

Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered *DRAFT* until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting

COMMITTEE NAME: Employee Food Safety Training Committee

COUNCIL or EXECUTIVE BOARD ASSIGNMENT: Council II

DATE OF REPORT: January 15, 2016

SUBMITTED BY: Ben Chapman and Chuck Catlin

COMMITTEE CHARGE(s): Created by Council II at the 2014 biannual meeting, in response to issue 011, the Employee Food Safety Training Committee was given the following charges:

1. Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to :
 - a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
 - b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.
2. Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Progress on Overall Committee Activities:
 - a. December 2014 kick off for charges and initial discussions
 - b. March 18, 2015, Face-to-face meeting Chicago

We divided our members into three subcommittees so that each could dig deeply into the subject matter to review and compile information to help make decisions on what to include in our final committee recommendations.

Subcommittee 1 - Industry non-regulatory delivery of food handler training

Subcommittee 1 focused on the main sources of information from existing programs that the retail and food service industry have implemented. Pertinent questions to answer included:

- What is common between the programs (content, practices, approach)?
- What is unique about any of the programs?
- Are there particular emphases?
- Delivery modes?
- Evaluation?

Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered **DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting**

Subcommittee 2 - Review current state requirements and local (e.g., CA, IL, FL)

Subcommittee 2 focused on the main sources of information will be gleaned from states that currently require some sort of food handler training. Pertinent questions to answer included:

- What is common between the programs (content, practices, approach)?
- What is unique about any of the programs?
- Are there particular emphases?
- Lessons learned from the process (where did the programs/requirements start, where did they end up what were the sticky points)?
- Delivery modes?

Subcommittee 3 - FDA Risk Factor related employee activities and research

Subcommittee 3 focused on reviewing and analyzing existing sources of data. These included:

- FDA Retail Risk Factor Study results.
(<http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/FoodborneIllnessRiskFactorReduction/ucm230313.htm>)
 - Information gleaned from the 2013 Food Code that relates to food handlers.
 - Peer reviewed literature and other pertinent research on food handler practices and behaviors.
- c. Sub committees met three times via call and one time as a whole group in person (minutes available in attachments).
- June 17, 2015 Phone
 - July 27, 2015, in Portland concurrent with IAFFP (in person)
 - August 12, 2015 Phone
 - October 2, 2015 Phone
- d. Also produced was a comparison of risk factor compliance issues taken from FDA's Risk Factor Studies. This information was used to ensure the risk-based nature of the committee's decision making, as well as provide a framework for charge #2 (A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives) to be carried out in future years. The document is entitled, **FDA Risk Factor Study 1998, 2003 and 2008 comparison**. In addition, the subcommittee compiled a list of relevant literature related to evaluating food employee training materials, entitled, **Literature on evaluating food employee training programs** (attached)
- e. Through reviewing the outputs from each of the subcommittees, in mid-October 2015, a draft of a compiled list of what a food employee should know about food safety was distributed to the entire committee for review, (attached, entitled, **CFP Food Employee Training Committee Training Component Draft**)
- f. On November 6, 2015, a call was held to discuss the compiled matrix. Quorum was not met so a vote was conducted via email. Attached final document, entitled, **Employee Food Safety Training Topics** detailing consensus-reached topics (two 'no' votes). This

Conference for Food Protection - Committee FINAL Report

Template approved: 08/14/2013

Committee Final Reports are considered *DRAFT until deliberated and acknowledged by the assigned Council at the Biennial Meeting*

document is a first-step tool for the committee to use to complete the charge provided by the Council. It is not meant to be adopted for any official action but provides a framework going forward if the Council wishes the committee to complete the charges.

2. Recommendations for consideration by Council:
 - a. **Future of the committee: Re-create the Committee through 2018**

CFP ISSUES TO BE SUBMITTED BY COMMITTEE:

1. Acknowledge the committee report, thank the committee members, and re-create the committee for the 2016-2018 biennium with the following charges:
 - a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
 - b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.Report Committee recommendations to the 2018 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROSTER (attached):

Last Name	First Name	Position (Chair/Member)	Constituency	Employer	City	State	Telephone	Email
Atkins	Hugh	member	State Regulator	TN Department of Health	Nashville	TN	(615) 741-8535	hugh.atkins@tn.gov
Bhatt	Chirag	member	Food Service Industry	Bloomin Brands, Inc	Tampa	FL	(813) 892-8641	ChiragBhatt@BloominBrands.com
Catlin	Chuck	Co-chair	Support	Food Safety RX	Mountain View	CA	(602) 769-1418	catlin@google.com
Chapman	Ben	Co-chair	Academia	North Carolina State University	Raleigh	NC	(919) 809-3205	benjamin_chapman@ncsu.edu
Eisenbeiser	Ashley	member	Retail Food Industry	Food Marketing Institute	Arlington	VA	(202) 220-0689	aeisenbeiser@fmi.org
Feazell	Susan	member	Food Industry Support	National Registry of Food Safety Professionals	Orlando	FL	(800) 446-0257	sfeazell@nrfsp.com
Graham	Joe	member	State Regulator	WA State Department of Health				joe.graham@DOH.WA.GOV
Green	Elizabeth	member	Local Regulator	Mid-Ohio Valley Health Department	Parkersburg	VA	(304) 420-1471	elizabeth.s.green@wv.gov
Grooters	Susan	member	Consumer	KAW Coalition	Washington	DC	(802) 223-6303	susangrooters@gmail.com
Jensen	Joyce	member	Local Regulator	Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department	Lincoln	NE	(402) 441-8033	jjensen@lincoln.ne.gov
King	Hal	Member	Food Service Industry	Chick-fil-A Inc.	Atlanta	GA	(404) 765-2508	hal.king@chick-fil-a.com
Lang	Jeffrey	member	Local Regulator	Lane County Environmental Health	Eugene	OR	(541) 682-3636	jeffrey.lang@co.lane.or.us
Lee	Aimee	member	Retail Food Industry	Publix Super Markets, Inc.	Charlotte	NC	704-424-5017	aimee.lee@publix.com
Luebkekmann	Geoff	member	Food Service Industry	Florida Restaurant and Lodging Assocation	Tallahassee	FL	(850) 224-2250	gluebkekmann@frla.org

Mull	Monique	member	Local Regulator	Mesa County Health Department	Grand Junction	CO	(970) 248-6962	monique.mull@mesacounty.us
Nelson	Laura	member	Food Industry Support	Alchemy Systems	Austin	TX	(512) 637-5100	laura.nelson@alchemysystems.com
Rosenwinkel	Ken	member	Retail Food Industry	Jewel-Osco	Itasca	IL	(630) 948-6787	ken.rosenwinkel@jewelosco.com
Tabata	Christina	member	Food Service Industry	Taco Bell (Yum!)	Irvine	CA	(949) 863-4327	christina.gallegos@tacobell.com
Taylor	Alan	member	State Regulator	Maryland Stae Department of Health	Balitmore	MD	(410) 767-8447	alan.taylor@maryland.gov
Weichert	William	member	Food Service Industry	National Restaurant Association	Chicago	IL	(312) 715-5388	wweichelt@restaurant.org
Coleman	Eric	CDC Advisor (non-voting member)	Advisory	CDC			(404) 488-3438	EColeman@cdc.gov
Hughes	Stephen	FDA member consultant	Advisory	FDA	College Park	MD	(240) 402-2833	stephen.hughes@fda.hhs.gov
Tart	Alan	Alternate	Advisory	FDA	Atlanta	GA	(404) 253-1267	alan.tart@fda.hhs.gov
Non-Voting Members:								
Buchanon	Janice	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	The Steritech Group	Charlotte	NC	(704) 971-6565	janice.buchanon@steritech.com
Buswell	Cheri	non- voting member	Food Service Industry	International Dairy Queen	Minneapolis	MN	(952) 830-0224	cheri.buswell@idq.com
Chong	Korey	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	Premier Food Safety	Fullerton	CA	(714) 451-0075	korey@premierfoodsafety.com

Costa	Cynthia	non- voting member	State Regulator	CT Department of Public Health	Hartford	CT	(860) 509-7297	cynthia.costa@ct.gov
Deslauriers	Susan	non- voting member	Retail Food Industry	Big Y Foods	Springfield	MA	(413) 504-4452	deslauris@bigy.com
Eckhardt	Christina	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	Aramark	Philadelphia	PA	(267) 939-4894	eckhardt-christina@aramark.com
Eisenbeiser	Ashley	non- voting member	Retail Food Industry	Food Marketing Institute	Arlington	VA	(202) 220-0689	aeisenbeiser@fmi.org
Eisenberg	Miriam	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	Ecosure, A Division of Ecolab	Lincolnshire	IL	(847) 597-9848	miriam.eisenberg@ecolab.com
Espinoza	Albert	non- voting member	Retail Food Industry	HEB	San Antonio	TX	(210) 884-5783	espinoza.albert@heb.com
Follett	Emilee	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	StateFoodSafety.com	Orem	UT	(801) 805-4679	efollett@statefoodsafety.com
Kim	James	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	Premier Food Safety	Fullerton	CA	(714) 451-0075	james@premierfoodsafety.com
Lewis	Christie H.	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	StateFoodSafety.com	Orem	UT	(801) 805-1872	chl@statefoodsafety.com
Maeson	Jordon	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	Safer Dining LLC	St. Petersburg	FL	(727) 422-7392	Jordon@SaferDining.com
McMahan	Thomas	non- voting member	Food Retail/Industry	Meijer	Grandville	MI	(616) 249-6035	thomas.mcmahan@meijer.com
Nakamura	George	non- voting member	Food Industry Support	StateFoodSafety.com	Orem	UT	(801) 494-1879	gmlnaka@comcast.net
Turner	Brian	non- voting member	Food Service Industry	Sodexo	Downers Grove	IL	(847) 682-5672	brian.turner@sodexo.com
Tyjewski	Susan	non- voting member	Food Service Industry	CKE Restaurants Holdings, Inc.	Anaheim	CA	(714) 254-4552	styjewski@ckr.com

Literature on evaluating food handler training programs:

