already publishing reports, to an estimated \$10 - \$20,000 for those not currently publishing reports). This approach would also be more responsive to local and regional regulatory changes to the inspection form, acknowledging that the FDA Model Food Code exists in many varied levels of adoption/equivalency.
- h. The CFP could simply recommend that each health department publish its results to the web, a notion that has inherent value to public health. Those entities willing and able to adopt a published standard represent a superior/preferred data flow that will grow over time.
- i. The “pull” approach places the burden of centralizing the data and searching the web for key data elements on the database management system. The development of such a centralized database was estimated at \$428,250.00. However, databases already exist that could be modified for less money.

### III. Charge (1) - Uniform violation categories/types, by utilizing the FDA inspection Form 3-A

## Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

1. The Committee met in a series of conference calls to discuss the experiences of five states in developing and utilizing electronic databases for health inspection reporting. These states were: Pennsylvania, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North Carolina. In brief, the Committee discussed and identified the following advantages to health departments that developed electronic databases for health inspection reporting:
  - a. Better staff uniformity in reporting violations due to training efforts
  - b. Tablets are used by inspectors in the field
  - c. Predefined comments can be selected decreasing inspection time
  - d. Inspector leaves a printed version with the restaurant
  - e. Electronic inspections can be accessed for consumers and others to see
  - f. Cost savings were noted over manual system costs once the system was implemented
  
2. **The Committee identified pitfalls in developing an electronic database. These included:**
  - a. Teaching inspectors to use an electronic data system was a stumbling block
  - b. No scoring system: only scoring is done by a count of risk factor violations and “repeats”
  - c. Internal assessments being done of (IN/Out/NA/NO of compliance) and (overall) compliance
  - d. Initial cost of database development and tablets
  
3. **The difficulty in harmonizing multiple health inspection forms was deliberated and acknowledged.**

The committee debated whether a standardized health inspection format, such as Form 3-A, could be utilized to develop uniform violation categories and types for developing standardized formats for a national database. The committee concluded that Form 3-A should be used to form the data elements of a national database because these data elements were originally developed and vetted by a previous CFP committee and the data elements were originally chosen based on their public health significance. Industry members cited the development of commercial, electronic databases for health inspection reports using existing state and local health inspection reporting formats and mapping inspection content to Form 3-A for reporting purposes. The desired outcome is a multi-tiered database that can encompass health inspection reports utilizing Form 3-A in its entirety (standardized datasets), as well as health inspection reports in which comparable data elements can be mapped to Form 3-A (non-standardized data sets).

# Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

## 4. Conclusion

The SDCERIC concluded that Form 3-A could be used for developing standardized data collection elements (datasets) of public health significance for a national database. Further, the IT Sub-Committee determined that a “pull” strategy that incorporates both standardized (Form 3-A) and non-standardized datasets that map to Form 3-A allows the development of a national database that can be developed immediately without universal adoption of Form 3-A by health departments.

## IV. Charge (2) - Consistent scoring methodology

1. The Scoring Sub-Committee had several conference calls to review and discuss various scoring systems. Several studies and published articles were reviewed and previous CFP committee reports were shared. The Committee quickly realized that without data linking different scoring methods to public health outcomes, choosing one scoring system over another simply became a matter of personal preference. The sub-committee also learned that FDA was working with NACCHO on collecting data relative to inspection scoring and was also incorporating data collection points in the upcoming Retail Food Risk Factor Study. For this reason, the sub-committee decided that any single method of scoring health inspections, could not be proven scientifically to show a better public health outcome, and therefore, could not be chosen for inclusion in a national database.
2. It was also recognized that using a “pull” approach to develop a national database, a consistent scoring method is not essential to database development. Scoring methods could be determined and evaluated at will, once data has been ‘pulled’ and the data elements available through the national database.

### Recommendations for consideration by Council:

That the Final Report of this Committee be acknowledged by the Council, the Committee be disbanded for completion of assigned charges, and that Council further consider the other three issues submitted by this Committee.

