



National Environmental Health Association

303-756-9090
720 S. Colorado Blvd., Ste. 105A, Denver, CO 80246-1910
staff@neha.org

The National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) represents more than 6,700 governmental, private, academic, and uniformed services sector environmental health professionals in the U.S., its territories, and internationally. NEHA is the profession's strongest advocate for excellence in the practice of environmental health as it delivers on its mission to build, sustain, and empower an effective environmental health workforce.

Policy Statement on the U.S. Food and Drug Administration Model *Food Code*

Adopted: June 2022

Policy Sunset: June 2025

NEHA believes that complete adoption of the current U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) model *Food Code* in retail food establishments will likely reduce the incidence of foodborne illnesses. NEHA recognizes that wide jurisdictional variability exists in the adoption and implementation of the current FDA *Food Code*. A retail food establishment includes certain businesses that sell food directly to consumers as its primary function along with food service establishments, such as restaurants, corner stores, bar and lounges, and temporary food service events.

NEHA recommends the complete adoption and implementation of the most recent version of the FDA *Food Code* by all federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial governmental agencies to promote the most current knowledge on food safety. In addition to adopting the *Food Code*, NEHA recommends the following for federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial governmental agencies:

- Ensure that jurisdictions have the appropriate funding, resources, and guidance needed to implement the most current FDA *Food Code* and understand the cross-cutting benefits of adoption for consumers, industry, and regulatory agencies.
- Ensure that food safety jurisdictions at all levels of government, including territorial government agencies and tribal jurisdictions, are engaged in decision-making conversations around the adoption and implementation of the most current *Food Code*.
- Enroll in the FDA Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards) and comply with Standard 1 on regulatory foundation. This standard is an important component of a comprehensive strategic approach for consistency and to help ensure the safety and security of the food supply at the retail level.
- Encourage use of the inspection form in the most current version of the *Food Code* Annex 7 to ensure consistent violation language across all jurisdictions in the U.S. and its territories.

- Participate in the Conference for Food Protection to provide perspective and insight into the challenges faced by jurisdictions when updating to the most current *Food Code*.

Analysis

The FDA *Food Code* is a model code for safeguarding public health and represents FDA’s best advice for a uniform system of provisions that addresses the safety and protection of food offered at retail food and food service industries (Food and Drug Administration [FDA], 2021; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2017). Historically, model codes were developed to assist state and local governments to initiate and maintain effective programs for the prevention of foodborne illness. Today, FDA’s purpose in maintaining an updated *Food Code* is to assist food control jurisdictions at all levels of government by providing them with a scientifically sound, technical, and legal basis for regulating the retail segment of the food industry (FDA, 2020). There are more than 3,000 state, local, tribal, and territorial government agencies that have the primary responsibility of regulating retail food and food service industries in the U.S. (FDA, 2021).

The *Food Code* is not law or a mandated regulation. It is a model code and a useful reference document that provides uniform guidance on food safety and sanitation for federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial agencies. These agencies regulate food service operations in institutions such as restaurants, retail food stores, food vendors, schools, hospitals, assisted-living facilities, nursing homes, and childcare centers (Marcason, 2014). Industry and government officials have long recognized the advantages of a well-written, scientifically sound, and up-to-date model code (FDA, 2020). Conformance with acceptable procedures and practices is far more likely when regulatory officials “speak with one voice” about what is required to reduce foodborne illness and protect the public health, why it is important, and what compliance alternatives might be acceptable (FDA, 2020).

As the retail food industry evolves, the *Food Code* is updated with evidence-based methods for combatting risk factors related to foodborne illness. From 1997–2019, seven editions of the *Food Code* have been released. FDA issues a new edition of the *Food Code* every 4 years and supplementals are released in the intervening 2 years to reflect the most current research (Marcason, 2014). Local and tribal organizations might not be required to use the same version as their surrounding state jurisdictions and are able to create unique regulations. Therefore, there is a wide variety of editions and unique regulations in place across the country. Varying versions and application differences in the *Food Code* not only cause confusion but also may contribute to the incidence of foodborne illness.

