



CONFERENCE FOR FOOD PROTECTION
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Boise, Idaho
April 21-22, 2015

April 21, Tuesday 8:30AM

Voting members present: Kelli Whiting, Kevin Smith, John M. Luker, Bill Hardister, William K. Shaw Jr., Patrick Guzzle, Rebecca Steiner, Kristin Delea, Jessica Fletcher, Cassandra Mitchell, Brian Nummer, Marline Gaither, Ken Rosenwinkel, Donna Garren, Larry Eils, Brenda Bacon, Terry Levee, David Plunkett, Dean Finkenbinder

Voting members absent: Lorna Jensen Girard, Lisa Staley, Lori LeMaster, Becky Stevens-Grobbelaar

Non-Voting Members present: Lee Cornman, James C. Mack, Julie Albrecht, Vicki Everly, David Lawrence, Davene Sarrocco-Smith, Chris Gordon, Susan Quam, Todd Rossow, Rick Barney

Non-Voting Members participating by Telephone: Gina Nicholson Kramer, Angela Nardone, Jeff Hawley

Guests: Jodi Callister

Note: Board members with dual roles on the Executive Board were only captured once, especially if the board member is a voting member.

Opening – Conference Chair John Luker, Presiding

Conference Chair Mr. John Luker called the meeting to order and thanked Patrick Guzzle for hosting the Executive Board (EB) Meeting.

Executive Director Dr. McSwane read the CFP Anti-trust Policy and reminded the members of the Board that it must be followed during all Board meetings. Executive Assistant Aggie Hale recorded a written list of members present.

Mr. Luker brought up the fact that the date and the name appearing below the “attested” provision at the bottom of the anti-trust statement were old and obsolete. Mr. Luker entertained a motion. Mr. Nummer moved to strike the name of the previous Executive Director from the bottom of the anti-trust statement and Mr. Guzzle seconded the motion.

ACTION ITEM: A vote was taken on the motion to strike the name of the Director from the bottom of the anti-trust statement and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luker asked for the roll call to be taken. Dr. McSwane stated that a roster would be circulated to assure everyone present is accounted for and provide an opportunity for attendees to make any changes needed to update their listing on the Board Roster.

Mr. Luker acknowledged a guest present, Ms. Jodi Callister from Winco Foods. (Co-Chair of LAC). Mr. Guzzle stated she was currently doing the bulk of the work.

Mr. Luker asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Mr. Luker stated the EB Meeting Minutes of Board Meeting Minutes, August 26-27, 2014 – (previously approved via E-

ballot) and included in Binder 1, since there were no comments, the minutes stand approved as written.

Executive Staff Reports

Executive Director – David McSwane

Dr. McSwane went over the ED report submitted. He stated that the meeting is being recorded and to speak up.

Dr. McSwane discussed the letters that were sent to Congress including the newly elected congressional members. The letters asked Congress to continue to support FDA's regulations on unpasteurized milk. The task was completed.

An ad hoc finance committee was created to review the financial health of the organization. He stated Ms. Garren is chairing the ad hoc committee and she will be discussing her report.

The Crumbine award was discussed. The CFP is one of eight organizations co-sponsoring the award. There are 3 applicants for the award in 2015. The jury has not met to date to determine if any of the applicants is worthy of being selected as the winner of the award.

A reminder was made of the approval for Richmond, VA. for next biennial meeting. Contracts have already been signed. Dr. McSwane acknowledged Mr. Chris Gordon and Ms. Julie Henderson and others for assistance on the 2018 biennial meeting.

The next board meeting is August 8-11/12-2015. Information has been provided for reservations. Use the code CFP2015 for proper room rates. Room nights were reserved for the front and back end of the meeting to accommodate those that have to travel a greater distance.

Mr. Nummer discussed that shuttles are available to get to the hotel in Park City. He stated it would be about a 30-minute trip. There is a shuttle available to and from the hotel to downtown. Mr. Nummer is not sure at this time if the shuttle is a hotel shuttle. Dr. McSwane requested Mr. Nummer send him information on logistics.

Executive Treasurer – Eric Pippert

Mr. Pippert discussed the amended report that he submitted. The first Amendment to the report was in regards to first quarter financials. He discussed expenses are rising and secondly, was about the small conference grant. He stated his request for permission to apply for the FDA small conference grant was accepted. He brought up the Boise budget, however he suggested it was better to discuss it at the August meeting. He went over the travel request process. Currently, we are over the \$13,000 budgeted to cover Board member expenses. It was also brought up about those that could not attend and had requested money for this meeting could defray the cost overage stated.

ACTION ITEM:

Dr. Garren moved and seconded by Mr. Rosenwinkel to accept the treasurer's report. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

Executive Assistant – Aggie Hale

Ms. Hale reported that the new recording device appears to be a much better tool than the previous recorder and hopes this will help in capturing meeting minutes more accurately. She also mentioned the information provided in the written report.

Mr. Rossow asked if there were problems with members not receiving emails. Ms. Hale stated she worked with Vertical Response and individuals to straighten it out. She also mentioned the importance of getting the word out that members need to notify us when they make changes to their contact information. Ms. Everly brought up how do issues get resolved with respect to spam, etc. Ms. Quam asked if there is an auto reply function. Ms. Hale stated she would work with our Webmaster to discuss the possibility.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Luker entertained a motion to acknowledge the Executive Assistant (EA) report.
Ms. Fletcher so moved and Dr. Garren seconded. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Old Business

Mr. Luker brought up that the Executive Director's (ED) report was not voted on and entertained a motion to do so.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Eils moved to accept the ED report and was seconded by Ms. Gaither. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Dr. McSwane contacted Ms. Lemaster by telephone to join the meeting.

Mr. Luker brought up the first report under Old Business –

1. The report from the ad hoc Committee on Standards for Documents Published on CFP Website and Peer Reviewed and Non-Peer Reviewed Publications chaired by Dr. Garren.

Dr. Garren stated there was no report at this time.