The Co-Chairs would like to thank the members of the SDCERIC and the organizations / agencies they represent that allowed them to participate in this Committee and its work. The expertise and significant time and effort brought to the SDCERIC and the passion for the charge resulted in successful committee results and Council issues that clearly address the assigned charges.

The Committee Co-Chairs would also like to recognize and thank the Co-Chair of the IT Subcommittee, Darryl Booth, for his expertise and significant time and effort in coordinating the work and preparation of the IT Subcommittee report.

### CFP ISSUES TO BE SUBMITTED BY COMMITTEE:

**Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections - (revised February 16, 2014)**

## Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

1. Standardized Data Collection / Electronic Reporting of Inspections Committee Report: Acknowledgement of the committee report and attachments, thanking the members, and dissolving the Committee, as the charges have been completed.
2. Public Website Posting of Inspection Reports: Modifying Food Code language in Annex 3 section 8-304.11 to encourage regulatory authorities to provide copies of inspection reports to the public through website databases. Example language:

To promote access to inspection results for public health purposes, the regulatory authority is encouraged to treat the inspection report as a public document and should be encouraged to make it available, ***preferably electronically on a public website***, for disclosure to a person who requests it as provided by Law.

3. Continued Data Collection to Determine Public Health Scoring: FDA continue exploring ways, such as the current work with NACCHO and data collection with the Risk Factor Studies, to determine if there is a public health impact related to scoring, and if one scoring system has a greater public health impact.
4. Publish the IT Subcommittee Report as a “White Paper” on the CFP Website: The IT Sub-Committee report, titled as a “White Paper” be posted on the CFP website under the section “Conference Developed Guides and Documents.”

## WHITE PAPER

# IT Subcommittee Report: Design and Development of an Inspection Results Collection/Reporting System

## Introduction

This report captures the research and recommendations of the IT Subcommittee. The IT Subcommittee is charged with assessing the existing landscape, proposing a system and methodology, and assessing project costs.

## Subcommittee members

Subcommittee membership is open to all interested committee members. Initial members are the following:

- Darryl Booth
- Chirag Bhatt
- Janice Buchanon
- Bryan Chapman
- Phillip Leslie
- Angela Nardone
- Ernesto Nardone
- Todd Taylor

## Assessment of Existing Landscape

In this section we review several organizations and projects currently working to provide some form of inspection database standardization or integration of retail food safety inspection results from local health departments. These projects vary in their purpose and details, as we describe below.

### **University of Maryland Project: “Digital Disclosure of a Nationally Standardized Database of Restaurant Food Safety Inspections”**

Funded by the Sloan Foundation, this project created a national database of restaurant food safety inspection results. The researchers retrieve inspection results from state and local health department web sites and integrate the data into a single integrated database.

The inspection results are not standardized — all the differences in the violation definitions across jurisdictions are preserved in the underlying data without imposing any assumptions to apply a standard.

The database is searchable. For example, a user can search for all food temperature violations at any restaurant during a specific period of time.

Not all jurisdictions put their data online. Those that do so, provide the results in many different formats. Simply scraping and integrating the data into an integrated database requires customization for each jurisdiction.

## **Yelp.com**

Yelp is a for-profit entity that collects and curates user-generated reviews. In January 2013 Yelp announced a plan to incorporate health department food safety inspections into their results.

Central to their plan is a standardized inspection score format across jurisdictions. Yelp partnered with the Cities of San Francisco and New York to generate a common data schema that health departments may utilize in providing their inspection data to Yelp. The schema is called the Local Inspector Value-Entry Specification (LIVES).

The LIVES format does not enforce a standard definition of violations.

## **HDScores.com**

HDScores.com is a Maryland-based for-profit startup that aims to “scrape” health department web sites for inspection data. The main goal appears to be utilizing the data to generate sales leads for restaurant hygiene solution providers.

