Today’s discussion

- A review of FLIK’s Food Safety program
- How code changes impact the business
- Case study review
- Q&A
• Founded in 1971
• Corporate dining, private schools, hotels and conference centers, senior living, airport lounges
• 18,000 associates
• 375 sites
• 33 states
• 40,000 meals daily
ever changing food supply chain
onboarding

Orientation
Knowledge Assessment
Centers for Excellence
the process

- Digitized 3rd party reviews
- Internal QA reports
- Incentives and penalties
the process

- Coopers Atkins auditors
  - automated temperature logs
  - customized menus and checklists
  - ensures temperatures are taken
  - prompts corrective actions
the process
• Acuity is our reporting dashboard.
• Our online portals are configured to show the data you need to see.
• Acuity works on desktops, tablets, and smart phones.
• View year-over-year results of data collected not only in Pulse but other sources like SAP and iVend.
• Roll data up by day, week, month, quarter, and year and export images into PowerPoint presentations.
• Create a hierarchy to look at data by region or state or any other customized view.
Comment Analysis

- Display Pulse comments as a word cloud to determine trending words
- View comment ratings to determine overall satisfaction.
the process

- Changing policies

How We Score and Grade

The Health Department inspects about 24,000 restaurants a year to monitor compliance with City and State food safety regulations. Since July 2010, the Health Department has required restaurants to post letter grades showing sanitary inspection results. Restaurants with a score between 0 and 13 points earn an A, those with 14 to 27 points receive a B and those with 28 or more a C. Inspection results are posted on the Health Department’s website.
the process

• What we’ve done to adapt

**Scoring System**

• Based on 100 points
• 85% (85 points) from inspection
• 15% (15 points) from microbial food testing
• Critical and non-critical violations
• Critical items identified in bold print on scoresheet
• Scoring weight placed on the prevention of foodborne illness
the process

Scoring System

• Inspectional score above 90% prior to lab samples
  • Inspections below 90% are deemed unsatisfactory regardless of food samples results
• No more than 1 critical violation

Unsatisfactory Inspection

• Final score below 90%
• Inspectional score below 90% prior to lab results
• 2 or more critical violations
• Generic E. coli positive food or environmental sample in a food area
• Aerobic Plate Count greater than 1 million CFU/gram
the process

New Provisions

• 2 or more repeat non-critical violations from the same category escalated to critical

• Inspector has the authority to fail inspection/initiate a re-inspection if a significant food safety or regulatory hazard is present regardless of score, i.e. the presence of significant insects of any type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Deli slicer observed to have an accumulation of old food residues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Cleaned and sanitized food processor observed to have old food residues present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Food processor blade observed to be damaged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Food contact surfaces of equipment and utensils are designed, constructed, installed, stored and maintained properly.

• 3 point violation – becomes critical.
the process

**Required HACCP Logs**

- All logs must be in paper format until/unless direct permission is received from FLIK Senior Management

Logs categorized as critical are in bold

1. **Allergens**
2. **Production Temperature Log (initial cook step)**
3. **Service/Line Temperature Log (cold/hot hold temperatures at least three per service period)**
4. **Thermometer Calibration Log (once per week)**
5. **Cooling Log**
6. **Receiving Log**
7. **Refrigeration Log**
8. **Ware-washing/Dish Machine Log**
9. **Sanitizer Concentration Log**
10. **Food in Production Log**
11. **Time as a Control Documentation (where applicable)**
Maximization Of Inspections And Reports

- **Corrective Action**
  - Performed ASAP
  - Clearly Defined Best Practice
  - Given Full Support

- **Verification**
  - Performed By Supervisor/Manager And Documented
  - Daily For Food Safety Logs (HACCP Logs)

- **Accountability**
  - Ownership
  - Clearly Delegated Responsibilities
  - Employment Record/Non-Compliance Documentation.
a case study
a case study

- Ciguatera Toxin

* A key culprit in climate change — carbon emissions — can also help agriculture by enhancing photosynthesis in many important (...) crops such as wheat, rice, and soybeans. The science, however, is far from certain on the benefits of carbon fertilisation.*

This map represents the case of beneficial carbon fertilisation processes.

Source: Cline W., 2007, Global Warming and Agriculture.
the process

- Ciguatera fish poisoning (or ciguatera) is an illness caused by eating fish that contain toxins produced by a marine microalga called Gambierdiscus toxicus.

Fish Identification

Barracuda, black grouper, blackfin snapper, cubera snapper, dog snapper, greater amberjack, hogfish, horse-eye jack, king mackerel, and yellowfin grouper have been known to carry ciguatoxins.
the process

- Washington, DC Major law firm, *Ciguatera Toxin*
to me, Carlos, John, Jason, Glenn

Good afternoon All,

The name of the M/V is Unleashed, the captain was Zane Albury. The amberjack were caught outside of Molasses Reef in Key Largo Florida, area fished was 31.