2. Mr. Luker moved on to Mr. Smith regarding developing a list of specific reasons that Councils should choose from when recommending "No Action" on an issue.

Mr. Smith brought up from previous board meetings, the issue of having a method whereby Councils adequately state reasons for no action being taken on Issues presented during the biennial meeting. Mr. Smith re-distributed a handout that he had provided at the last Board meeting and that included examples of possible reasons for consideration. He stated in seeing a list of general categorical reasons for why the Council reached a recommendation of No Action, rather than the Council attempting to craft a single detailed reason. The reason one Council member voted in favor of No Action may be quite different from the reasons another Council member No Action. Achieving consensus on why No Action is not a duty of the Council.

Mr. Smith brought up that Ms. Everly and Ms. Mitchell (Issue Chairs) were involved already regarding the creation of a list of reasons for taking no action. Ms. Everly confirmed they have this on their "to do" list. Mr. Smith asked if Ms. Everly wanted the board to submit comments. She welcomed comments from board members. Ms. Everly stated by the August board meeting a response to this issue would be submitted for consideration.

Mr. Smith went over the comments he submitted for consideration. Discussion was had concerning the validity of standardized comments. Ms. Bacon brought up that "it is already addressed in Food Code" was used frequently. Mr. Smith stated he did not like this response because it does not explain what the intent was for the no action and does not provide a clear message, especially to the state delegates as to what led to the no action. Further discussion ensued

regarding the need for a meaningful explanation for the no action. Ms. Everly discussed her understanding that the Issue Chairs were to come up with a guidance document to help give direction on explaining why the no action was given. She envisioned that this would be part of the package of guidance material that would be brought forward to the council for deliberations.

Mr. Luker stated the Issue Committee would be working on this and coming back to the EB in August. Therefore, he suggested that we move on with the agenda items.

Ms. LeMaster stated she was having difficulty hearing the proceedings and elected to end her participation in the conference call.

3. Dr. Nummer brought up his concerns regarding how Issues accepted by the Assembly of Delegates at the 2014 biennial meeting that had a recommended solution of “Let FDA figure out what to do.” He suggested Mr. Smith might shed some light on what he considers a vague recommendation could result in the issue not being addressed. Mr. Smith stated that this could be a valid solution. However, that a more specific rationale for this comment be made including specific language or references. Mr. Smith suggested a recommendation that a motion be made for a reminder to the FDA to provide a report at least 6 months prior to the next conference the status of recommendations pertaining to Food Code changes. Dr. Nummer suggested the Conference Chair could do this.

Dr. McSwane reminded the EB that this information is posted on the CFP website already. His concern is that members may not go to the website to find the information. Dr. McSwane discussed the possibility of a reminder through the Vertical Response blast email system for members to see the status reports provided by the FDA on the CFP website.

Mr. Luker brought up that perhaps Dr. Nummer’s concern was that sometimes we don’t formally hear back from the FDA on a particular issue and this is what needs to be addressed. Dr. Nummer was concerned about two issues for which he felt were not being properly addressed. Mr. Smith stated that one of the issues concerning HACCP was being addressed in the upcoming supplement to the Food Code. However, the issue concerning incubation during cooking is still being considered by FDA This is an example where perhaps a letter to let the CFP know what progress the FDA is making towards providing an adequate response to this issue. Dr. McSwane suggested that the FDA report at the Board meetings, beyond the FDA response letter, should provide information on the FDA’s progress and would be the kind of information that could be helpful. CFP could be sent out to the members as a reminder via website and email.

Mr. Luker suggested moving on to the next item on the agenda: Instruction Sheet for State Delegates – Marlene Gaither.

4. Ms. Gaither discussed the possibility of creating a boilerplate type check sheet of do’s and don’ts on the process to assist state delegates especially if they are new state delegates. Ms. Fletcher stated this document already exists and provided a copy for review. This document is given to council members during orientation. Ms. Cornman suggested that perhaps during orientation it be further explained to state delegates. Ms. Cornman also suggested further explanation be handled through the mentor program. Ms. Steiner asked what needs updating to the current document? Ms. Cornman shared that these documents have been around for many past biennial meetings and this information is given out to all registered attendees. Ms. Cornman also stated there is a Powerpoint presentation given during the orientation to state delegates. Dr. McSwane suggested Mr. Alan Tart be included in this discussion and that perhaps the information could also be handed out during Mr. Tart’s presentation to the state delegates. Mr. Mack agreed with Dr. Garren that a webinar could be created and posted on the website and could also be shared during the mentoring process. This information could also be provided via a welcome letter. Dr. Garren shared that she can possibly provide help with creating a webinar through her current employer. Ms. Bacon agreed with Ms. Sarrocco-Smith that during this process a segment should be included concerning guidance for presenters. It was suggested that Ms. Gaither review the document(s) in question. She also asked if anyone would like to assist her in this area. Dr. McSwane suggested Mr. Tart be asked to review the existing documents as well. Ms. Mitchell stated that Dr. Garren’s idea for a webinar would be helpful.

Mr. Luker introduced Ms. Cornman to discuss the issue: Identifying the role of voting and non-voting (at-large) committee members during meetings and calls.

5. Ms. Cornman discussed the history and the process that went into establishing language on committee size and was officially written into the current Constitution and Bylaws. Ms. Cornman requested that if there were any concern on readdressing this issue she would welcome dialog on addressing issues such as at-large members. All membership must go through the board as specified in the Constitution and Bylaws. She mentioned this was a concern expressed at the last EB meeting. Dr. McSwane suggested that council chairs check with their committees to see if they are having problems regarding this situation. It is important to make sure only “official” members that are approved by the Board of CFP are the only ones that have a vote.

Ms. Quam stated the situation has more or less corrected itself. Mr. Guzzle mentioned that committees are cyclical in interest and participation. It is up to council chairs/vice chairs to be involved and to be clear as to the roles of voting and non-voting members. Ms. Sarrocco-Smith asked if there was a need to place a cap on the number of non-voting, at-large members? Mr. Rossow reiterated the importance of maintaining balance.