Studies of training programs

- ServSafe programs
 - York et al., 2009: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19699837>
 - **Abstract:** The number of foodborne illnesses traced to improper food handling in restaurants indicates a need for research to improve food safety in these establishments. Therefore, this 2-year longitudinal study investigated the effectiveness of traditional ServSafe (National Restaurant Association Educational Foundation, Chicago, IL) food-safety training and a Theory of Planned Behavior intervention program targeting employees' perceived barriers and attitudes toward important food-safety behaviors. The effectiveness of the training and intervention was measured by knowledge scores and observed behavioral compliance rates related to food-safety practices. Employees were observed for handwashing, thermometer usage, and proper handling of work surfaces at baseline, after receiving ServSafe training, and again after exposure to the intervention targeting barriers and negative attitudes about food-safety practices. Repeated-measures analyses of variance indicated training improved handwashing knowledge, but the intervention was necessary to improve overall behavioral compliance and handwashing compliance. Results suggest that registered dietitians; dietetic technicians, registered; and foodservice managers should implement a combination of training and intervention to improve knowledge and compliance with food-safety behaviors, rather than relying on training alone. Challenges encountered while conducting this research are discussed, and recommendations are provided for researchers interested in conducting this type of research in the future.
 - Roberts et al., 2008: <https://krex.k-state.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2097/806/RobertsFPTApr2008.pdf;jsessionid=EBCE1BAFFD47F3A77D6DE777F3D36203?sequence=1>
 - **Abstract:** Statistics show that 59% of foodborne illnesses are traced to restaurant operations. Food safety training has been identified as a way to assure public health, yet evidence supporting the effectiveness of training has been inconclusive. A systematic random sample of 31 restaurants in three midwestern states was selected to assess the effect of training on food safety knowledge and behavior. A total of 402 employees (242 pretraining and 160 post-training)

participated in this study. Pre and post-training assessments were conducted on knowledge and behavior related to three key food safety practices: cross contamination, poor personal hygiene, and time/temperature abuse. Overall knowledge ($P \geq .05$) and compliance with standards of behavior ($P \geq .001$) improved significantly between pre- and post-training. When each practice was examined independently, only handwashing knowledge ($P \geq .001$) and behavior ($P \geq .001$) significantly improved. Results indicated that training can improve knowledge and behaviors, but knowledge alone does not always improve behaviors.

- Non-ServSafe or multi-program studies
 - Ehiri, Morris, and McEwen, 1997:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956713597000054>
 - Abstract: This paper reports the findings of a study which investigated the effectiveness of a food hygiene training course in Scotland, and discusses the implications these may have for food safety control in the UK and elsewhere. One hundred and eighty-eight individuals who undertook the elementary food hygiene training course of the Royal Environmental Health Institute of Scotland (REHIS), and a comparison group comprising two hundred and four employees of a City Council were surveyed by means of a structured self-completion questionnaire. Food hygiene knowledge, attitudes and opinions of the course participants were assessed before and after training, and compared with those of the comparison group. The training course evaluated by the study is typical of many certificated training courses applied in the food industry. After training, no significant improvements were observed in course participants' pre-course knowledge of a number of crucial aspects of food safety, including food storage, cross contamination, temperature control, and high risk foods. The findings highlight problems likely to arise from reliance on training designs which primarily emphasise the provision of information that seldom translates into positive attitudes and behaviours. This suggests a need for the adoption of approaches which take account of social and environmental influences on food safety, thus, ensuring that food hygiene training is seen, not as an isolated domain which sole purpose is to produce certificated personnel, but as part of an overall infrastructure for effective food safety control.
- Online programs
 - Croker and Liu, 2006 (dissertation):
<http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1168405>

- Abstract: The purpose of the study was to identify preferences among foodservice employees for traditional classroom or computer-based training (CBT) based upon age, gender, and educational level; examine how employee preferences toward traditional classroom training or CBT differ in two franchise restaurant types, fast food restaurants and full service restaurants; explore learning preferences among foodservice employees toward using traditional classroom training or CBT; and analyze the possible relationships between age, gender, educational level, type of restaurant, and learning style in the attitudes toward CBT among foodservice employees in Southeastern Idaho. A self-reporting inventory was designed to collect data. Results of this study showed that older employees were less comfortable with CBT than younger employees, females were less comfortable with CBT than males, and employees in full service restaurants were also less comfortable than those in fast food restaurants. Employees with a diverger learning style more often preferred traditional classroom training than CBT. As to the attitudes among foodservice employees toward CBT, the results revealed that female and older employees, employees with lower education levels, employees in full service restaurants and employees with a diverger or an assimilator learning style had more negative attitudes toward CBT in terms of format, presentation, confidence, learning motivation, and usefulness of CBT. These findings might contribute to a better understanding of employee preferences for different training methods, employee attitudes toward CBT and examine CBT usage and programs.
- Hislop and Keara, 2009 (food safety knowledge retention):
<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/iafp/jfp/2009/00000072/00000002/art00030>
 - Abstract: Foodborne illness in Canada is an ongoing burden for public health and the economy. Many foodborne illnesses result from improper food handling practices. If food handlers had a greater knowledge of what causes foodborne illness, perhaps these illnesses would have less of an impact on society. This study gave researchers the opportunity to examine the current food safety knowledge of food handlers by using a standardized questionnaire. Questionnaires were distributed by environmental health officers to food handlers working in the food service industry during on-site inspections, and responses were used to evaluate immediate knowledge of key food safety issues. Both certified and noncertified food handlers were evaluated. Information also was collected on the number of years since food safety

certification was achieved and the number of years experience noncertified food handlers had in the food service industry. Results indicated that certified food handlers had a greater knowledge of food safety information than did noncertified food handlers. The highest failure rates were observed among noncertified food handlers with more than 10 years of experience and less than 1 year of experience. The results support the need for mandatory food safety certification for workers in the food service industry and for recertification at least every 10 years. Although the study was not sufficiently rigorous to evaluate existing food safety courses, data collected provided valuable insight into what issues should be emphasized in existing food safety courses and which should be targeted by future food safety initiatives.

- Worsfold, Griffith, and Worsfold, 2004 (Enviro Health officer's views on food hygiene training effectiveness):
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/00070700410515208>
 - Abstract: In both their enforcement and training role environmental health officers (EHOs) may influence businesses' attitudes to hygiene training. A survey was conducted to examine EHOs' experience and perceptions of the provision and effectiveness of food hygiene training in small food businesses. The results indicate that officers had concerns about the content and the delivery of hygiene courses and about the quality of other hygiene trainers. Officers use the industry guides to advise on training but receive limited guidance on the assessment of hygiene training in the workplace. The checking of training records was considered to be less important than the use of observation and questioning for assessing hygiene training effectiveness. Environmental factors, such as supervisor support and situational aids were judged by officers to be important factors in the implementation of workplace hygiene training. They reported low levels of formal refresher training and active support of training by management.
 - See Methods section for survey details
- **Medeiros et al. 2011 (Food Control, Volume 22, Issue 8, August 2011, Pages 1136–1144) Assessment of the methodological strategies adopted by food safety training programmes for food service workers: A systematic review**
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956713511000569>
- Abstract: This is a systematic review conducted to identify and assess the methodological strategies used in training programmes designed to enhance food safety in food services. Fourteen original articles

were selected from the Scopus, Scielo and Medline digital databases. The topics most dealt with in the educational programmes were personal hygiene, food safety and best practices. The resources most widely used during the training courses were interactive media, audiovisual materials, videos, lectures and recreational activities. In addition to being low cost, hand washing activities yield positive results in food safety. Employee training assessment is carried out by using questionnaires, analytical monitoring, a check list and the Likert scale. Hand washing is the most assessed item. The activities most widely accepted by the employees during training courses are interactive media and hands-on activities. These activities contribute toward the enhancement of employees' skills and knowledge, and encourage changes in attitude and behaviour.

Studies on evaluation

- Ko, 2010:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956713509002199>
 - Abstract: This study investigates food safety perceptions and agricultural food handling practices, as well as satisfaction with the work performance of such handlers. Data are collected from 333 food handlers at agricultural food processing companies or restaurants. Data is analyzed by SPSS, with statistical analyses including descriptive statistics, *t* tests and regression analyses. **Dimensions pertaining to food safety perception and practices include personal sanitation, pre-handling food preparation, food preparation and after food preparation.** The scales of food safety perception during analysis are higher than what are typically found in practice, and some gaps are identified. Analysis results indicate that food preparation and after food preparation dimensions have significantly higher mean values than those associated with pre-food handling and personal sanitation. Regression analysis further demonstrates that satisfaction with work performance can accurately predict food safety perception and practice components. Moreover, their handling practices mediate how perception affects satisfaction with work performance of food handlers.
- Medeiros et al., 2001:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1499404606600675>
 - Abstract: Traditionally, nutrition educators have used a fairly global approach to teach food safety by teaching a broad range of safe food handling behaviors in the expectation that this will lead to the avoidance of foodborne illness. This approach can be confusing and lead to evaluation data that are difficult to interpret. This article suggests that food safety education and evaluation in the future be organized around five behavioral constructs: practice personal

hygiene, cook foods adequately, avoid cross-contamination, keep foods at safe temperatures, and avoid food from unsafe sources. These five constructs are derived from data on actual outbreaks and estimated incidences of foodborne illness. **Research is needed to establish reliable and valid evaluation measures for these five behavioral constructs. Evaluation instruments can be tailored to fit specific education programs. If evaluation instruments focus on these five behavior areas, the result will be meaningful evaluation data that can be more easily summarized across food safety education programs for consumers.**

- Deniston, Rosenstock, and Getting, 1968:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1891042/>
 - Old study on evaluating the effectiveness of public health programs

FDA Risk Factor Study 1998, 2003 and 2008 comparison

% Out of Compliance

Risk Factors	1. Food from Unsafe Sources	2. Inadequate Cooking	3. Improper Holding Time/Temper-ature	4. Contaminated Equipment/Protection from Contamination	5. Poor Personal Hygiene	6. Other (Chemical Contamination)	Notes
Hospitals	4.7	2.3	36.2	17.6	17.1	14.6	
Nursing Homes	2.1	9.6	29.2	16.8	16.0	12.5	
Elementary Schools	3.7	11.8	27.5	14.7	14.9	13.4	
Fast Food	2.4	7.4	38.2	17.4	24.2	31.4	
Full Service	12.0	15.4	54.7	35.0	40.9	25.2	
Delis	4.3	9.4	50.8	18.8	20.5	28.4	
Meat & Poultry	2.3	-#	19.9	17.0	6.8	14.1	#low observations
Seafood	11.4	-#	32.5	13.6	8.9	9.6	#low observations
Produce	1.5	-#	34.7	16.1	15.1	10.2	

The highest percentage out of compliance for all 9 types of facilities that were visited was Improper Holding Time/Temperature.