Please let us know if any further assistance is needed?

Thank you,

Tim
Profish
Customers Receiving Amberjack

Profish has provided the below list of other customers receiving the Amberjack:

1. Chartwell Country Club
2. Family Meal- Richmond
3. Le Grenier
4. District Commons
5. Henlopen City Oyster
6. Restaurant Depot
7. Marriott Suites- Bethesda
8. Sandy Run Country Club
9. Radnor Valley Country Club
## Action Plan/Status Updates

### Call Attendees:
Scott Davis, Bill Chodan, Peter Suguero, Marcia Andere, David Joyce, Cherl Buchanan, Molly Cunningham, Ginny Woerner, Lisa Westfall, Sandra Koehler, Laurent Chassot

### 9.21.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Staff Training | • Basic knowledge assessment on food handling test to be given to both offices (given to both)  
• Follow up targeted training on any deficiencies  
• All staff in both offices Serv Safe Certified by 9.30 (NYC & CDC)  
• Knowledge assessment re-test to be taken within 15 days: NY - 9.29, DC - 9.24  
• Monthly plan along with policies around testing to be completed by Oct 1 | ALL/Marcia |
| 2     | Weekly Menus & Partner's Menu Review | • Weekly menus are being reviewed each week (Adam, Peter, David)  
• Partner's lunch menu: no fish/shellfish, nuts  
• List of banned fish was sent to DC and NYC  
• When can fish go back on the menu? Adam checking with Scott and Kit  
• No nuts or alcohol to be served | Adam/Peter/David |
| 3     | DC Department of Health Lab Results | • Marcia has contacted Health Inspector as we still do not have any results and no re-inspection has occurred as of 9.16  
• Waiting on program manager to contact us with results | Marcia |
| 4     | Position Statement | • Create position statement document so that both offices understand where the critical control points are so they don't happen again  
• Associates signoff on document  
• Drafting position statement on incident for associates to sign, to be signed by 9.25 by associates | Adam/Marcia/Ginny |
| 5     | HD Actions Plan for 9.1 Inspection | • Received from Cherl on 9.14  
• Everything has been completed on plan  
• NYC to review plan and check kitchen to ensure compliance to plan | Cherl |

### COMPLETE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daily Update Calls - NYC &amp; DC</td>
<td>• Invitation sent out</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2     | Knowledge Assessment Test | • Team at both locations have taken test  
• Retests will be given in 15 days after initial exam if needed. | UNIT | Complete |
**Wednesday, August 19, 2015**

- **9:30am**
  - Laura Bartee approached Cheri about Partners being sick

- **10:00am**
  - Cheri called Marcia (HR) immediately after being informed of illness
  - Informed Chef of illness
  - Marcia asked Cheri to send menu, save any food and get information on Partners symptoms

- **10:15am**
  - Marcia called Peter and left voicemail

- **10:20am**
  - Peter returned Marcia’s call

- **10:25am**
  - Peter e-mailed Cheri protocol information
  - Bill contacted about possibility of foodborne illness

- **10:27am**
  - Cheri informed the Chef to freeze any leftovers

- **10:30**
  - Marcia notified Tonya (QA Manager)
  - Cheri reached out to Charlene (Client) to notify of situation

- **11:30am**
  - Marcia called Dr. Kramer (EHA)
  - List of partner names was received for HR

- **12:15pm**
  - Joe Levine came to Cleary for support and reiterated to the Chef to freeze samples

- **1:30pm**
  - EHA came to location for sample

- **3:07pm**
  - E-mail was sent out to Partners involved asking for information for FLIK to contact them for symptoms (E-mail from Katherine Krents)

- **3:29pm**
  - Approval to reach out to Partners started coming in via e-mail

- **4:30pm**
  - Marcia called Gallagher and provided names and contact information but was unable to provide symptoms

---

**Thursday, August 20, 2015**

- **8:52am**
  - First indication of symptoms reported via e-mail
  - Peter immediately reported symptoms to EHA

- **10:48am**
  - Bill contacted via e-mail of the early symptoms of Mark Nelson and Derrick Bush

- **1:00pm**
  - Bill began calling the Partners to interview for symptoms. Called Derrick Bush, Mark Nelson, Brian Byrne (could not reach at home). Mitch Dooler (was traveling out of country and could not be reached)

- **PM**
  - Found out the fish was Amberjack and not Rockfish and Chef was suspended pending investigation
  - Peter e-mailed team with initial findings and what the plan was

---

**Monday, August 24, 2015**

- Received two additional Partners, Ken Bachman and Richard Hines, that ate at the lunch and interviewed them
Negotiations

- 8 partners confirmed positive for **Ciguatera Toxin**
- Lost work days
- Lost income to the firm
- Major client

The Ask

- $350K
- Insurance deductible: $500K
- Return of service?
Questions?