Mr. Levee asked what is the will of the EB? Ms. Cornman stated it has been fully discussed and left at the status quo at this time.

10:30am Break

Mr. Luker brought forward the request for Council Reports.

COUNCIL I REPORTS – Chris Gordon, Rick Barney

Mr. Gordon directed attention to the reports submitted by all the Committees under Council I. Mr. Gordon held 3 conference calls with all committees. Committee Chairs meet with Council Chairs once a month by phone. All updated rosters have also been submitted.

Council I Committees:

Food Recovery -No items presented by the committee for Board approval.

Ice Maker Equipment Cleaning and Sanitizing - No items presented by the committee for Board approval.

Plan Review (discussed holding a meeting at the NEHA conference, however, it appears the Committee will not hold a face to face meeting, therefore the Chairs are not recommending this action to the EB)

Unattended Food Establishments - Susan Kowalczyk will be on committee as a voting regulatory member, and Scott Gilliam who was a regulatory voting member has transitioned to industry and represents that constituency on the committee.

Oyster Committee - No items presented by the committee for Board approval.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Finkenbinder moved and Mr. Plunkett seconded to acknowledge the Council I report and rosters. No discussion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

COUNCIL II REPORT – Susan Quam, David Lawrence

Ms. Quam discussed the current progress of the committees and requested the EB approve changes listed below. All four Committees have been actively meeting.

Council II Committees:

Certification of Food Safety Regulatory Professionals - (asked the EB for approval of changes in roster due to constituency changes: see report)

Demonstration of Knowledge - No items presented by the committee for Board approval.

Employee Food Safety Training Employee Food Safety Committee - (Committee had a change of Committee Chair. The committee did get behind because of leadership changes. Committee is looking to be re-formed due to volume of work. The Committee held a face-to-face meeting.)

Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training - No items presented by the committee for Board approval.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Luker entertained a motion to acknowledge reports and approve the requested change in roster. Ms. Bacon moved and Mr. Finkenbinder seconded to acknowledge the report with the requested change. No discussion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

COUNCIL III REPORT – Todd Rossow, Davene Sarrocco-Smith

Council III Committees:

Mr. Rossow discussed the progress of Council III's committees. He stated he was pleased with the progress made by the two Committees. Both Committees have included their reports and rosters. The two action items the Committees want to put forward are listed below. He then began by discussing the Listeria Retail Guidelines Committee.

Listeria Retail Guidelines Committee - (asked the EB for approval of changes to the roster)

A Board member asked about the charge of the Listeria Committee. Mr. Rossow stated the committee's charge was to revise the "2006 Voluntary Guidelines of Sanitation Practices Standard Operating Procedures and Good Retail Practices to Minimize Contamination and Growth of Listeria monocytogenes Within Food Establishments".

Ms. Mitchell asked Mr. Rossow how the Committee accomplished inactivating a Committee member. Mr. Rossow said he believed the Committee followed the proper procedure. The Committee Chairs did attempt numerous times to contact the member with no results.

Hand Hygiene Committee – (asked the EB for approval of changes to the roster, however the Committee believes there is still balance of the Committee, which is now 8 industry and 6 regulatory. One regulatory member moved from a voting to a non-voting "at-large position" and the Committee stated they could not find another regulator.

The Hand Hygiene Committee did meet and Mr. Rossow stated that Ms. Sarrocco-Smith sat in on their conference calls.

The Committee requested clarification in the form of language changes for charges to Issue 2014 III-011: Item a - Ascertain if additional definitions are necessary to clarify the hand hygiene procedures listed in the Food Code.

Mr. Rossow stated it was not the Committee's intent to eliminate the charge, but have the charge clarified. The Committee proposed to the EB, language for clarification purposes based on the Committee's unanimous recommendations, see the charges with the proposed additional language as submitted by Hand Hygiene Committee in their Report)

Mr. Rossow suggested going through each proposed language changes to charges separately.

Mr. Smith reiterated that a discussion was had on committees changing charges. He asked if it would be better if rather than change a charge, if the EB would allow for further recommendations from the Committee as a reasonable fulfillment of the charge? Mr. Smith asked if this was ok with respect to maintaining the intent of the charge or does the Committee want to change the charge? Ms. Sarrocco-Smith stated yes to clarification not changing the charge.

charge.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Smith made a motion for the Executive Board to advise the Co-Chairs of the Hand Hygiene Committee that it is appropriate for the Committee to pursue the development of proposed recommendations as part of the fulfillment of the existing Charge a.

Discussion ensued. Dr. Garren agreed with Mr. Smith regarding the intent vs. changing the language of the charges in the Issue. Ms. Albrecht brought up that a motion was on the floor and there was no second prior to discussion. Mr. Levee stated that Mr. Smith did make a motion and asked Mr. Smith if this was so. Mr. Smith clarified that his motion was only with respect to Charge a. Mr. Luker asked if there was a second to the motion. Mr. Eils seconded the motion.

Ms. Everly stated that from an Issue review standpoint she does not understand the motion. She suggested that perhaps the Committee asks for an additional charge that asks for recommendations regarding the definitions they have identified that need clarity. She stated she is only referring to Charge "a" at this time.

Mr. Levee shared that at the last biennial meeting he dealt with this situation and he came away with the understanding that a charge could not be changed by adding or subtracting anything to the original charge. Discussion ensued as to the capability of adding additional language with respect to clarification as long as the original charge was not changed. Ms. Comman stated that language was changed last biennial meeting to Conference Procedures regarding the situation. She asked if the EB wanted to hear the language and the answer was yes. At this point she read the language in Section 8 – Committees, Subsection G – 1 of the *2014 CFP Biennial Meeting/Conference Procedures*.