Study also found all 9 types of facilities did not have adequate written employee health policies. All had greater than 50% out of compliance.

1998, 2003 and 2008

Data Items in Need of Priority Attention for Each Risk Factor

Risk Factor	Data Items
Food from Unsafe Sources	Shellstock tags retained for 90 days;
Inadequate Cooking	Rapid reheating; poultry, stuffed fish, meat, pasta cooked;
Improper Holding Time/Temperature	cooling; cold-holding; hot holding; date-marking; discarding of foods; time alone used as a public health control;
Contaminated Equipment/Protection from Contamination	Surface/utensils cleaned/sanitized; separation of raw/RTE foods; protection from contamination; raw animal foods separated
Poor Personal Hygiene	Proper, adequate handwashing; handsink convenient/accessible; good hygienic practices; prevention of contamination of hands; handsink, cleanser/drying device;
Other (Chemical Contamination)	Poisonous or toxic materials properly identified, stored and used

FDA Risk Factor Study

1998, 2003 and 2008

Recommendations

For Whom	Task	Including
Industry Managers	Develop and Implement SOPs	Detail monitoring & corrective action for time/temperature control; training should be covered in employee orientation and in refreshers
Industry Managers	Provide necessary resources, equipment, and supplies	Thermocouples, temperature logs, hand soap & towels, chemical sanitizers, test kit
Industry Managers	Verify employees are following monitoring procedures	Daily oversight; provide employees with necessary knowledge & skills
Industry Managers	Identify methods to routinely assess effectiveness of SOPs	Could be based on internal review; regulatory inspections, or third party evaluation; risk factor violations noted during inspections should motivate managers to respond with active managerial control
Industry Managers	Overall – active managerial control over the risk factors	High out of compliance percentages of data items related to handwashing, bare-hand contact with ready to eat foods, time/temperature control, and contaminated equipment indicate needed improvement in those areas
Regulatory Programs	Conduct quality, risk-based inspections	Spend more time observation employee practices – handwashing, food handling, cooling of foods, and clean-up procedures; provide inspection tools; consider alternate working schedules to allow inspections at different times – observe cooling when it is occurring
Regulatory Programs	Providing onsite education and achieving voluntary compliance	Make use of existing training programs; establish open dialogue; obtain immediate corrective action; assist operators with SOPs and risk control plans; develop intervention strategies
Regulatory Programs	Implementing consistent and effective enforcement protocol	Develop procedures and strategies; look for active managerial control over risk factors; ensure credibility by applying enforcement actions uniformly
Regulatory Programs	Continuous program improvement	Self-assessment outlined in Program Standards

“...it is important to note that the risk factors and data items in need of priority attention remain the same as in previous data collection periods for each of the facility types. This is an indication that more action is needed by the industry and regulatory bodies.” FDA Risk Factor Study, page 150

Employee Food Safety Training Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2014

Time: 3:00 p.m. (EST)

Facilitator: Hal King

Introduced himself as Chair and Ben as Vice Chair. . . Ben is not on the call due to illness.

1. Thanked everyone for agreeing to be a participant on the committee and explained that there is a lot of work to do
2. 19 voting members, Linda Catalan will not participate due to change in job duties
3. 18 participants on the call. Hal allowed the pragmatic system to announce callers.
4. Hal read the Antitrust Statement (conference for Food Protection, Inc.). Wants to be clear that everyone has a copy and understands.
5. Read the Committee Charge
 1. Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to:
 - a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
 - b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.
 2. Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.
6. Ken Rosenwinkel – thanked Hal for being committee chair. Committee has one year as opposed to two years to complete the charge.
 - Hal stated that he wants to make sure that every voice is heard, and solicits everyone's input

7. The process of gathering information will allow to “close the gaps” in standards of food safety.
 - Christina. . .likes how process is layed out. Question: What can we gain from the training??
 - William. . .not a regulated thing from gov’t perspective. It is a requirement for food safety training.
 - Chirag. . .understands that the focus is retail food protection and not the manufacturing side.
8. We are only talking about “line” employees. Don’t want miss what we can learn from other sectors. The goal is to make sure that the food handler is ready.
9. Alan – Does anyone have a job that is based on Job Task Analysis (JTA)? Wants to prevent any assumptions as to what a food worker should know. The committee should decide what a food handler should really know. He and Hal have been through the JTA process. It would be great to stay as close to the JTA process as possible.
10. Take a look across the board at processes in different states (William). Agreed to be a part of this process and get ASTM standard information. Want to compare the states that are represented, just to see if there is a gap in what states are using.
11. Next call can be based on reports of gaps by members. Will collect info via email prior to call.
12. Steven (FDA) made suggestion to first figure out where programs are. Then look at them as a committee to agree on the actual gaps.
13. Aimee volunteered to get info on the grocery/retail side. Ben will search on the academic side.
14. Janice suggested to start at the state level.
15. Jeff Lang willing to serve with Ben on the academic sector.
16. Regardless of industry, there should not be that big of a difference.

17. A little confusion as to what the motive or goal is. As a baseline, it was suggested to start with the ASTM standard.
18. Hal thanked everyone for the comments and suggestions. The next call should take place at the end of January. Send emails or templates to Hal to assist. The goal is to make more progress.
19. Scheduling of future calls – suggested to preset calls. Select dates that will work for Hal and Ben. Then to send committee to vote on those dates. FDA can't use doodle. Meeting Wizard works best for FDA. Suggested to have calls more frequently.
20. Call ended at 4:25 p.m.

**CFP Food Service Employee Training Committee Meeting
Chicago, IL - March 18, 2015
Minutes of the Meeting**

Attendance (see below)

1. Introductions

The members introduced themselves and their interest in this committee.

2. An industry and regulatory perspective on the process (Chuck Catlin)

Co-Chair Chuck Catlin presented an overview of perspectives for the Committee to consider as it frames its work. It was noted that the typical food employee sees their activity as “low risk,” a dangerous perspective. Catlin also reminded the members that consensus is important, and asked them to leave personal and business biases aside, and deliberate with open-mindedness.

3. Framing behavior-based training (Ben Chapman)

Co-Chair Ben Chapman suggested that the Committee could work on “knowledge based” guidance, but miss the opportunity to focus on changing behavior. Looking at the food safety requirements and risk factors viewed through the “why” of best practices, in a “behavior based” frame might yield greater impact. Identifying desirable behaviors and advancing their adoption and implementation is the opportunity. Chapman went on to present some academic background information for the members’ consideration, including:

- A good analogy for our work is to consider employees that clean hospital rooms: its known that they care, and understand that their interventions (sanitizing to control infection) matters.

- For our purposes, how do we ensure that food employees care? Teaching and showing them that people get sick when they fail to adhere to standards, and that is largely preventable by food employees. Training must show them how to do this, and getting them talking to each other about this is essential to its successful adoption.
- Methods that matter:
 1. Using stories more than numbers
 2. Putting the info into relatable context for the employee
 3. Generating surprise
 4. Generating ongoing dialog

4. Review of the committee charge, clarification of scope

Charge 1

Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to:

- a. What a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
- b. A guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.

Charge 2

Report Committee recommendations to the 2016 CFP Biennial Meeting.

Chapman asked Council II member Brian Turner to perspective on this Committee's genesis, and about what audience we should focus on. Turner explained that discussion about forming this Committee centered on the need for consistent criteria for "frontline" training, and how to provide value (impact) to that training.

Discussion ensued regarding the jobs/people this Committee should focus on impacting, and it was suggested that while position-specific information might be useful, starting with the Food Code definition of "food employee" is a better, more general, and broader reaching start. Consensus of the Committee is to use the Food Code definition of "food employee." Discussion ensued regarding the study and creation of JTAs, and consensus reached that this would not be undertaken by the Committee.

Chapman then asked the Committee to consider clarifying its understanding of the term "prioritized" in the charge, and consensus was reached that this means starting with the known risk factors and prioritizing their importance in training content. Chapman will communicate this "reading" of the prioritization charge to the CFP Executive Board.

Additional consensus was reached by the Committee that:

- the Committee's work will apply to employees in any place the Food Code applies to.
- the learning objectives in the Committee charge are from section a) of the charge (with perspective provided from Council II by Brian Turner).

5. Review cataloged documents/data sources

- Job Task Analysis (JTA) and the process
- Current industry outlines
- Compliance/behavior change literature related to employee food safety training
- FDA risk factor study insights

Chapman overviewed documents that Committee members were provided, and asked for others to be submitted. Differentiation was established between “certificate” (that uses learning objectives), and “certification” (that uses a JTA) work. Committee consensus is to proceed based on learning objectives, rather than JTAs.

Discussion ensued regarding CA and IL programs, and their basis in ASTM 2659, which does require a JTA, and consensus reached that what the Committee produces must be “measurable and reportable,” and provide a template for national consistency.

Opposition was voiced to moving in any way toward ASTM 2659 and/or employee testing. It was pointed out that demonstration of knowledge via employee questions currently exists in the Food Code. Steven Hughes, FDA consultant to the Committee, pointed out that three main areas exist in our review: Content, Mechanics (implementation), and Food Code relativity, and suggested the Committee focus on the Content mission.

6. Establish subcommittees for each group

Chapman reviewed three proposed subcommittees scopes of work:

1. Review current Industry non-regulatory delivery
2. Review current state requirements (i.e., CA, IL, FL)
3. FDA Risk Factor related employee activities (FC sec. 203.11; “must haves” and “nice to haves”).

