



CATHY A. RAEVSKY, DIRECTOR

MARK A. LUNDBERG, M.D., M.P.H., HEALTH OFFICER

WWW.BUTTECOUNTY.NET/PUBLICHEALTH

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION

FOOD SAFETY ADVISORY GROUP

MINUTES

JUNE 18, 2013

TAHOE ROOM ** 202 MIRA LOMA DRIVE, OROVILLE

I. Preliminary Items

A. Call to Order

Linda called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

B. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Brian Wong (large restaurant), John Geiger (mobile food facility), Heather Hacking (news media), Stephen Kenny (community event organizer), Chris Kerston (farmer's market/local food), and Linda Baker (school nutrition) were present. Dean McKelvey (minimart), Adam Urgeago (small restaurant), and Mike Ward (large market) were absent.

C. Introduction of Guests

Antionette Van Gundy (Gridley Unified School District and Butte County Fair), Analise Farmer and Jenna Hunter (The Hunter and The Farmer MFF), and Peter Bridge attended as guests. Brad Banner, Kimberly Hunt, Jennifer Veilleaux, Megan Herrenkohl (intern), and Mart Brown (Department IT) attended the meeting on behalf of the Public Health Department.

D. Minutes from Previous Meeting

Chris made a motion to approve the minutes as written. John seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

E. Public Comment

None.

II. Informational Non-Action Items

A. Presentation on San Diego County's Grading Program

1. Liz Pozzebon, Assistant Director of San Diego Environmental Health, gave a webinar presentation focusing on the ABC grading program in her jurisdiction. Copies of the PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to those in attendance at the meeting.

TEL- 530.538.7281
FAX- 530.538.5339

202 MIRA LOMA DRIVE
OROVILLE, CA 95965

2. Following Liz's presentation Brad pointed out that the advisory group has now heard from the three primary food safety leaders in the State: (1) The USFDA, (2) Sacramento County Environmental Management, and (3) San Diego Department of Environmental Health.
3. The group discussed the relative merits of the placarding system and the grading system. It was generally agreed that there only needed to be three levels of grading: (1) Good, (2) Needs Improvement, and (3) Unacceptable. The group felt that the ABC grading might be confusing to the public because it would imply that C was an acceptable average grade. The need for greater public access to inspection records was also discussed as an important component of the program. Implementation of either of the approaches would probably have a two year timeline that would include a pilot trial.
4. [Chris made a motion that staff return to the next meeting with an outline of how a placarding system would be implemented and spell out in more detail for how facility placard designations would be determined. John seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.](#)

B. Updated Online Inspection Reports

Mart demonstrated the upgrades made thus far to the Internet display of Butte County food facility inspection reports, and then demonstrated Orange County's inspection reporting as an example of what will be implemented in Butte County.

C. Next Steps for QR Code

Brad explained that the posting of QR codes will be a part of any placarding or grading system and will need to be incorporated into a county ordinance.

D. Multi-Lingual Food Safety Resources

Mart gave a demonstration of the multi-lingual food safety resources that are now found under the "Retail Food" link on the EH webpage.

III. Action Items

A. Mobile Food Facility Issues and Challenges

1. Brad presented the rationale for providing MFFs with greater operational flexibility and discussed public health impact of proposed changes in the interpretation of the California Retail Food Code. The following issues were discussed:
 - a. Can potentially hazardous food be held hot on a food cart not equipped for ware washing?
 - b. Can tents be used in conjunction with a MFF?
 - c. Can MFFs have an outside BBQ?

2. Peter raised a number of cautionary issues, including potential problems from of not following the code as written, concerns about having different requirements from those in neighboring counties, liability in case someone becoming ill, and the need for fairness and equity in how requirements are applied. In other words, if one potentially hazardous food product can be hot held in a MFF, then the same allowance should be made for MFFs hot holding different potentially hazardous food products.
3. The group discussed the need for flexibility in application of the code and pointed out that, if Environmental Health takes too rigid of an approach, people will be inclined to avoid the health department rather than obtain permits.

Note: The meeting was running late and the Chair left the meeting at about this point.

4. The group focused its attention for the remaining portion of the meeting on the use of BBQs and other heat sources outside MFFs. [The general consensus of the group was that Environmental Health should explore expanding the definition of a Community Event to allow MFFs with greater flexibility to use BBQs.](#)

IV. **Agenda Preparation for Next Meeting**

- A. At the next meeting, the advisory group will review the updated web presentation of food facility inspections, discuss problems regarding the late payment of permit fees, review more detailed information about implementing a placarding system, complete the discussion of measures to allow MFFs greater operational flexibility, and discuss the responsibility of the owner of a facility (such as the school district) to assure that those using the facility for community events have the required permits.
- B. The group requested that the meetings be held monthly until some of the current issues are resolved. [The next meeting will be the third Tuesday of July, July 16, in the Tahoe Room from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.](#)

V. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.