Mr. Smith reiterated that the EB should respond to the Committee stating that the EB agreed with their request for clarification thus meeting the intent of the charge. Mr. Smith stated that perhaps adding an additional Issue would then mean the EB is adding a charge and to that he believes the EB should stay clear. Mr. Eils agrees with Mr. Smith that we cannot change the charge, but the EB can provide a response by saying their proposed language can be accepted as recommendations, but not change the language of the charges.

Mr. Guzzle asked if we could strike the words in the report “or revision” and just keep it as the Committee is seeking clarification. He stated he did not know if this was appropriate.

Mr. Eils stated you could not change the language in the report. Dr. Garren stated that she agreed with Mr. Smith and she suggested that the EB agrees with clarification as stated in the Committee report, but not revisions to the charges. Dr. Garren suggested that the Committee include in the Committee final report that the EB provided clarification to the charge, but not changes to the language of the charge or something to that effect so that during Council deliberation someone could not say that this was not what the charge stated.

Dr. McSwane asked Mr. Smith if his proposed language in his motion did in fact address the will of the EB to provide clarification to the Committee by recognizing their proposed language to meet the intent of the charge without changing the charge as originally written. Mr. Smith answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Luker stated there was a motion and a second on the floor. Mr. Rosenwinkel asked to repeat the motion.

Mr. Smith repeated the motion: that the EB advise the Chair of the Committee that if the Committee chooses to propose recommendations, such an activity would be consistent with the original charges to the Committee.

better

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Rosenwinkel made a friendly amendment to Mr. Smith’s motion on Charge a of the Committee and it was seconded by Mr. Finkenbinder, that the Executive Board give clarification to the Hand Hygiene Committee through the Council Chair that the Committee can choose to explain how they fulfilled the charges by the recommendations as stated in their report. However, charges cannot be changed or removed. Mr. Luker asked for a vote on the amendment to the motion. No further discussion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Rossow asked the EB if the same resolution for Charge a could be applied to Charge c. Ms. Mitchell asked why we are asking for the same thing to be done for Charge c as done for Charge a. She asked if the EB could go back and change the previous motion to include c as well?

Dr. Garren stated that the language proposed by the Committee is better language and she does agree with the clarification. However, the charge needs to remain as written. Therefore, this is a clarifying statement.

ACTION ITEM:

Dr. Garren moves and Mr. Rosenwinkel seconded, that the clarifying language to Charge “a” is warranted to include methods and available research. However, the language of the original charge remains the same. Mr. Luker asked for a vote. No further discussion. The vote was taken and carried unanimously.

Mr. Rossow brought up his last request and that is to address Charge d. He read that section of the Committee report.

ACTION ITEM:

Dr. Garren made a motion and Mr. Rosenwinkel seconded, stating the request to remove the charge is denied. The Executive Board felt that the committee had completed the charge as written.

* See excerpt of the Committee Report. The Council Chair will take back to the Committee Chair what the Executive Board discussed regarding Charge d.

- * Original Charge: d. Review available research on the efficacy and public health significance of antibacterial soaps, and their impact on hand hygiene procedures in the food industry.

Proposed Revision:

The committee voted unanimously to request that this charge be removed. FDA published a proposed rule regarding the available data and FDA's criteria for establishing the safety and effectiveness of antiseptic washes for consumer use in December 2013. Although CDER has not yet defined antiseptic criteria for food handler use, we plan to address these products in the future.

Should the Board deny the request to remove this charge, the committee requests to not be required to make a recommendation to the next Conference on this charge.

Dr. Garren suggested the Committee might choose to include or not include some of the language in their proposed revision in their final report as to why the Committee felt they could not fulfill the charge as written.

Mr. Smith asked if any committee has the right to come back and say they could not fulfill this charge as written. Ms. Everly stated that yes they can as long as they say why they could not fulfill the charge. Mr. Rosenwinkel restated that the EB could not remove the charge.

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Bacon moved and Mr. Rosenwinkel seconded, to acknowledge Council III Committee Reports and approve the rosters. There was no further discussion. Mr. Luker asked for a vote. The vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Guzzle and Ms. Callister from the LAC handed out goodie bags and provided information about the local area.

Lunch Break – Ivy Room

Standing Committee Reports

Constitution, Bylaws/Procedures – Lee Cornman

Ms. Cornman discussed charges from 2014 biennial Meeting. She discussed merging documents together. She has been looking at what other similar organizations have done such as the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments and Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference. She mentioned the charge to change language and it was changed from ad hoc committee to read council committee.

A member of the Constitution and Bylaws (C&B) Committee submitted questions (See Constitution and Bylaws/Procedures Committee report) to bring to the Board. Ms. Cornman asked if it was the will of the Board to discuss these questions now or later? Mr. Luker asked if the EB wanted to discuss now? Ms. Everly discussed the first item from the list - "discuss submitting the same Issue for Council consideration repeatedly at biennial meetings". She mentioned that it is difficult for the Issue reviewers when the same issue is submitted repeatedly. Issue reviewers would have to go back and look at previous submissions. She questioned whether limiting a person to submitting the same issue repeatedly may be limiting a person's rights. More importantly having to create guidance and going back to see if

