Food Safety Inspection Rating Proposal

Food Advisory Board June 10, 2020 Meeting

Amber Gibbar and Kelsie Lane
Food Safety Program
Proposed Timeline

**June 2020**
Get feedback from stakeholders.

**July 2020**
Propose to Board of Health.

**August-December 2020**
Inspectors discuss rating process, signs and placement during inspections.

**December 2020**
Mail rating signs with annual permits.

**February 1, 2021**
All facilities in Pierce County must post rating signs.

**Throughout 2021**
Inspectors work with facilities. No penalty fees for signs.
Information Sharing Goals

• Make it easier to see a facility’s food safety performance.
• Encourage and reward safer food handling.
• Reduce food-related illnesses and outbreaks.
Ratings Based on Risk

We propose:

- Base ratings on red critical points from last 4 routine inspections.
- Red critical violations are likely to cause foodborne illness.
  - Examples:
    - Employee not washing their hands when required
    - Not keeping food hot or cold enough.
    - Improper cooling of potentially hazardous foods.
Signs

Food Safety Inspection

Based on last 4 routine inspections.

See full inspection results at: tpchd.org/rating

Report food safety concerns and illnesses. Contact us at (253) 798-6460, food@tpchd.org or tpchd.org/report.
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“Good” Sign

We propose:

• Up to 135 total red critical points over the last 4 inspections.
• This is an average of 33.75 points per inspection.
• What percent of facilities would get a "Good" sign today?
  • 92% of all facilities.
  • 85% of high risk facilities.
  • 96% of medium risk facilities.
  • 100% of low risk facilities.
“Okay” Sign

We propose:

• 136-299 total red critical points over the last 4 routine inspections.

• What percent of facilities would get an “Okay” sign today?
  • 4% of all facilities.
  • 8.6% of high risk facilities.
  • .04% of medium risk facilities.
  • 0% of low risk facilities.
“Needs to Improve” Sign

We propose:

• 300 or more total red critical points over the last 4 routine inspections.
• Facilities on probation for repeated red violations.
• 100 or more red critical points on a routine inspection.
  • Until they pass a follow-up inspection.
• About 0.1% of facilities would get a “Needs to Improve” sign today.
New Facilities

We propose:

• High and medium risk facilities with only 1 inspection get “We are still so new our rating is being determined” sign.

• 100 or more red critical points gets a “Needs to Improve” sign until they pass a follow-up inspection.

• Low risk facilities will get a rating sign after their first routine inspection.
New High and Medium Risk Facilities

We propose:

- After their second routine inspection:
  - Base the rating on the total number of red critical points from the 2 inspections.
    - A “Good” sign for 85 or less red critical points.
    - An “Okay” sign for 86-180 red critical points.
    - A “Needs to Improve” sign for 180+ red critical points.
New High and Medium Risk Facilities

We propose:

• After their third routine inspection:
  • Base the rating on the total number of red critical points from the 3 inspections.
    • A “Good” sign for 100 or less red critical points.
    • This is an average of 33.33 and is an average of a passing score on all 3 inspections.
  • An “Okay” sign for 101-250 red critical points.
  • A “Needs to Improve” sign for 251 or more red critical points.
New Low Risk Facilities

We propose:

• Low risk facilities are only visited 1 time per year.

• They will receive a rating sign after their first routine inspection:
  • A “Good” sign for up to 50 red critical points.
  • An “Okay” sign for 51-75 red critical points.
  • A “Needs to Improve” sign for 76+ red critical points.

• The rating will be the same as high and medium risk facilities after the second inspection.
Appeals Process

We propose:

• We base food safety ratings on inspection findings. So an appeal of a rating should be based on inspection findings.

• The appeals process follows the same guidelines as our current food inspection appeals process.
Where to post signs?

We propose:

Make information visible and accessible.

- Post signs within 5 feet of the main public entrance to the food establishment.
- Signs must be clearly visible to people passing by or entering the food establishment.
- Place signs in a window or door when possible.
- People should be able to get within 6 inches of the sign to make it more visible and accessible.
- Food inspectors and restaurant staff can work together to post the sign in a place that works for both parties.
Where to post signs?

We propose:

Make signs visible and accessible.

• Post signs at all entrances, including drive-thru window(s).
• Food courts, grocery stores with multiple permits post:
  • By the cash register.
  • On the deli case.
  • On top of the buffet, near the plates/to-go containers.
  • On a wall.
  • On a line partition or stanchion.
Where to post signs?

We propose:

Make signs visible and accessible.

• Do not post:
  • On poles.
  • In the back of the deli or behind the counter.
  • In a window with bars over it or other coverings that make it difficult to read.
  • Partially or fully covered up.

*If signs are not visible and accessible, we will work with the facility to repost the sign. Facilities may receive a penalty fee if the problem continues after enforcement begins.*
Enforcement Policy

We propose:

• Operators/People In Charge (PIC) must follow guidelines and post rating signs at the end of each inspection.

• Inspector will work with the operator to resolve questions about proper placement.

• The inspector may charge the facility a penalty fee if it:
  • Removes the sign.
  • Places the sign in a location that does not meet guidelines.
  • Covers up the sign.

We are working with stakeholders to determine what the penalties will be and how to enforce them.
Questions?

Suggestions?