The Committee Co-Chairs will call for volunteers to subcommittees, then when formed those groups will select their chairs.

Catlin pointed out that the Committee should be creative in its objectives and activity, not simply use existing “check boxes,” and be aware of the opportunity to create work product based in or derived from something that does not yet exist.

7. Milestone setting

- Co-Chairs set March 27 as the deadline for subcommittee sign up.
- Subcommittees will meet at their own direction, and once empanelled the Committee Co-Chairs will establish reporting deadlines for the remainder of the CFP 2014-16 cycle.
- Committee Co-Chairs will poll Committee members for three proposed Committee meetings moving forward, with integration of the subcommittee schedules. Potential dates:
 - May 2015, in Chicago concurrent with the NRA show
 - July 24-27, 2015, in Portland concurrent with IAFF

November, 2015, week 1, details TBD

8. Adjourn

With unanimous consent the Committee adjourned at 1:40 PM.

Food Handler Training subcommittee: Industry non-regulatory delivery of food handler training

June 15

12pm ET- 1pm ET

Attending: Ben Chapman, Suzanne Feazell, Susan Delauris, Chirag Bhatt, Chuck Catlin, Aimee Lee, Stephen Hughes

- Reviewed the charge and approved the charge subcomponents.
- Quick thoughts on the charge, focused on generating a common outline capturing the elements of current programs.
- Suggestion to create a matrix, using risk factors as a foundation, in order to compare 'apples to apples' of different programs. What elements were similar?
- Discussion on recognizing that specific departments may result in specific requirements: produce department and pizza are different.
- Specific to job tasks should be recognized, not in the generic outline.
- Lets focus on the common knowledge, skills and behaviors.
- We need to try to achieve that the syllabus is universal as the baseline knowledge, skills and understanding
- Suggestion to align the matrix by the suggested inspection code
- Additional resources for this group: Brian Chapman State Food Safety & Kate Piche with NRA

Action 1 : Reach out to William on NRAs members looking like

Action 2: Susan Feazell - create a template to compare apples to apples - Susan to send to Ben

Action 3: Chirag to send to a quick email to restaurants food service to

gather FMI info.

Action 4: Chuck to reach out to additional resources noted above

CFP Employee Training Committee Meeting
IAFP Conference – Portland, OR
July 8, 2015
Conference call

Jordan Mason -FL
Ken Rosenwinkel - IL
Joe Graham - WA
Joyce Jensen

Ben talked about the charge, what we need to do.

Introductions

Expectations were confirmed – review state programs and discuss common elements

Allergens were discussed as a hot topic as they relate to food handlers - need to take into consideration and what's out there and not being used

Joe for context - states that already have it that go into the code interesting conversation, code requirement

Ken Shared: IL - Contentious issues were not really even within scope of content but related to implementation of assessment.

Some very basic criteria food employee training/food handler
Little of basic components - cleaning and sanitizing, temperature controls, personal hygiene
Should it be ANSI approved or not
* IL rule as a compromise - two classifications of training (restaurant vs non-restaurant) no such thing as restaurant vs. non-restaurant component

In IL - Certificates that required after three years

Joe from WA shared:

30 min training requirement as a minimum

Every two years

Food allergy awareness is included

Manual

36 questions are provided in the assessment they are risk based and weighted

Offered in 7 languages - not required in the code

Actions: Joe to send us a food handler info an populate the matrix.
(completed)

Food employees

ANSI landminds

FL experience from Allergens Safe Staff

GA requirements

JTAs

Jordan – shared that there are not JTAs available from Florida

Wrap-up and next meeting confirmed for August 12, 2015.

CFP Employee Training Committee Meeting

July 8, 2015

Conference call

Attendees:

Tom McMahan

Susan Fezell

Ashley Eisenbeiser

Chirag Bhatt

Ben Chapman

Stephen Hughes

Chirag provided details on a few programs:

Cracker Barrel

Waffle House and Starbucks, to be added to matrix

Susan's discussed the matrix including common competencies and unique foci

Pest control - brief of and concise - inform supervisor as - control measures related to pest control

Tom suggested that cleaning and sanitizing - is a core item (specifically the difference between cleaning and sanitizing)

Identifying core items - pest control/cleaning and sanitizing should that maybe be required under.

Some discussion around allergens - potential around adding allergens for food handler core

Focused some discussion of knowledge of a food handler diseases:

Reportable illnesses

- Knowledge know and understand the 6 reportable illnesses
- Shouldn't come to work if they are feeling sick
- Obligation when they have certain symptoms
- Some kind of documentation and a diagnosis is a manager
- If they are throwing up with diarrhea - because of the symptoms
- The problem with the anecdote, is that the indicated pathogens
- Sort of need to know why they are reporting it
- Teach them the symptoms vs. the pathogen
- Need to make sure that the knowledge

Wrap Up

**CFP Employee Training Committee Meeting
IAFP Conference – Portland, OR
Monday, July 27, 2015
Portland Convention Center**

A meeting of the CPF Training Committee was called to order by Chairman Ben Chapman at noon on July 27, 2015. Those in attendance were Ben Chapman, Susan Feazell, Hal King, Geoff Luebke, William Weichelt, Chuck Catlin, Davene Sarrocco-Smith, Bryan Chapman, George Nakamura, Jeff Lang, Joe Graham,

Chairman Chapman explained that the purpose of the meeting was to report on the progress of the work of the three subcommittees and clarify any matters.

Subcommittee 1: Looking at current Industry Practices with regard to food safety employee training.

There was some discussion regarding the different levels of training across the food service industries and the differing categories of food industries – grocery, restaurant, wholesale, etc. It was noted that the subcommittee should not describe in detail what is in the training program but that a subject matter is present.

Subcommittee 2: Looking at State Food Service Employee Training Programs.

It was noted that there appears to be little consistency between State food service training programs and requirements. A request went out for more state program information.

Subcommittee 3: Looking at Risk Factors as they relate to food safety employee training.

In reviewing the literature, it appears that there are five common risk factors being addressed across several training programs. They include Cross Contamination, Personal Hygiene/Hand Washing, Temperature Control, Employee Illness Reporting, and Cleaning/Sanitizing. There was some discussion regarding clarification of terms of employee illness reporting with regard to exclusion/restriction, reportable disease and symptom reporting. It was felt that symptom reporting was key to the discussion.

It was reported that some of the outliers being noted were issues like Pest Control, Allergens, etc.

It was noted that an important factor in evaluating training programs for the food serving employee would be to assess the learning level of the population. It was also noted that when putting in place the California statutes for food training there were political hurdles which needed to be overcome and should be considered when making recommendations to Council. Two new committee members volunteered to work with Subcommittee 2 in looking at state programs.

It was reported that all three subcommittees were collecting data and information and building matrixes for the purpose of comparison and concluding recommendations.

Chairman Chapman advised that what we would be submitting to Council would be “guidelines” for what should be in any food server training program.

The subcommittees will be meeting by conference call monthly to complete their matrixes and will attempt to schedule a call of the full committee around the Thanksgiving time frame. Chairman Chapman thanked everyone in attendance and those on the phone.

CFP Food Employee Training Committee

Training Component Draft (October 2, 2015)

1. Introduction To Food Safety; What it is and the impact on health

Burden of foodborne illness

- Number of illnesses
- Cost of illnesses
- Consequences Pathogens of most concern – [Add highly susceptible populations very quickly – and a possible example from the oral](#)

What is food safety

What is foodborne illness

Who gets it, CDC risk factors

[Other hazards – include it Chemical/Physical](#)

Ben 10/2/2015 11:49 AM

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

2. Reportable Symptoms, Illnesses, Causes; Food Handler Role

Supervision

- Person in Charge

Employee Health

- Reportable Symptoms
 - Vomiting
 - Diarrhea
 - Jaundice
 - Sore throat with fever
 - Lesion containing pus or infected wound that is open and draining.
- Stay home if sick – [if you have these symptoms -](#)
- Reportable Illnesses
 - Norovirus

- Shiga Toxin-Producing Escherichia Coli or Shigella
- Salmonella spp.
- Salmonella Typhi
- Hepatitis A
- Exclusion/Restrictions

Labeling

- Consumer advisory

Highly Susceptible Populations

Compliance with Approved Procedures

- HACCP Plans

Ben 10/2/2015 11:54 AM

Comment [1]: Move – labeling is also not the correct – move it to allergens

Ben 10/2/2015 11:51 AM

Comment [2]:

3. Avoiding Contamination and Cross-contamination

Preventing contamination

- Ice
- Equipment
 - Utensils
- Consumers
- Produce Washing
- Animals
- Pasteurized Eggs
- Ventilation
- Vending Machines
 - Auto shutoff
- Equipment Certifications (NSF, UL)
- Single Service Use Items
- Proper Storage of Food
 - Locations
 - Storage levels

4. Time and Temperature Control PHF/TCS

Food

- Receiving

- Condition
- Temperatures
- Shellfish
- Shellfish Tags
- Juicing

Destruction of organisms of public health Concern

- Cooking
- Freezing
 - Parasite destruction
- Reheating
- Raw Animal Foods

Limiting Growth Of Organisms of Public Health Concern

- Hot holding
- Cold holding
- Chilling
- Time as a public health control
- Thawing
- Date Marking (TCS RTE foods)

5. Personal Hygiene and Hand Washing

Good Hygienic Practices

- Clean Clothing
- Washing Hands and arms
- Fingernails
- Jewelry
- Proper eating, drinking and Tobacco use

Preventing Contamination from hands

- Food Contamination Prevention
- Hair Restraints
- Glove use
- Hand washing
- Facilities for hand washing
- No bare hand contact with RTE's

6. Cleaning and Sanitizing

Chemical Use and Storage

- Chlorine
- Quaternary Ammonia
- Iodine
- Pesticides

Cleaning and Sanitation (Food & Non-food Contact Surfaces)

- Wiping Cloths
- Dish Washing
- Manual Cleaning
- Hot Water

Responding to Contamination Events

- Bodily Fluids clean up (Vomit, Diarrhea)

7. Pest Control

Insect control devices that are used to electrocute or stun flying insects must be designed to retain the insect within the device.