in fact the issue was exactly the same would create a whole extra hurdle for the issue reviewers. If this request was approved, she felt it would put a heavier burden on the issue reviewers. Dr. Albrecht suggested the submitter be required to submit a copy of their previous submittals. Ms. Everly stated that if they do not do that it would begin the cycle of looking back through previous meetings for the issue and compare. Mr. Rosenwinkel stated that individuals should not be restricted. Dr. Garren asked if drop down boxes could be included to help. However, this would still be a challenge. Mr. Gordon agreed that limiting someone is not appropriate. He also asked if we are discussing each item separately or speaking in general. He addressed item two, prohibiting the creation of a committee as a recommended solution. Dr. Nummer asked if these questions were meant for the Committee itself or the EB. Ms. Cornman stated that the individual wanted this to be discussed to the Committee as a whole. Ms. Cornman said she was putting it before the EB for discussion. Ms. Everly stated there are not enough committees and due to subject matter the issue reviewers often have suggested that the subject is complex enough to justify it be studied through the committee process. Ms. Cornman brought up discussion of item three, the question of how to handle “no action” extractions. Ms. Bacon made the point that the ad hoc committee created to deal with extracted no action issues submitted to EB needs to be more balanced. Dr. McSwane, who was on the previous ad hoc committee felt his experience was that the balance was there. Mr. Rosenwinkel suggested adding council members to the ad hoc committee that are either for or against the issue involved depending on who extracted the issue. Mr. Eils does not agree with removing the term “option” from the language. Mr. Guzzle asked if there was any data on how many no actions by the councils were overridden by the Board. He does not feel this is a problem. Mr. Plunkett who is new to the CFP stated the last extracted issue brought to the Board was his and he did not feel the ad hoc committee was unbalanced. Mr. Guzzle brought up the fact that if this were not an overwhelming problem it would be unjust to the body of delegates who decides whether the no action by the council should be overturned. Mr. Rosenwinkel brought up that it was not the will of the council to change the current process. He also agreed with Ms. Bacon that perhaps the balance on the ad hoc committee should be adjusted. Someone stated they did not see the ad hoc committee as biased. Item 4 – discussion on imbalance of industry on Council I because vendors should not have the same voting rights as regulated industry and regulators. Ms. Everly felt it would not be appropriate to remove those individuals who are part of the CFP. Ms. Everly asked for a count of constituencies. At this time the constituencies are as follows:

Academia – 22, Consumer – 6, District/Tribal/Territory Regulator – 3, Federal Regulator – 42, Local Regulator – 57, State Regulator 107, Emeritus – 1, Retail Food – 93, Foods Service – 94, Vending/Distribution – 6, Food Industry Support 130, Student – 1.

Ms. Cornman reviewed the number of industry vs. regulator for Council I. The individual submitting this question does not want any support industry, but only be regulated industry as voting members. Mr. Smith suggested that only two of the four “other” industry be from a support constituency. Discussion in general is supportive of the status quo.

ACTION ITEM:

Dr. Garren moved and Mr. Finkenbinder seconded, to acknowledge the Constitution and Bylaws report.

ACTION ITEM:

A friendly amendment to the original motion made by Dr. Garren and seconded by Mr. Findenbinder was made by Dr. Nummer and seconded by Mr. Eils to acknowledge the report and go back to the Constitution and Bylaws committee with comments made at this EB meeting.

Issue Committee – Vicki Everly and Cassandra Mitchell

Ms. Mitchell reviewed the Committee report submitted and discussed the charges and timelines. She went over the changes to be implemented on the website upgrades and discussions with the Webmaster Mr. Kevin Hamstra. Activities to be completed include reviewing the recent statements for no actions. Also for the committee members will

be involved in assisting with beta testing. Additionally the new process will include updating the instructions for the program.

Mr. Levee asked if there were any questions. Mr. Nummer asked about the workload discussed and if there were any problems with accomplishing all the items in the report with respect to the upgraded system. Ms. Everly stated it would not be easily accomplished, but will be accomplished by the issue submittal deadlines. The improvements will not necessarily be seen by the submitters but will make the system work better. Ms. Everly stated a request not to throw away the old system until the new system is ready to go as a precaution. Any progress other than web related, will be brought to the August EB meeting. Mr. Gordon was concerned about the process of submitting and resubmitting issues and reports. He was commenting on problems such as punctuation etc. Ms. Everly went over how the timeline of review and clarification requests works i.e. troubleshooting. She stated the biggest challenge is when committees don't submit their work in December. She also stated that when the process is followed the system works well. She stated the biggest task coming up is for the committees to separate the content from supportive documents.

ACTION ITEM:

A motion was made by Dr. Garren and seconded by Mr. Eils to acknowledge the Issue Committee report. Discussion: Dr. McSwane asked if the Issue Chairs planned on having a conference call like the one done last time again with council chairs and this time with committee chairs as well. Ms. Everly responded in the affirmative. Mr. Luker asked if there were any further discussion and hearing none asked for a vote. The vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Program Committee – Dr. Julie Albrecht

Dr. Albrecht brought forward the discussion. She stated the Committee met and brainstormed ideas. She stated she went back and read what was previously done in past biennial meetings. She did list some potential ideas and wanted the EB to comment. She asked for suggestions. Ms. Cornman suggested genome sequencing. Innovations, was the overall theme brought up. The Committee has not gone forward yet on the layout of how the presentation would go for the workshop. Mr. Nummer made a statement that he wanted everyone to be aware of the target audience with respect to science and perhaps to concentrate more on how the science is applied in practical experiences. Dr. Albrecht and Dr. Nummer are also working on recruiting speakers. Ms. Fletcher stated that looking at the subjects, as a regulator she can see a few items she really felt would be excellent. Dr. Garren mentioned food borne outbreaks would be good topic. Ms. Fletcher brought up the question of CEU's. Dr. McSwane responded that there are no foreseeable problems for individuals that attend the training program to receive continuing education credit Dr. McSwane also mentioned application vs. theory on subject matter and relevancy to the audience is important. Dr. Albrecht brought up the subject of student discount. Mr. Guzzle mentioned the biennial meeting problem was recruiting students because it was close to finals. The question was asked about adequate meeting rooms. Dr. McSwane stated it was not an issue. Mr. Levee asked how we went from acknowledging the report to providing discounts for students. Laughter ensued. Ms. Everly stated we should be clear that we mean full-time students only qualify for the discount.

ACTION ITEM:

Dr. Nummer made a motion and was seconded by Mr. Finkenbinder, for a full-time student to be given a discount for the workshop only. Mr. Luker asked for any discussion and hearing none a vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEM:

A motion was made by Mr. Eils and seconded by Dr. Garren to acknowledge the Program Committee report. Mr. Luker asked if there was any discussion and hearing none he asked for a vote. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

The agenda items were taken out of order to allow for the presentation scheduled by Pragmatic on the Adobe Connect program.