## **CalCode Data Dictionary**

The CalCode Data Dictionary, established in 2006, was created to provide a standardized data schema for California health departments to provide electronic records of retail food safety inspection results.

## **Local Data Management Systems**

There exist several companies that provide software and IT services to health departments, including an accounting of restaurant inspection results.

In addition, any number of health departments may have locally-developed systems.

## **State-Wide Systems**

Approximately sixteen states (plus Washington DC) have integrated inspection in a single database at the state level.<sup>1</sup>

In these instances, the inspections themselves may or may not be standardized across reporting health departments within the state.

## **Proposed System and Recommended Methodology**

---

<sup>1</sup> Alabama, Delaware, DC, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia.

## Pull Over Push

A traditional approach to the challenge of standardized and consolidated retail food inspection results is to 1) publish a data dictionary; 2) advocate its adoption through CFP, NEHA, and others; and 3) rely upon state and local health departments to voluntarily standardize and “push” their inspection data according to the documented standard.

This proposition is not particularly attractive to local health departments. The motives to establish and maintain the data-flows from the local to the consolidated system just are not compelling. Without a national requirement and financial remuneration, this traditional approach is likely to start slowly, struggle, or even fail at the local level.

Why is it that one can search Google for “Restaurant Name, Restaurant Number” and find recent inspection results from the Boulder County Environmental Health web site? It’s through Google’s engineering and computing power. On a regular basis, Google scours the Internet, following web pages link-by-link, until it eventually discovers Boulder County’s inspection results and the “Restaurant” inspection history. Boulder County didn’t have to do anything... except to publish its inspection results to the web (a best practice) for Google to “pull” into its system.

This subcommittee recommends a “pull” strategy that incorporates BOTH standard and non-standard datasets.

## Non-Standardized Datasets

A strategy to embrace non-standardized datasets favors rapid start-up, simply by immediately using local and state health departments’ common practice of publishing inspection results to the web. By identifying and collecting or “spidering” existing public-facing web sites, the project can expect early returns. To grow the database, CFP, NEHA, and other leaders need only advocate for best practices... specifically, adopting the FDA Model Food Code and publishing inspection results to the web.

Within these non-standard datasets, we can expect to realize many of the stated goals of the committee’s charge. That is, with these data, we can present the frequency of violations with keywords and date ranges in dashboards dedicated to this purpose. Within these data, we may curate and stream data to brand owners for their own analyses.

As the Model Food Code is adopted more widely, one can expect these data to naturally normalize over time. As the tools and techniques mature, more and more can be determined from the universe of data, not unlike election pundits and news organizations which increasingly scour and extract their conclusions from data-streams such as Twitter and others.

The costs and management under this approach are centralized. The primary request of our state and local partners is to continue along the course already set... to embrace the FDA Model Food Code and to publish their inspection results to the web.

This subcommittee recommends a system capable of discovering, collecting, and indexing the immediately-available restaurant inspection results published to the web by health departments, even if these results do not meet a documented format or standard.

## Standardized Datasets

The subcommittee would never dismiss the added value of standardized inspection datasets. After all, standardized data is part of the committee’s charge.

In fact, where a health department is able and willing to adhere to a published data schema and make that data file available in a “pull” configuration, the recommended system must routinely retrieve the updated dataset in favor of any corresponding web-published restaurant inspection pages.

We must recognize that data standards are adopted slowly. A data standardization project should begin with a version-controlled schema that captures the elements described by Annex 7 of the 2009 Model Food Code - Form 3a. Further, the first outreach promoting adoption of a uniform data standard should be to the commercial off-the-shelf software providers where integrating the standard into a commercial system provides for greater reach as that system is adopted.

This subcommittee recommends a published schema for standardized data which, if provided by the health department, is retrieved and processed instead of the public web site data.

### Data Stewardship

Data stewardship refers to the person or entity responsible for the data content and context. In practical terms, it means the entity who can correct errors and answer questions.