- Control devices shall not be located over food prep areas.
- Dead insects and fragments must be prevented from falling on exposed food or clean equipment or other food contact surfaces.
- Exposed food or food contact surfaces must be protected from contamination by insects, rodents or other vermin.

Poisonous or toxic materials shall be stored in a manner that prevents contamination of food, or food contact surfaces.

8. Hazard Identification & Control (receiving, storing and preparing)

Identify harbors for microorganisms

- Niches
- Foods to pay attention to
-

Identify control measures for some specific foods as they relate to risk factors

9. Allergen Control

Allergens are proteins that react negatively in some people triggering an immune system response that can be life threatening. Anaphylaxis is a severe allergic reaction of rapid onset affecting many body systems and is the most dangerous to the victim. More than 160 foods have been identified as sources of allergic reactions in humans. However, 90 percent of these reactions are caused by eight main food categories.

The 8 main categories of food containing allergens are milk, eggs, finfish, crustacean shellfish, peanuts, tree nuts, wheat and soy.

- Food services must post emergency contact numbers to provide a quick reference in an emergency.
- Call 911 if a guest or employee is having a serious allergic reaction.
- Ask the person, who is having the reaction, if they carry an EpiPen. **Do not inject the allergic victim.** The allergic person or medical personnel are the only people authorized to administer medicine.

Note: an EpiPen is a small medical device often carried by people that have severe allergic reactions. The device delivers a measured dose (or doses) of epinephrine (also known as adrenaline) using autoinjector technology.

Compliance With Laws

- Permits
- Regulatory Agencies
- Inspection and Correction of Violations

Facilities

- Approved Water Sources
- Hand wash sinks
- Hand drying provisions
- Plumbing
 - Airgap
 - Backflow prevention

- Mobile Food Trucks
- Toilet Rooms
- Lighting

Terms

(NOTE this is not the list of things that food employees should know, this is a list of terms that we would want to use for consistency within the content areas)

(1) "Food additive" has the meaning stated in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, § 201(s) and 21 CFR 170.3(e)(1).

(2) "Color additive" has the meaning stated in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, § 201(t) and 21 CFR 70.3(f).

"Adulterated" has the meaning stated in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, § 402.

"Approved" means acceptable to the REGULATORY AUTHORITY based on a determination of conformity with principles, practices, and generally recognized standards that protect public health.

Asymptomatic.

(1) "Asymptomatic" means without obvious symptoms; not showing or producing indications of a disease or other medical condition, such as an individual infected with a pathogen but not exhibiting or producing any signs or symptoms of vomiting, diarrhea, or jaundice.

(2) "Asymptomatic" includes not showing symptoms because symptoms have resolved or subsided, or because symptoms never manifested.

"aw " means water activity which is a measure of the free moisture in a FOOD, is the quotient of the water vapor pressure of the substance divided by the vapor pressure of pure water at the same temperature, and is indicated by the symbol AW .

"Balut" means an embryo inside a fertile EGG that has been incubated for a period sufficient for the embryo to reach a specific stage of development after which it is removed from incubation before hatching.

"Beverage" means a liquid for drinking, including water. "Bottled drinking water" means water that is SEALED in bottles, packages, or other containers and offered for sale for human consumption, including bottled mineral water.

"Casing" means a tubular container for sausage products made of either natural or artificial (synthetic) material.

"Certification number" means a unique combination of letters and numbers assigned by a SHELLFISH CONTROL AUTHORITY to a MOLLUSCAN SHELLFISH DEALER according to the provisions of the National Shellfish Sanitation Program.

"CFR" means CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS. Citations in this Code to the CFR refer sequentially to the Title, Part, and Section numbers, such as 40

CFR 180.194 refers to Title 40, Part 180, Section 194. CIP.

(1) "CIP" means cleaned in place by the circulation or flowing by mechanical means through a piping system of a detergent solution, water rinse, and SANITIZING solution onto or over EQUIPMENT surfaces that require cleaning, such as the method used, in part, to clean and SANITIZE a frozen dessert machine.

(2) "CIP" does not include the cleaning of EQUIPMENT such as band saws, slicers, or mixers that are subjected to in-place manual cleaning without the use of a CIP system. 3

"Commingle" means:

(1) To combine SHELLSTOCK harvested on different days or from different growing areas as identified on the tag or label, or

(2) To combine SHUCKED SHELLFISH from containers with different container codes or different shucking dates.

Comminuted. (1) "Comminuted" means reduced in size by methods including chopping, flaking, grinding, or mincing.

(2) "Comminuted" includes FISH or MEAT products that are reduced in size and restructured or reformulated such as gefilte FISH, gyros, ground beef, and sausage; and a mixture of 2 or more types of MEAT that have been reduced in size and combined, such as sausages made from 2 or more MEATS.

"Conditional employee" means a potential FOOD EMPLOYEE to whom a job offer is made, conditional on responses to subsequent medical questions or examinations designed to identify potential FOOD EMPLOYEES who may be

suffering from a disease that can be transmitted through FOOD and done in compliance with Title 1 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

"Confirmed disease outbreak" means a **FOODBORNE DISEASE OUTBREAK** in which laboratory analysis of appropriate specimens identifies a causative agent and epidemiological analysis implicates the FOOD as the source of the illness.

"Consumer" means a **PERSON** who is a member of the public, takes possession of FOOD, is not functioning in the capacity of an operator of a **FOOD ESTABLISHMENT** or **FOOD PROCESSING PLANT**, and does not offer the FOOD for resale.

Core Item. (1) "Core item" means a provision in this Code that is not designated as a **PRIORITY ITEM** or a **PRIORITY FOUNDATION ITEM**.

(2) "Core item" includes an item that usually relates to general sanitation, operational controls, sanitation standard operating procedures (SSOPs), facilities or structures, equipment design, or general maintenance.

"Corrosion-resistant material" means a material that maintains acceptable surface cleanability characteristics under prolonged influence of the FOOD to be contacted, the normal use of cleaning compounds and **SANITIZING** solutions, and other conditions of the use environment.

"Counter-mounted equipment" means **EQUIPMENT** that is not portable and is designed to be mounted off the floor on a table, counter, or shelf.

"Critical control point" means a point or procedure in a specific FOOD system where loss of control may result in an unacceptable health **RISK**.

"Critical limit" means the maximum or minimum value to which a physical, biological, or chemical parameter must be controlled at a **CRITICAL CONTROL POINT** to minimize the **RISK** that the identified FOOD safety **HAZARD** may occur.

"Cut leafy greens" means fresh leafy greens whose leaves have been cut, shredded, sliced, chopped, or torn. The term "leafy greens" includes iceberg lettuce, romaine lettuce, leaf lettuce, butter lettuce, baby leaf lettuce (i.e., immature lettuce or leafy greens), escarole, endive, spring mix, spinach,

cabbage, kale, arugula and chard. The term "leafy greens" does not include herbs such as cilantro or parsley.

"Dealer" means a PERSON who is authorized by a SHELLFISH CONTROL AUTHORITY for the activities of SHELLSTOCK shipper, shucker-packer, re-packer, re-shipper, or depuration processor of MOLLUSCAN SHELLFISH according to the provisions of the National Shellfish Sanitation Program.

"Disclosure" means a written statement that clearly identifies the animal-derived FOODS which are, or can be ordered, raw, undercooked, or without otherwise being processed to eliminate pathogens, or items that contain an ingredient that is raw, undercooked, or without otherwise being processed to eliminate pathogens.

Drinking Water.

(1) "Drinking water" means water that meets criteria as specified in 40 CFR 141 National Primary Drinking Water Regulations.

(2) "Drinking water" is traditionally known as "potable water."

(3) "Drinking water" includes the term "water" except where the term used connotes that the water is not potable, such as "boiler water," "mop water," "rainwater," "wastewater," and "nondrinking" water.

"Dry storage area" means a room or area designated for the storage of PACKAGED or containerized bulk FOOD that is not TIME/TEMPERATURE CONTROL FOR SAFETY FOOD and dry goods such as SINGLE-SERVICE items.

Easily Cleanable.

(1) "Easily cleanable" means a characteristic of a surface that: (a) Allows effective removal of soil by normal cleaning methods; (b) Is dependent on the material, design, construction, and installation of the surface; and (c) Varies with the likelihood of the surface's role in introducing pathogenic or toxigenic agents or other contaminants into FOOD based on the surface's APPROVED placement, purpose, and use.

(2) "Easily cleanable" includes a tiered application of the criteria that qualify the surface as EASILY CLEANABLE as specified in Subparagraph (1) of this definition to different situations in which varying degrees of cleanability are required such as:

- (a) The appropriateness of stainless steel for a FOOD preparation surface as opposed to the lack of need for stainless steel to be used for floors or for tables used for CONSUMER dining; or
- (b) The need for a different degree of cleanability for a utilitarian attachment or accessory in the kitchen as opposed to a decorative attachment or accessory in the CONSUMER dining area.

"Easily movable" means:

- (1) Portable; mounted on casters, gliders, or rollers; or provided with a mechanical means to safely tilt a unit of EQUIPMENT for cleaning; and
- (2) Having no utility connection, a utility connection that disconnects quickly, or a flexible utility connection line of sufficient length to allow the EQUIPMENT to be moved for cleaning of the EQUIPMENT and adjacent area.

Egg.

- (1) "Egg" means the shell EGG of avian species such as chicken, duck, goose, guinea, quail, RATITES or turkey.
- (2) "Egg" does not include:
 - (a) A BALUT;
 - (b) The egg of reptile species such as alligator; or
 - (c) An EGG PRODUCT.

Egg Product.

- (1) "Egg Product" means all, or a portion of, the contents found inside EGGS separated from the shell and pasteurized in a FOOD PROCESSING PLANT, with or without added ingredients, intended for human consumption, such as dried, frozen or liquid eggs.
- (2) "Egg Product" does not include FOOD which contains EGGS only in a relatively small proportion such as cake mixes.