Mr. Luker would entertain any comments before the demonstration begins. Dr. McSwane went over how to get on the proper URL for your device. He distributed a handout on the message about what can be done with Adobe Connect and what CFP would receive in return for the license fee etc. Dr. McSwane mentioned this platform was more economical to use than other programs such as WebPro. Other platforms were investigated but Adobe Connect seems to be the one that best meets the needs of CFP and its members.

Demonstration of Adobe Connect

Mr. Michael McCreddie of Pragmatic gave the presentation. He went over the different features of the system including polling functions during a meeting. The question was asked as to whether iPads (and similar tablets) can be used with Adobe Connect. The answer was yes. He stated a pod could be created to download and share documents. However, it failed to work during the demonstration. He went on to demonstrate a note pod that can be sent via email. This can be handled for the user. Dr. McSwane brought up the incident in which a participant who participated in a meeting conducted using Adobe Connect failed to hang up their telephone in order to disconnect from the call properly. He stated there are two ways to prevent this from happening, one is to contact your audio conference provider so that all calls are disconnected (hung lines) or at the end of call press ## and this will disconnect all calls on Pragmatic. They stated Ms. Quam can call them and they will remove the charges for the aforementioned call. Dr. McSwane asked about training class size. The response was as many as you want or one on one. He mentioned as a Pragmatic customer you have access to their helpdesk. Dr. Garren asked if a training session could be recorded and then shared. He stated yes. Initial training package includes 2 – 2 hour training sessions.

Mr. Luker asked if there are any questions or comments. Dr. McSwane went over the original motion.

The original motion was: Mr. Finkenbinder made and Mr. Eils seconded the motion to approve the purchase of Adobe Connect for one year at a cost of approximately \$1250.00 which would include the license fee, registration of branded custom URL, full training and ongoing support.

Dr. McSwane suggested bringing the original motion to the table. Dr. Garren discussed that expenditures such as this a face-to-face was needed.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Eils made a motion to take the original motion off the table and was seconded by Dr. Nummer.

Mr. Luker asked for discussion. Ms. Bacon asked if committee chairs could be included in training. Dr. McSwane suggested it be someone willing (volunteer) that is savvy on the system such as Ms. Quam. He added Ms. Hale would be a likely choice. He suggested all chairs are welcome and anyone interested. Any questions that are beyond the ability of staff or members would go to the Pragmatic staff. Ms. Quam brought up that only PDF, Powerpoint, Excel type documents, but not Word documents can be uploaded. It would have to be converted first. She mentioned Pragmatic does do a good job of training and helping. Mr. Nummer asked if other programs were used. Ms. Quam mentioned this is one of the programs that many government entities can use. Dr. McSwane mentioned one of the strengths of Adobe Connect was that it could be used on several platforms. Mr. Pippert was asked if there was money to pay for this and

Mr. Luker asked for a vote. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Finkenbinder made and Mr. Eils seconded the motion to approve the purchase of Adobe Connect for one year at a cost of approximately \$1250.00, which would include the license fee, registration of branded custom URL, full training and ongoing support.

Mr. Luker asked for a vote on the motion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luker brought forward the next item on the agenda.

Program Standards Committee – David Lawrence

Mr. Lawrence discussed the progress report. He went over Issue 5 and Issue 3 charges. There were monthly meetings to address the charges. One charge was to look at Standard 4 and 7 at the request of the FDA and to make recommendations. The Committee has a deadline to be completed by end of July. The charge addressing cost benefit may have to be extended to next biennial meeting. Issue 3 concerning competency of inspector are these charges are progressing well. There have been some withdrawals from the Committee; therefore there is a request to the EB to approve the amended roster.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Nummer made a motion and Ms. Steiner seconded, to acknowledge the Program Standards Committee report and changes to the roster. Discussion below. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion ensued as to an instructor being an academic. The Constitution and Bylaws defines an academic and it would not include someone who may be an instructor for IFPTI. Mr. Levee suggested we move on and vote on the report and the discussion of whether someone such as Mr. Read is considered an academic be left to the Committee to investigate. Ms. Quam stated individuals self select their constituency. Dr. McSwane mentioned if there were a question on the constituency chosen, the individual would be contacted. Mr. Nummer questioned as to whether we should approve the roster at this time. Ms. Everly mentioned we are technically acknowledging and not accepting the report.

Mr. Luker brought forward the next report.

Strategic Planning – James Mack

Mr. Mack discussed the report and acknowledged the meetings and work done to date. The Committee met five times. He asked to look at appendix IA and IB of the report. Discussion ensued about the survey. The SWOT team asked to add a few questions. There was some disagreement between the two groups. However, by the next board meeting the issue will be resolved between both groups. The charge today is to look at the navigator program IA revised version. Ms. Fletcher discussed the work done. She discussed her conversation with Ms. Nutt in regards as to who could be a navigator. A list would be created and be sent out. A method to identify first time attendees was discussed. She brought up the use of ribbons to identify attendees and navigators. She also discussed some of the items that were brought up earlier in this meeting. See IA revised.

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Bacon made a motion and Dr. Garren seconded, to acknowledge the Strategic Planning Committee report. Discussion. A comment was made on survey Number 11. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Levee mentioned that the new position description for the Program Standards Committee would be moved to new business.

Special Committee Reports:

2016 Local Arrangements Committee – Patrick Guzzle and Jodi Callister Mr. Guzzle deferred to Ms. Callister. She stated the next EB meeting in August would provide a written report. She mentioned that they are happy to be part of the 2016 biennial meeting in Boise. The committee has had a good response from industry and regulatory to make the conference successful. Sponsors are responding well already. She also provided information on transportation opportunities and will be working with participation from universities for assistance as scribes and runners.

Dr. McSwane has two concerns relating to the 2016 meeting. The first concern has to do with space. In Orlando a decision was made that the state and local would meet together. Ms. Whiting brought up that some discussion was had that several locals did not want to be part of the state meeting. He suggested he give Ms. Whiting a list in order to poll the locals and state as to whether they want to be separated out. Dr. McSwane suggested “sleeping on it” and getting back to him. Dr. McSwane stated it had to be done sooner rather than later (within 60 days.)