The subcommittee recommends that the health department that created the data remain the stewards of the data. Any data remediation should be brought to the attention of the originating agency, corrected in-place, and re-published.

## System Infrastructure

### Infrastructure Requirements

The following high-level requirements are addressed by this proposed infrastructure.

Category	Requirement	Notes
Web Site Crawling Capacity	18M web pages (inspections) per week <sup>2</sup>	Assuming: - 3,000 health departments <sup>3</sup> - Average 2,000 facilities per department - Average 3 inspections per facility
Standardized File Retrieval	200 files per week	Assuming 200 state/local agencies provide consolidated file per published standard
Storage Capacity	2 Million Inspection Events Annually  200 Million Checklist Items	Based upon a 1M estimated national inventory of restaurants, assuming average two inspections annually.

<sup>2</sup> Most will be duplicates of previously crawled pages. Very few will be new/updated data.

<sup>3</sup> See [http://www.naccho.org/topics/infrastructure/profile/upload/LHD\\_Workforce-Final.pdf](http://www.naccho.org/topics/infrastructure/profile/upload/LHD_Workforce-Final.pdf)

## 2014 Conference for Food Protection IT Subcommittee Report I

	Annually 10 Years History Maintained <sup>4</sup>	Checklist Items describe a distinct inspection data-point (e.g., IN, OUT, NA, NO).
Users	1,000 Registered Users 250,000 Anonymous Simultaneous Users (Maximum capacity - in cases of national interest)	Registered include those with privileged access for query/research/study. Anonymous Users include non-privileged public-access, including consumers, owners/brand-holders, news media, etc.
Interfaces	Login / Account Management / Security Aspects  Website Registration, Web Crawler / Data Discovery / Data Collector  Public-Facing Web Site for Search/Results and Data Export	Login / Account Management refers to the creation and approval of accounts as well as lost passwords, changed profile, etc.
Documentation	End User Documentation (Online) Administrator Documentation Standardized Data File Format Documentation	

### Infrastructure Recommendations

#### System Development

The subcommittee recommends that the system be developed by a professional entity selected on the basis of its demonstrated technical aptitude as well as a minimum of five years' involvement in and understanding of the food safety regulatory principles at national level.

#### System Requirements

In coordination with the CFP, this committee and other stakeholders must establish a Software Requirements Specification (SRS). The SRS may become the basis of an invitation to to bid on the project.

#### System Testing

The project shall include both functional and load testing by the vendor and a committee of beta testers. The project shall also include initial and routine security vulnerability assessments.

#### System Acceptance

System acceptance shall be delegated to a committee of stakeholders and beta testers.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although this may exceed the data/record retention policies of a reporting agency, the system may be designed to anonymize data for inspections that are no longer subject to record retention.

### System Maintenance

The resulting system will require ongoing maintenance including end-user support, change control management/implementation, optimization, monitoring, security patches, bug fixes, etc.

### Change Control Process

As a component of System Maintenance, the implementing entity shall recommend and facilitate a Change Control Process. The Change Control Process is the means by which bug fixes and enhancements shall be captured, prioritized, and addressed.

## Estimated Costs

<b>Task</b>	<b>Estimated Hours</b>	<b>Estimated Costs</b>
Inception - Gather Requirements	250	\$37,500.00
Inception - Author Software Requirements Specification	250	\$37,500.00
Inception - Manage Vendor Selection	200	\$30,000.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$105,000.00</b>
Implementation - Infrastructure / Data Center	85	\$12,750.00
Implementation - Coding	500	\$75,000.00
Implementation - Testing	250	\$37,500.00
Implementation - Documentation - Including Standard Data Format	120	\$18,000.00
Implementation - System Acceptance	60	\$9,000.00
Implementation - Web Site Plug-Ins	500	\$75,000.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$227,250.00</b>
Annual Maintenance - Data Center		\$24,000.00
Annual Maintenance - End User Support		\$30,000.00
Annual Maintenance - Change Control Management		\$30,000.00
Annual Maintenance - Security Updates		\$12,000.00
<b>Total (Annual Costs)</b>		<b>\$96,000.00</b>

## 2014 Conference for Food Protection IT Subcommittee Report I

### Estimated Cost to Health Departments to Participate

The costs below estimate the investment by an individual reporting agency (e.g., health department) to engage by contributing its data.