"Employee" means the PERMIT HOLDER, PERSON IN CHARGE, FOOD EMPLOYEE, PERSON having supervisory or management duties, PERSON on the payroll, family member, volunteer, PERSON performing work under contractual agreement, or other PERSON working in a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT.

"EPA" means the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Equipment.

(1) "Equipment" means an article that is used in the operation of a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT such as a freezer, grinder, hood, ice maker, MEAT block, mixer, oven, reach-in refrigerator, scale, sink, slicer, stove, table, TEMPERATURE MEASURING DEVICE for ambient air, VENDING MACHINE, or WAREWASHING machine.

(2) "Equipment" does not include apparatuses used for handling or storing large quantities of PACKAGED FOODS that are received from a supplier in a cased or overwrapped lot, such as hand trucks, forklifts, dollies, pallets, racks, and skids.

"Exclude" means to prevent a PERSON from working as an EMPLOYEE in a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT or entering a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT as an EMPLOYEE.

"FDA" means the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Fish.

(1) "Fish" means fresh or saltwater finfish, crustaceans and other forms of aquatic life (including alligator, frog, aquatic turtle, jellyfish, sea cucumber, and sea urchin and the roe of such animals) other than birds or mammals, and all mollusks, if such animal life is intended for human consumption.

(2) "Fish" includes an edible human FOOD product derived in whole or in part from FISH, including FISH that have been processed in any manner.

"Food" means

(1) a raw, cooked, or processed edible substance, ice, BEVERAGE, or ingredient used or intended for use or for sale in whole or in part for human consumption, or chewing gum. "Foodborne disease outbreak" means the occurrence of two or more cases of a similar illness resulting from the ingestion of a common FOOD.

"Food-contact surface" means:

(1) A surface of EQUIPMENT or a UTENSIL with which FOOD normally comes into contact; or

(2) A surface of EQUIPMENT or a UTENSIL from which FOOD may drain, drip, or splash: (a) Into a FOOD, or (b) Onto a surface normally in contact with FOOD.

"Food employee" means an individual working with unPACKAGED FOOD, FOOD EQUIPMENT or UTENSILS, or FOOD-CONTACT SURFACES

Food Establishment.

(1) "Food establishment" means an operation that: (a) stores, prepares, packages, serves, vends food directly to the consumer, or otherwise provides FOOD for human consumption such as a restaurant; satellite or catered feeding location; catering operation if the operation provides FOOD directly to a CONSUMER or to a conveyance used to transport people; market; vending location; conveyance used to transport people; institution; or FOOD bank; and (b) relinquishes possession of FOOD to a CONSUMER directly, or indirectly through a delivery service such as home delivery of grocery orders or restaurant takeout orders, or delivery service that is provided by common carriers.

(2) "Food establishment" includes: (a) An element of the operation such as a transportation vehicle or a central preparation facility that supplies a vending location or satellite feeding location unless the vending or feeding location is permitted by the REGULATORY AUTHORITY; and (b) An operation that is conducted in a mobile, stationary, temporary, or permanent facility or location; where consumption is on or off the PREMISES; and regardless of whether there is a charge for the FOOD.

(3) "Food establishment" does not include:

(a) An establishment that offers only prePACKAGED FOODS that are not TIME/TEMPERATURE CONTROL FOR SAFETY FOODS;

(b) A produce stand that only offers whole, uncut fresh fruits and vegetables;

(c) A FOOD PROCESSING PLANT; including those that are located on the PREMISES of a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT

(d) A kitchen in a private home if only FOOD that is not TIME/TEMPERATURE CONTROL FOR SAFETY FOOD, is prepared for sale or service at a function such as a religious or charitable organization's bake sale if allowed by LAW and if the CONSUMER is informed by a clearly visible placard at the sales or service location that the FOOD is prepared in a kitchen that is not subject to regulation and inspection by the REGULATORY AUTHORITY;

(e) An area where FOOD that is prepared as specified in Subparagraph (3)

(d) of this definition is sold or offered for human consumption;

(f) A kitchen in a private home, such as a small family day-care provider; or a bed-and-breakfast operation that prepares and offers FOOD to guests if the home is owner occupied, the number of available guest bedrooms does not exceed 6, breakfast is the only meal offered, the number of guests served does not exceed 18, and the CONSUMER is informed by statements contained in published advertisements, mailed brochures, and placards posted at the registration area that the FOOD is prepared in a kitchen that is not regulated and inspected by the REGULATORY AUTHORITY; or

(g) A private home that receives catered or home-delivered FOOD. Food Processing Plant.

(1) "Food processing plant" means a commercial operation that manufactures, packages, labels, or stores FOOD for human consumption, and provides FOOD for sale or distribution to other business entities such as FOOD PROCESSING PLANTS or FOOD ESTABLISHMENTS.

(2) "Food processing plant" does not include a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT.

Game Animal.

(1) "Game animal" means an animal, the products of which are FOOD, that is not classified as livestock, sheep, swine, goat, horse, mule, or other equine in 9 CFR 301.2 Definitions, or as Poultry, or FISH.

(2) "Game animal" includes mammals such as reindeer, elk, deer, antelope, water buffalo, bison, rabbit, squirrel, opossum, raccoon, nutria, or muskrat, and nonaquatic reptiles such as land snakes.

(3) "Game animal" does not include RATITES.

"General use pesticide" means a pesticide that is not classified by EPA for restricted use as specified in 40 CFR 152.175 Pesticides classified for restricted use. "Grade A standards" means the requirements of the United States Public Health Service/FDA "Grade A Pasteurized Milk Ordinance" with which certain fluid and dry milk and milk products comply.

"HACCP plan" means a written document that delineates the formal procedures for following the HAZARD Analysis and CRITICAL CONTROL POINT principles developed by The National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods.

Handwashing Sink.

(1) "Handwashing sink" means a lavatory, a basin or vessel for washing, a wash basin, or a PLUMBING FIXTURE especially placed for use in personal hygiene and designed for the washing of the hands.

(2) "Handwashing sink" includes an automatic handwashing facility.

"Hazard" means a biological, chemical, or physical property that may cause an unacceptable CONSUMER health RISK.

"Health practitioner" means a physician licensed to practice medicine, or if allowed by LAW, a nurse practitioner, physician assistant, or similar medical professional.

"Hermetically sealed container" means a container that is designed and intended to be secure against the entry of microorganisms and, in the case of low acid canned FOODS, to maintain the commercial sterility of its contents after processing.

"Highly susceptible population" means PERSONS who are more likely than other people in the general population to experience foodborne disease because they are:

- (1) Immunocompromised; preschool age children, or older adults; and
- (2) Obtaining FOOD at a facility that provides services such as custodial care, health care, or assisted living, such as a child or adult day care center, kidney dialysis center, hospital or nursing home, or nutritional or socialization services such as a senior center.

"Imminent health hazard" means a significant threat or danger to health that is considered to exist when there is evidence sufficient to show that a product, practice, circumstance, or event creates a situation that requires immediate correction or cessation of operation to prevent injury based on:

- (1) The number of potential injuries, and
- (2) The nature, severity, and duration of the anticipated injury.

"Injected" means manipulating MEAT to which a solution has been introduced into its interior by processes that are referred to as "injecting," "pump marinating," or "stitch pumping".

Juice.

(1) "Juice" means the aqueous liquid expressed or extracted from one or more fruits or vegetables, purées of the edible portions of one or more fruits or vegetables, or any concentrates of such liquid or purée.

(2) "Juice" does not include, for purposes of HACCP, liquids, purées, or concentrates that are not used as BEVERAGES or ingredients of BEVERAGES.

"Kitchenware" means FOOD preparation and storage UTENSILS.

"Law" means applicable local, state, and federal statutes, regulations, and ordinances.

"Linens" means fabric items such as cloth hampers, cloth napkins, table cloths, wiping cloths, and work garments including cloth gloves. Major Food

Allergen.

(1) "Major food allergen" means: (a) Milk, EGG, FISH (such as bass, flounder, cod, and including crustacean shellfish such as crab, lobster, or shrimp), tree nuts (such as almonds, pecans, or walnuts), wheat, peanuts, and soybeans; or (b) A FOOD ingredient that contains protein derived from a FOOD, as specified in Subparagraph (1)(a) of this definition.

(2) "Major food allergen" does not include: (a) Any highly refined oil derived from a FOOD specified in Subparagraph (1)(a) of this definition and any ingredient derived from such highly refined oil; or (b) Any ingredient that is exempt under the petition or notification process specified in the Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-282).

"Meat" means the flesh of animals used as FOOD including the dressed flesh of cattle, swine, sheep, or goats and other edible animals, except FISH, POULTRY, and wild GAME ANIMALS as specified under Subparagraphs 3-201.17(A)(3) and (4).

Mechanically Tenderized.

(1) "Mechanically tenderized" means manipulating meat with deep penetration by processes which may be referred to as "blade tenderizing," "jaccarding," "pinning," "needling," or using blades, pins, needles or any mechanical device.

(2) "Mechanically tenderized" does not include processes by which solutions are INJECTED into meat. "mg/L" means milligrams per liter, which is the metric equivalent of parts per million (ppm).

"Molluscan shellfish" means any edible species of fresh or frozen oysters, clams, mussels, and scallops or edible portions thereof, except when the scallop product consists only of the shucked adductor muscle.

Non-Continuous Cooking.

(1) "Non-continuous cooking" means the cooking of FOOD in a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT using a process in which the initial heating of the FOOD is intentionally halted so that it may be cooled and held for complete cooking at a later time prior to sale or service.

(2) "Non-continuous cooking" does not include cooking procedures that only involve temporarily interrupting or slowing an otherwise continuous cooking process.

Packaged.

(1) "Packaged" means bottled, canned, cartoned, bagged, or wrapped, whether PACKAGED in a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT or a FOOD PROCESSING PLANT.

(2) "Packaged" does not include wrapped or placed in a carry-out container to protect the FOOD during service or delivery to the CONSUMER, by a FOOD EMPLOYEE, upon CONSUMER request.

"Permit" means the document issued by the REGULATORY AUTHORITY that authorizes a PERSON to operate a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT.