The second concern is what is needed for the regional meetings. He is concerned about how much space is needed in order for regions to meet if needed and how long they would need the room. Dr. McSwane is unclear as to how the regions function during the biennial meeting with respect to meeting which night, how often and what space is needed. Ms. Everly asked Dr. McSwane if he had an electronic version of the program book (agenda) from the 2014 book.

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Gaither moved to recess and Mr. Eils seconded. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

April 22, Wednesday 8:30AM

Dr. McSwane passed around the position description for the Program Standards Committee. Mr. Lawrence discussed the process he used to develop the position description. He read the bulleted items. Mr. Levee asked if there was a motion. Ms.

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Mitchell moved to discuss the Program Standards Committee position description and the motion was seconded by Mr. Finkenbinder.

Discussion: Mr. Gordon asked if under bullet number 4, the language in the C&B could be referenced for clarification purposes (Article XV Section 9.) Dr. McSwane asked if there are any problems getting industry representation on the Committee. Mr. Lawrence discussed the Issue 3 charges with respect to balance on the committee. Ms. Cornman asked if this position would report only to the EB and/or Council II. She was asking if perhaps this information should be captured in the position description. Ms. Everly clarified that this Committee reports to the ED rather than the Council Chair regarding issue review and processing of preliminary paperwork. The only thing Council II does is deal with the issues at Council deliberations. Mr. Luker asked Mr. Lawrence if he was ok with the requested changes. Mr. Lawrence he would make the necessary changes.

Mr. Levee asked if we needed a friendly amendment to the motion.

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Mitchell moved and Mr. Finkenbinder seconded, that we accept the Program Standards Position Description with the change to bullet Number 4 concerning the membership of the Committee. No further discussion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luker brought forward the **Financial Study Committee** – Donna Garren

Ms. Garren discussed the makeup and purpose of the ad hoc committee. The report was distributed during the meeting. She stated the Conference Chair and Vice Chair tasked her to study the issue of the financial health of the CFP. Recommendations were discussed such as Item 1, the formation of this ad hoc committee to a standing committee. Item 2, Critical analysis and evaluation of sources of income, which involved looking at the history of the CFP resources, Item 3, the cost of the membership and the possibility of increasing it. Item 4, going to a two year cycle rather than one and a review of all eight items listed in the report. Ms. Garren stated the Mr. Pippert was creating a sample of what a 2-year budget would look like. She mentioned the role of the LAC as far as rollover of funds. Sustaining sponsorships were discussed because many companies would find it easier to budget the funds on a yearly basis. Several board members reiterated the importance of this and the need to have such a committee. Dr. Garren stated the IAFP has sustaining memberships. Mr. Luker asked to table the discussion because Ms. Kramer was on the phone to discuss the Sponsorship Committee report. Discussion continued regarding how the CFP can increase revenue. Ms. Everly asked what would it mean to be a sustaining member. Dr. McSwane brought up the funding from NAACHO last biennial meeting benefited CFP because it was part of a grant for the program standards. This was an example of funding provided. He mentioned that it would be good to let NAACHO know. Ms. Mitchell stated that their agency used this money to attend meetings such as NEHA and CFP. Mr. Smith mentioned that FDA is getting better at getting funding to the Local Health Department's. Dr. McSwane asked Ms. Delea if there is a list of those that get funds from CDC for attending meetings such as CFP that he can get. She said she could provide him with this information. She mentioned that as long as you don't apply for the same thing for FDA and CDC monies the CFP could receive monies from the CDC as well. She also mentioned there are cooperative agreement grants that have been provided to regulators. Mr. Guzzle asked if it was possible to get some sort of an agenda in advance for regulators to prepare their request in a timely manner to attend the biennial meeting. Ms. Everly suggested a preliminary draft agenda on our website. We should include or fees etc.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Guzzle moved and Mr. Rosenwinkel seconded, to acknowledge the Finance Committee report and to have the ad hoc Finance Committee provide a proposal to describe function, structure and charges to create the Committee as a standing committee by the August EB meeting. Discussion: Ms. Quam asked if it should be a subcommittee? Ms. Everly stated that creating a standing committee with the members being EB members might address Ms. Quam's concerns. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Sponsorship Committee - Ms. Kramer

Ms. Kramer reviewed how much the sponsorship committee has raised in funds from the 2006 biennial meeting up until the last biennial meeting indicating in the last eight years has had an increase of over \$100,000. It was decided to keep the sponsorship levels the same for the upcoming biennial meeting because they felt that raising the levels might have a negative impact. She requested comments from the EB about this proposal. Mr. Luker asked if there were any question, however there were none. Mr. Eils asked if Ms. Kramer could work on what a sustaining membership would entail and submit a proposal to the EB. Mr. Luker asked could they have something prepared for the August EB meeting. Ms. Kramer said yes. Would there be added benefit to the industry, increasing donations?

Dr. Nummer asked what would the companies get for their money? It was asked about what could they sponsor for example pay for Pragmatic? Dr. Garren mentioned this would take more time i.e. selling. Dr. McSwane discussed that it is great to discuss how to increase revenue for the CFP but we must maintain neutrality. Mr. Luker asked Ms. Kramer is she had any questions.

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Bacon made a motion and Mr. Eils seconded, that the Sponsorship Committee report be acknowledged and that maintaining the current sponsorship levels be accepted.