This may occur through Electronic Data Transfer (EDT), CSV Upload, Direct Entry, or “Screen Scraping.”

Within each option, the reporting agency may engage their existing vendor (e.g., a national vendor) or their own internal IT resources.

Method of Participation	Description
Non-Standardized Dataset from Public Posting of Restaurant inspections	<p>If agency already publishing inspection results to the web and/or is already engaged in a project to do so, the cost is near \$0.00.</p> <p>If the agency has not yet committed to publishing restaurant inspection results to the web, the project may be \$10,000 to \$20,000 to do so using established vendor or internally developed system.</p>
Standardized Dataset - Curated and provided by health department to be “pulled” by central system.	<p>Established Vendors - \$10,000</p> <p>Internally Maintained - \$10,000</p>

Committee Name:

**Committee Name: Standardized Data Collection and Electronic Reporting of Inspections Committee**

Last Name	First Name	Position (Chair/Member)	Constituency	Employer	City	State	Telephone	Email
Bhatt	Chirag H.	Member	Industry	Consultant	Houston	TX	(281) 684-6883	<a href="mailto:chiragbhatt@bloominbrands.com">chiragbhatt@bloominbrands.com</a>
Booth	Darryl	Member (voting)	Other - Software Services	Decade Software Company	Fresno	CA	(559) 271-2890	darrylbooth@decadesoftware.com
Buchanon	Janice D.	Member	Other - Sanitation Services	Steritech	Charlotte	NC	(704) 971-6565	janice.buchanon@steritech.com
Chapman	Bryan	Member	Other - Training and Testing Services	AboveTraining	Orem	UT	(801) 494-1879	bchapman@abovetraining.com
Connell	Kevin	Member	Industry - Food Service	Wawa	Wawa	PA	(610) 505-4964	kevin.c.connell@wawa.com
Davis	Douglas	Member (voting)	Industry - Food Service	Marriott	Bethesda	MD	(301) 380-5736	douglas.davis@marriott.com
Deslauriers	Susan	Member (voting)	Industry - Retail Food Stores	Big Y	Springfield	MA	(413) 504-4452	deslaurs@bigy.com
D'Souza	Tanya	Member (voting)	Industry - Jetro Restaurant Depot	Jetro/Restaurant Depot	College Point	NY	(718) 412-4552	TDsouza@jetrord.com
Girard	Lorna	Member (voting)	Regulatory - State	State of Minnesota	St. Paul	MN	(651) 201-6591	lorna.girard@state.mn.us
Graves	Thomas	Member	Industry - Food Service	Wendy's	Dublin	OH	(614) 764-3056	thomas.graves@wendys.com
Hanrahan	Robert	Member (voting)	Industry - Retail Food Stores	Kroger	Memphis	TN	(901) 765-4371	robert.hanrahan@kroger.com
Hardister	Bill	Member (voting)	Regulatory - Local	Mecklenburg County	Charlotte	NC	(704) 336-5533	bill.hardister@mecklenburgcountync.gov
Higley	Jamie	Member (voting)	Regulatory - State	State of Ohio	Columbus	OH	(614) 644-8659	jamie.higley@odh.ohio.gov
Hughes	Stephen		FDA-Consultant	FDA				<a href="mailto:stephen.hughes@fda.hhs.gov">stephen.hughes@fda.hhs.gov</a>
Jacobs	Darryl	Member	Industry - Food Service	Wendy's	Dublin	OH	(614) 546-7007	darryl.jacobs@wendys.com
Jenkins	Tim	Member (voting)	Regulatory - Local	City of Minneapolis	Roseville	MN	(651) 248-1947	tim.jenkins@minneapolismn.gov