"Permit holder" means the entity that:

(1) Is legally responsible for the operation of the FOOD ESTABLISHMENT such as the owner, the owner's agent, or other PERSON; and

(2) Possesses a valid PERMIT to operate a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT.

"Person" means an association, a corporation, individual, partnership, other legal entity, government, or governmental subdivision or agency.

"Person in charge" means the individual present at a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT who is responsible for the operation at the time of inspection.

Personal Care Items.

(1) "Personal care items" means items or substances that may be poisonous, toxic, or a source of contamination and are used to maintain or enhance a PERSON'S health, hygiene, or appearance.

(2) "Personal care items" include items such as medicines; first aid supplies; and other items such as cosmetics, and toiletries such as toothpaste and mouthwash.

"pH" means the symbol for the negative logarithm of the hydrogen ion concentration, which is a measure of the degree of acidity or alkalinity of a solution.

"Physical facilities" means the structure and interior surfaces of a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT including accessories such as soap and towel dispensers and attachments such as light fixtures and heating or air conditioning system vents.

"Plumbing fixture" means a receptacle or device that:

(1) Is permanently or temporarily connected to the water distribution system of the PREMISES and demands a supply of water from the system; or

(2) Discharges used water, waste materials, or SEWAGE directly or indirectly to the drainage system of the PREMISES.

"Plumbing system" means the water supply and distribution pipes; PLUMBING FIXTURES and traps; soil, waste, and vent pipes; sanitary and storm sewers and building drains, including their respective connections, devices, and appurtenances within the PREMISES; and water-treating EQUIPMENT.

"Poisonous or toxic materials" means substances that are not intended for ingestion and are included in 4 categories:

(1) Cleaners and SANITIZERS, which include cleaning and SANITIZING agents and agents such as caustics, acids, drying agents, polishes, and other chemicals;

(2) Pesticides, except SANITIZERS, which include substances such as insecticides and rodenticides;

(3) Substances necessary for the operation and maintenance of the establishment such as nonfood grade lubricants and PERSONAL CARE ITEMS that may be deleterious to health; and

(4) Substances that are not necessary for the operation and maintenance of the establishment and are on the PREMISES for retail sale, such as petroleum products and paints.

"Poultry" means:

(1) Any domesticated bird (chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese, guineas, RATITES, or squabs), whether live or dead, as defined in 9 CFR 381.1

Poultry Products Inspection Regulations Definitions, Poultry; and

(2) Any migratory waterfowl or game bird, pheasant, partridge, quail, grouse, or pigeon, whether live or dead, as defined in 9 CFR 362.1 Voluntary Poultry Inspection Regulations, Definitions.

"Premises" means:

(1) The PHYSICAL FACILITY, its contents, and the contiguous land or property under the control of the PERMIT HOLDER; or

(2) The PHYSICAL FACILITY, its contents, and the land or property not described in Subparagraph (1) of this definition if its facilities and contents are under the control of the PERMIT HOLDER and may impact FOOD ESTABLISHMENT personnel, facilities, or operations, and a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT is only one component of a larger operation such as a healthcare facility, hotel, motel, school, recreational camp, or prison.

"Primal cut" means a basic major cut into which carcasses and sides of MEAT are separated, such as a beef round, pork loin, lamb flank, or veal breast.

Priority Item.

(1) "Priority item" means a provision in this Code whose application contributes directly to the elimination, prevention or reduction to an acceptable level, hazards associated with foodborne illness or injury and there is no other provision that more directly controls the hazard.

(2) "Priority item" includes items with a quantifiable measure to show control of hazards such as cooking, reheating, cooling, handwashing; and

(3) "Priority item" is an item that is denoted in this Code with a superscript P-P .

Priority Foundation Item.

- (1) "Priority foundation item" means a provision in this Code whose application supports, facilitates or enables one or more PRIORITY ITEMS.
- (2) "Priority foundation item" includes an item that requires the purposeful incorporation of specific actions, equipment or procedures by industry management to attain control of risk factors that contribute to foodborne illness or injury such as personnel training, infrastructure or necessary equipment, HACCP plans, documentation or record keeping, and labeling; and
- (3) "Priority foundation item" is an item that is denoted in this Code with a superscript Pf - Pf .

"Public water system" has the meaning stated in 40 CFR 141 National Primary Drinking Water Regulations.

"Ratite" means a flightless bird such as an emu, ostrich, or rhea.

Ready-to-Eat Food.

- (1) "Ready-to-eat food" means FOOD that:
- (a) Is in a form that is edible without additional preparation to achieve FOOD safety, as specified under one of the following: ¶ 3-401.11(A) or (B), § 3-401.12, or § 3-402.11, or as specified in ¶ 3-401.11(C); or
 - (b) Is a raw or partially cooked animal FOOD and the consumer is advised as specified in Subparagraphs 3-401.11(D)(1) and (3); or
 - (c) Is prepared in accordance with a variance that is granted as specified in Subparagraph 3-401.11
- (D) (4); and(d) May receive additional preparation for palatability or aesthetic, epicurean, gastronomic, or culinary purposes.
- (2) "Ready-to-eat food" includes:
- (a) Raw animal FOOD that is cooked as specified under § 3-401.11 or 3-401.12, or frozen as specified under § 3-402.11;
 - (b) Raw fruits and vegetables that are washed as specified under § 3-302.15;
 - (c) Fruits and vegetables that are cooked for hot holding, as specified under § 3-401.13;
 - (d) All TIME/TEMPERATURE CONTROL FOR SAFETY FOOD that is cooked to the temperature and time required for the specific FOOD under Subpart 3-401 and cooled as specified under § 3-501.14;

- (e) Plant FOOD for which further washing, cooking, or other processing is not required for FOOD safety, and from which rinds, peels, husks, or shells, if naturally present are removed;
- (f) Substances derived from plants such as spices, seasonings, and sugar;
- (g) A bakery item such as bread, cakes, pies, fillings, or icing for which further cooking is not required for FOOD safety;
- (h) The following products that are produced in accordance with USDA guidelines and that have received a lethality treatment for pathogens: dry, fermented sausages, such as dry salami or pepperoni; salt-cured MEAT and POULTRY products, such as prosciutto ham, country cured ham, and Parma ham; and dried MEAT and POULTRY products, such as jerky or beef sticks; and
- (i) FOODS manufactured as specified in 21 CFR Part 113, Thermally Processed Low-Acid Foods Packaged in Hermetically Sealed Containers.

Reduced Oxygen Packaging.

(1) "Reduced oxygen packaging" means:

- (a) The reduction of the amount of oxygen in a PACKAGE by removing oxygen; displacing oxygen and replacing it with another gas or combination of gases; or otherwise controlling the oxygen content to a level below that normally found in the atmosphere (approximately 21% at sea level); and
- (b) A process as specified in Subparagraph (1)(a) of this definition that involves a FOOD for which the HAZARDS Clostridium botulinum or Listeria monocytogenes require control in the final PACKAGED form.

(2) "Reduced oxygen packaging" includes:

- (a) Vacuum PACKAGING, in which air is removed from a PACKAGE of FOOD and the PACKAGE is HERMETICALLY SEALED so that a vacuum remains inside the PACKAGE;
- (b) Modified atmosphere PACKAGING, in which the atmosphere of a PACKAGE of FOOD is modified so that its composition is different from air but the atmosphere may change over time due to the permeability of the PACKAGING material or the respiration of the FOOD. Modified atmosphere PACKAGING includes reduction in the proportion of oxygen, total replacement of oxygen, or an increase in the proportion of other gases such as carbon dioxide or nitrogen;
- (c) Controlled atmosphere PACKAGING, in which the atmosphere of a PACKAGE of FOOD is modified so that until the PACKAGE is opened, its composition is different from air, and continuous control of that atmosphere

is maintained, such as by using oxygen scavengers or a combination of total replacement of oxygen, non-respiring FOOD, and impermeable PACKAGING material;

(d) Cook chill PACKAGING, in which cooked FOOD is hot filled into impermeable bags which have the air expelled and are then sealed or crimped closed. The bagged FOOD is rapidly chilled and refrigerated at temperatures that inhibit the growth of psychrotrophic pathogens; or

(e) Sous vide PACKAGING, in which raw or partially cooked FOOD is vacuum packaged in an impermeable bag, cooked in the bag, rapidly chilled, and refrigerated at temperatures that inhibit the growth of psychrotrophic pathogens.

"Refuse" means solid waste not carried by water through the SEWAGE system.

"Regulatory authority" means the local, state, or federal enforcement body or authorized representative having jurisdiction over the FOOD ESTABLISHMENT.

"Reminder" means a written statement concerning the health RISK of consuming animal FOODS raw, undercooked, or without otherwise being processed to eliminate pathogens.

"Re-service" means the transfer of FOOD that is unused and returned by a CONSUMER after being served or sold and in the possession of the CONSUMER, to another PERSON.

"Restrict" means to limit the activities of a FOOD EMPLOYEE so that there is no RISK of transmitting a disease that is transmissible through FOOD and the FOOD EMPLOYEE does not work with exposed FOOD, clean EQUIPMENT, UTENSILS, LINENS, or unwrapped SINGLE-SERVICE or SINGLE-USE ARTICLES.

"Restricted egg" means any check, dirty EGG, incubator reject, inedible, leaker, or loss as defined in 9 CFR 590.

"Restricted use pesticide" means a pesticide product that contains the active ingredients specified in 40 CFR 152.175 Pesticides classified for restricted use, and that is limited to use by or under the direct supervision of a certified applicator.

"Risk" means the likelihood that an adverse health effect will occur within a population as a result of a HAZARD in a FOOD.

"Safe material" means:

- (1) An article manufactured from or composed of materials that may not reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in their becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any FOOD;
- (2) An additive that is used as specified in § 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or
- (3) Other materials that are not ADDITIVES and that are used in conformity with applicable regulations of the Food and Drug Administration.

"Sanitization" means the application of cumulative heat or chemicals on cleaned FOOD-CONTACT SURFACES that, when evaluated for efficacy, is sufficient to yield a reduction of 5 logs, which is equal to a 99.999% reduction, of representative disease microorganisms of public health importance.

"Sealed" means free of cracks or other openings that allow the entry or passage of moisture.