Discussion ensued about sustaining sponsorship monies on a yearly level rather than every two years. Mr. Luker asked Ms. Kramer to look at methods for a sustaining membership. Discussion as to what it would mean to go to a sustaining membership with respect to monies collected. Would it increase the overall donations? A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Food Protection Manager Certification – Jeff Hawley/ Christine Hollenbeck

Mr. Hawley discussed the Committee's progress. First, he discussed the continuing work on the Standards, mostly minor changes. The second charge regarding security issues was addressed by working with ANSI, Dr. Ford, on security data. Dr. Ford worked with a baseline and discussed additional tools to improve security. Dr. Ford compared the data. He found a decrease in cheating among administrators. Mailing problems went down, but may not go down much more. Mr. Hawley stated there was an increase in issues with quality control, but this could be due to detection methods increasing as well (see report.) All providers currently have QA methods installed. ANSI is satisfied with the changes. The bottom line is that the measures taken have shown the system is working. The Committee is still looking at ISO 17024 and the work is still ongoing. A couple of changes in roster have already been approved by the EB.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Rosenwinkel moved and Ms. Mitchell seconded to acknowledge the report. There was no discussion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEM:

A motion was made by Dr. Garren and seconded by Mr. Finkenbinder to acknowledge the report. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Audit – Angela Nardone

Angela discussed the audit report for 2014 calendar year. One of the things that became a byproduct of report was to put in protocols to create structure for the Committee and to assure no loss of records. Also, reviewing 2013 that has outstanding records. Recommendations are to improve the process. One of recommendations to include full financial statements for yearly review and adding full financial statements along with the quarterly review, at the end of the year. Eric requested guidance on full financial report.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Luker entertained a motion to acknowledge the report. Ms. Mitchell moved and Ms. Fletcher seconded the motion to acknowledge the Audit Committee report. No discussion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Break for tour and lunch

Tour of 2016 biennial meeting facilities, hotels and downtown Boise Conducted by Lisa Edens (Boise Convention and Visitors Bureau) – 10:00 a.m. – noon

ANSI/CFP Certification Committee (ACAC) – Lee Cornman

Ms. Cornman mentioned that this is her last term and Mr. Roger Hancock will be replacing her. There was a meeting held last fall. ANSI continued accreditations for three of the providers. Prometric is in the process of finalizing their continued accreditation. There were some issues with remote online proctoring. It is the way the standards are written. The standard prohibits this; therefore this issue needs to be considered further.

ACTION ITEM:

Mr. Eils moved and Mr. Finkenbinder seconded to acknowledge the ACAC report. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Federal Agency Reports

FDA – Kevin Smith Mr. Smith provided a PowerPoint presentation of the FDA report that is attached to this report. Kevin announced that he will soon be moving into a Senior Advisor position within CFSAN and that a search for his replacement as Director of the Retail Food Protection Staff is underway. He shared that ORA is undergoing realignment and that the current proposal is to shift most Regional Staff, including the retail food specialists to a headquarters component while retaining their geographic locations. Realignment is targeted for FY2017. The Supplement to the Food Code will be coming out next month. Program Standards as of fiscal year - 638 enrolled.

USDA – William Shaw, Jr. Mr. Shaw provided a Powerpoint presentation of the USDA report, which is attached to this report. He discussed what is of interest to the retail arena. Guidance is not required to go through a comment period, but once posted, it is available for use. Close to posting final rules at this time. By law intact beef intended to be used intact is not considered adulterated with STEC see slide 13. It will be important to manufacturer and end consumer to be aware that intended use is part of the equation with respect to what is considered adulterated.

CDC – Kristin Delea – Ms. Delea will provide bullet points and attachments with this report. Center of excellence has been completed and implemented. Ms. Delea said she will be leaving the EB and will be replaced by Mr. Vince Radke.

New Business

Do Rightly App for managing crisis in retail food establishments – Dr. McSwane discussed the application created named Do Rightly. This application addresses crisis management on food safety issues in restaurants, however they are planning to include other retail constituencies. Ms. Quam brought up the issue of a “for profit” using our information. Dr. Garren questioned whether there are any legal concerns. Limit our liability. Ms. Everly suggested Dr. Garren look at language with respect to legal issues on all documents available to interested parties, and the copyright statement on our website.

ACTION ITEM:

Dr. Nummer made a motion seconded by Mr. Rosenwinkel, not act on the Do Rightly Application until Dr. Garren’s Committee looks at it, but to respond to this company and direct the Executive Director to provide a written response. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Response language to Do Rightly*

ACTION ITEM:

Ms. Bacon made a motion and Dr. Garren seconded to adjourn. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Fall 2015 Executive Board Meeting – August 11-12, 2015 in Park City, Utah

Meeting adjourned. April 22, 2015

* At its recent meeting in Boise, Idaho the Executive Board of the Conference for Food Protection (CFP) discussed a proposal from DoRightly, LLC for a mobile application for managing crises in restaurants. In the proposal, DoRightly indicated that it was planning to use the CFP's *Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments* guidance document as a source of information for the mobile application. Specifically, the company was interested in learning: 1) if there were objections to identifying CFP as a key source of information; 2) if the Board could provide feedback to the company on the merits of the project; and 3) if the company could solicit participation from CFP members to review the application for accuracy and consistency. The responses to these items appear below.

It was the consensus of the Board that the *Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments* document posted on the CFP website is available for use by any interested party who wants to promote retail food safety. Therefore, the Board agreed that DoRightly, LLC could identify the Conference for Food Protection and the *Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments* document as a source of information used by the company in developing the application. However, it is the Conference for Food Protection's policy not to endorse a brand name, a commercial proprietary process, products or services. Therefore, the CFP requires that DoRightly, LLC not mention the Conference for Food Protection or use its logo in any of its promotional and marketing materials. In addition, the Conference for Food Protection does not assume any liability for the content, design and operation of the mobile application.

The Board found it difficult to give constructive feedback on the merit of the project given the limited amount of information provided in the proposal. While in principle the application has merit, the viability of the product can only be determined by testing it in the field under real world conditions.

The Conference for Food Protection doesn't share its membership list with individuals and organizations outside of the Conference. Therefore, CFP would not be able to assist DoRightly, LLC with soliciting volunteers to review the application for accuracy and consistence. Once again, the Conference for Food Protection doesn't assume any responsibility or liability for the content, design and operation of the mobile application.