Committee Name:

Kennedy	Terrence	Member	Industry - Food Service	Starbucks	Seattle	WA	(617) 784-2884	tkennedy@starbucks.com
Leslie	Phillip	Member	Academia	UCLA	Los Angeles	CA	650-387-5498	<a href="mailto:pleslie@anderson.ucla.edu">pleslie@anderson.ucla.edu</a>
Liggans	Girvin		FDA-Consultant	FDA	College Park	MD	240-402-1382	<a href="mailto:grivin.liggans@fda.hhs.gov">grivin.liggans@fda.hhs.gov</a>
Luebke	Geoff	Member	Industry - Food Service	Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association	fria.org	FL	(850) 224-2250	geoff@fria.org
Luker	John	Member (voting)	Regulatory-State	New York State Dept of Agriculture and Markets	Albany	NY	518-457-5382	<a href="mailto:john.lucker@agriculture.ny.gov">john.lucker@agriculture.ny.gov</a>
McNamara	Dr. Ann Marie	Chair (voting)	Industry - Food Service	Jack in the Box	San Diego	CA	(858) 571-2280	annmarie.mcnamara@jackinthebox.com
Melchert	Christopher	Member	Other - Association	National Restaurant Association	Washington	DC	(202) 973-3960	cmelchert@restaurant.org
Moore	Eric	Member (voting)	Industry - Food Service	Aramark	Philadelphia	PA	(215) 409-7343	moore-eric2@aramark.com
Morris	Sheri	Vice-Chair (voting)	Regulatory-State	Dept. Agriculture	Hbg	PA	717-787-4315	<a href="mailto:shmorris@pa.gov">shmorris@pa.gov</a>
Nardone	Angela	Member	Other - Software Services	Chairman, N2N Global	Longwood	FL	(407) 331-5151	anardone@us.n2nglobal.com
Nardone	Ernesto	Member	Other - Software Services	N2N Global	Longwood	FL	(407) 331-5151	anardone@us.n2nglobal.com
Narvaez	Nona	Member	Consumer	Anaphylaxis and Food Allergy Association of Minnesota	St Paul	MN	(651) 644-5937	nona@minnesotafoodallergy.org
Owens	Jackie	Member (voting)	Regulatory	Wisconsin State	Madison	WI	608-224-4734	<a href="mailto:jackie.owens@wi.gov">jackie.owens@wi.gov</a>
Petran	Ruth	Member	Other - Sanitation Services	Ecolab	Eagan	MN	(651) 795-5646	ruth.petran@ecolab.com
Plante	Andrew	Member (voting)	Industry - Food Service	Brinker International	Dallas	TX	(972) 770-1778	andrew.plante@brinker.com
Sanchez	Angela	Member (voting)	Industry - Food Service	CKE Restaurants	Ontario	CA	(714) 254-4556	asanchez@ckr.com
Tate	Gretchen	Member	Industry - Food Service	Buffalo Wild Wings	Minneapolis	MN	(952) 818-3673	gtate@buffalowildwings.com
Taylor	Todd	Member	Other - Sanitation Services	Ecolab	Greensboro	NC	(336) 931-2606	todd.taylor@ecolab.com

Committee Name:

Tew	Daniel	Member (voting)	Industry - Food Service	Yum! Brands	Louisville	KY	(502) 874-2422	daniel.tew@yum.com
Waldrep	Justin	Member	Industry - Retail Food Stores	RaceTrac	Smyrna	GA	(404) 276-2410	jwaldrep@racetrac.com
Williams	Joshua	Member (voting)	Regulatory - Local	Delaware County Health Department	Muncie	IN	(765) 747-7721	jwilliams@co.delaware.in.us