"Service animal" means an animal such as a guide dog, signal dog, or other animal individually trained to provide assistance to an individual with a disability.

"Servicing area" means an operating base location to which a mobile FOOD ESTABLISHMENT or transportation vehicle returns regularly for such things as vehicle and equipment cleaning, discharging liquid or solid wastes, refilling water tanks and ice bins, and boarding FOOD.

"Sewage" means liquid waste containing animal or vegetable matter in suspension or solution and may include liquids containing chemicals in solution.

"Shellfish control authority" means a state, federal, foreign, tribal, or other government entity legally responsible for administering a program that includes certification of MOLLUSCAN SHELLFISH harvesters and DEALERS for interstate commerce.

"Shell stock" means raw, in-shell MOLLUSCAN SHELLFISH.

"Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli" (STEC) means any E. coli capable of producing Shiga toxins (also called verocytotoxins). STEC infections can be asymptomatic or may result in a spectrum of illness ranging from mild non-bloody diarrhea, to hemorrhagic colitis (i.e., bloody diarrhea), to hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS - a type of kidney failure). Examples of serotypes of STEC include: E. coli O157:H7; E. coli O157:NM; E. coli O26:H11; E. coli O145:NM; E. coli O103:H2; and E. coli O111:NM. STEC are sometimes referred to as VTEC (verocytotoxigenic E. coli) or as EHEC (Enterohemorrhagic E. coli). EHEC are a subset of STEC which can cause hemorrhagic colitis or HUS.

"Shucked shellfish" means MOLLUSCAN SHELLFISH that have one or both shells removed. "Single-service articles" means TABLEWARE, carry-out UTENSILS, and other items such as bags, containers, placemats, stirrers, straws, toothpicks, and wrappers that are designed and constructed for one time, one PERSON use after which they are intended for discard.

Single-Use Articles.

(1) "Single-use articles" means UTENSILS and bulk FOOD containers designed and constructed to be used once and discarded.

(2) "Single-use articles" includes items such as wax paper, butcher paper, plastic wrap, formed aluminum FOOD containers, jars, plastic tubs or buckets, bread wrappers, pickle barrels, ketchup bottles, and number 10 cans which do not meet the materials, durability, strength, and cleanability specifications under §§ 4-101.11, 4-201.11, and 4-202.11 for multiuse UTENSILS.

"Slacking" means the process of moderating the temperature of a FOOD such as allowing a FOOD to gradually increase from a temperature of -23o C (-10o F) to -4o C (25o F) in preparation for deep-fat frying or to facilitate even heat penetration during the cooking of previously block-frozen FOOD such as shrimp.

"Smooth" means:

- (1) A FOOD-CONTACT SURFACE having a surface free of pits and inclusions with a cleanability equal to or exceeding that of (100 grit) number 3 stainless steel;
- (2) A non-FOOD-CONTACT SURFACE of EQUIPMENT having a surface equal to that of commercial grade hot-rolled steel free of visible scale; and
- (3) A floor, wall, or ceiling having an even or level surface with no roughness or projections that render it difficult to clean.

"Tableware" means eating, drinking, and serving UTENSILS for table use such as flatware including forks, knives, and spoons; hollowware including bowls, cups, serving dishes, and tumblers; and plates.

"Temperature measuring device" means a thermometer, thermocouple, thermistor, or other device that indicates the temperature of FOOD, air, or water.

"Temporary food establishment" means a FOOD ESTABLISHMENT that operates for a period of no more than 14 consecutive days in conjunction with a single event or celebration.

Time/Temperature Control for Safety Food (formerly "potentially hazardous food" (PHF)).

(1) "Time/temperature control for safety food" means a FOOD that requires time/temperature control for safety (TCS) to limit pathogenic microorganism growth or toxin formation.

(2) "Time/temperature control for safety food" includes:

(a) An animal FOOD that is raw or heat-treated; a plant FOOD that is heat treated or consists of raw seed sprouts, cut melons, cut leafy greens, cut tomatoes or mixtures of cut tomatoes that are not modified in a way so that they are unable to support pathogenic microorganism growth or toxin formation, or garlic-in-oil mixtures that are not modified in a way so that they are unable to support pathogenic microorganism growth or toxin formation; and

(b) Except as specified in Subparagraph (3)(d) of this definition, a FOOD that because of the interaction of its AW and PH values is designated as Product Assessment Required (PA) in Table A or B of this definition:

Table A. Interaction of PH and AW for control of spores in FOOD heat-treated to destroy vegetative cells and subsequently PACKAGED

A_w values	pH: 4.6 or less	pH: > 4.6 - 5.6	pH: > 5.6
≤0.92	non-TCS FOOD*	non-TCS FOOD	non-TCS FOOD
> 0.92 - 0.95	non-TCS FOOD	non-TCS FOOD	PA**
> 0.95	non-TCS FOOD	PA	PA

* TCS FOOD means TIME/TEMPERATURE CONTROL FOR SAFETY FOOD

** PA means Product Assessment required

Table B. Interaction of PH and AW for control of vegetative cells and spores in FOOD not heat-treated or heat-treated but not PACKAGED

A_w values	pH: < 4.2	pH: 4.2 - 4.6	pH: > 4.6 - 5.0	pH: > 5.0
< 0.88	non-TCS food*	Non-TCS food	non-TCS food	non-TCS food
0.88 – 0.90	non-TCS food	non-TCS food	non-TCS food	PA**
> 0.90 – 0.92	non-TCS food	non-TCS food	PA	PA
> 0.92	non-TCS food	PA	PA	PA

* TCS FOOD means TIME/TEMPERATURE CONTROL FOR SAFETY FOOD

** PA means Product Assessment required

(3) "Time/temperature control for safety food" does not include:

- (a) An air-cooled hard-boiled EGG with shell intact, or an EGG with shell intact that is not hard-boiled, but has been pasteurized to destroy all viable salmonellae;
- (b) A FOOD in an unopened HERMETICALLY SEALED CONTAINER that is commercially processed to achieve and maintain commercial sterility under conditions of non-refrigerated storage and distribution;
- (c) A FOOD that because of its PH or AW value, or interaction of AW and PH values, is designated as a non-TCS FOOD in Table A or B of this definition;
- (d) A FOOD that is designated as Product Assessment Required (PA) in Table A or B of this definition and has undergone a Product Assessment showing that the growth or toxin formation of pathogenic microorganisms that are reasonably likely to occur in that FOOD Is precluded due to:

- (i) Intrinsic factors including added or natural characteristics of the FOOD such as preservatives, antimicrobials, humectants, acidulants, or nutrients,
- (ii) Extrinsic factors including environmental or operational factors that affect the FOOD such as packaging, modified atmosphere such as REDUCED OXYGEN PACKAGING, shelf life and use, or temperature range of storage and use, or
- (iii) A combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors; or

(e) A FOOD that does not support the growth or toxin formation of pathogenic microorganisms in accordance with one of the Subparagraphs (3)(a) - (3)(d) of this definition even though the FOOD may contain a pathogenic microorganism or chemical or physical contaminant at a level sufficient to cause illness or injury.

"USDA" means the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

"Utensil" means a FOOD-CONTACT implement or container used in the storage, preparation, transportation, dispensing, sale, or service of FOOD, such as KITCHENWARE or TABLEWARE that is multi use, SINGLE-SERVICE, or SINGLE-USE; gloves used in contact with FOOD; temperature sensing probes of FOOD TEMPERATURE MEASURING DEVICES; and probe-type price or identification tags used in contact with FOOD.

"Variance" means a written document issued by the REGULATORY AUTHORITY that authorizes a modification or waiver of one or more requirements of this Code if, in the opinion of the REGULATORY AUTHORITY, a health HAZARD or nuisance will not result from the modification or waiver.

"Vending machine" means a self-service device that, upon insertion of a coin, paper currency, token, card, or key, or by optional manual operation, dispenses unit servings of FOOD in bulk or in packages without the necessity of replenishing the device between each vending operation.

"Vending machine location" means the room, enclosure, space, or area where one or more VENDING MACHINES are installed and operated and includes the storage areas and areas on the PREMISES that are used to service and maintain the VENDING MACHINES.

"Warewashing" means the cleaning and SANITIZING of UTENSILS and FOOD-CONTACT SURFACES of EQUIPMENT.

"Whole-muscle, intact beef" means whole muscle beef that is not injected, mechanically tenderized, reconstructed, or scored and marinated, from which beef steaks may be cut.

Employee Food Safety Training Topics Adopted Dec 1, 2015

Topic	Category	Short Description	Risk Delineation
I	Introduction To Food Safety	Burden of foodborne illness	
		Pathogens of most concern	Risk Factors
		CDC risk factors	Risk Factors
		Highly susceptible populations	Priority
II	Reportable Symptoms, Illnesses, Causes; Food Handler Role	Stay home if sick	Priority
		Reportable symptoms (food code)	Priority
		Reportable illnesses (food code)	Priority Foundation
III	Personal Hygiene and Hand Washing	Clean clothing	
		Washing hands and arms: How, When, Facility needs	Priority
		Fingernails	Priority Foundation
		Jewelry	
		Proper eating, drinking and tobacco use	
		Hair restraints	
		Glove use	Priority Foundation
		Bare hand contact with ready-to-eat foods	Priority Foundation
IV	Avoiding Contamination and Cross-contamination	Preventing contamination: ice	Priority
		Preventing contamination: equipment, utensils	
		Preventing contamination: produce washing	
		Preventing contamination: proper food storage (location, storage hierarchy)	Priority
V	Allergen Control	8 main categories	
		Major symptoms	
VI	Time and Temperature Control PHF/TCS	Cooking	Priority
		Cooling	Priority Foundation
		Thawing	
		Reheating	Priority
		Hot holding	Priority
		Cold holding	Priority

		Date marking	Priority Foundation
VII	Cleaning and Sanitizing	Chemical use and storage (sanitizers)	Priority Foundation
		Chemical use and storage (chemicals)	Priority Foundation
		Wiping cloths	
		Dish washing: Mechanical, Manual	Priority Foundation
		Hot water	Priority Foundation