There is substantial evidence that public health, economic, and societal costs of foodborne illness may be astronomical. The Economic Research Service (ERS) within the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has estimated the cost of foodborne illnesses from 15 major pathogens that are responsible for more than 95% of illnesses and deaths from foodborne illnesses. The ERS mean estimate for the total annual cost of foodborne illness associated with noroviruses in 2018 was over \$2.5 billion (Hoffman & Ahn, 2021). Overall, the economic impact for foodborne illness associated with the 15 pathogens studied was calculated to be \$ 17.5 billion annually (Hoffman & Ahn, 2021). The uniform adoption of the *Food Code*, due to the inclusion of provisions for reducing foodborne illness outbreaks, will likely reduce costs for restaurants, states, consumers, and the country.

Justification

Collectively and individually, FDA, the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) work with federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial agencies to ensure that consumers are protected from foodborne illness. Each agency seeks to address the control of foodborne illness risk factors through various studies and initiatives, many of which stem from public health provisions within the *Food Code*.

The FDA Retail Program Standards define what constitutes a highly effective and responsive program for the regulation of food service and retail food establishments. The standards provide a foundation and system that all regulatory programs can build by promoting continuous improvement of food safety inspection programs. These standards promote the adoption of evidence-based rules and regulations, such as the *Food Code*, for retail food regulatory programs to follow. Enrollment in the program increases communication between FDA and federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial governments. It also encourages national uniform adoption of the most current *Food Code*.

CDC has identified five risk factors associated with foodborne illness in the retail food industry: poor personal hygiene, improper food holding temperatures, contaminated equipment, inadequate cooking temperatures, and food obtained from unsafe sources (Bean et al., 1996). More than one half of foodborne illness outbreaks are connected to restaurants or other commercial food outlets (Angelo et al., 2017). To avoid these risk factors and improve the safety of commercial kitchens, Shaw (2017) recommended training workers in food management courses and food handling programs, conducting self-inspections, conducting third-party inspections, and using temperature logs. These risk-reducing actions are associated with lower levels of foodborne illness (Shaw, 2017). Implementation of the current version of the *Food Code* ensures that new evidence-based knowledge is being applied to address these risk factors and that the most current food safety management systems and protocols are being followed in commercial kitchens.

Food safety management systems are a set of actions (e.g., procedures, training, monitoring) intended to promote food safety and decrease foodborne illness within retail food establishments. The U.S. has multiple food safety management systems with varying degrees of implementation and requirements throughout the country (FDA, 2018). One way to provide physical, written evidence that a retail food establishment is following the *Food Code* is the development and implementation of standard operating procedures. Implementation of standard operating procedures for a retail food establishment improve areas such as food safety, training tools and references for staff, process consistency, and mistake reduction (Truitt, 2018).

Training and Certification

Trained and certified food employees are instrumental in developing and maintaining a successful food safety management system. Having a certified food protection manager on staff is associated with many benefits, including better inspection scores, fewer foodborne illness outbreaks, safer food preparation practices, and cost-effectiveness (Lipcsei & Kambhampati, 2016). The *Food Code* provides guidelines for the assignment of responsibility, demonstration of knowledge, and certification of food protection managers, which strengthen food safety management systems (FDA, 2022). Uniform adoption of the current version of the *Food Code* would create a level regulatory landscape as a foundation to a nationwide food safety management system that promotes food safety and likely decreases foodborne illness.

In 2016, CDC released a report focused on determining whether food establishments were meeting four provisions from the 2013 *Food Code*: 1) preventing ill staff from working for at least 24 hours after symptoms ceased, 2) preventing bare hand contact with ready-to-eat foods, 3) requiring food service staff to wash their hands, and 4) requiring at least one staff member to become a certified food protection manager. The report found only 17 states had adopted all four of these provisions (Lipcsei & Kambhampati, 2016). Lack of compliance with these items is associated with food safety issues, including norovirus outbreaks from contaminated food (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). Uniform adoption of the current version of the *Food Code* ensures that these protection measures for food safety are in place for a retail food establishment to achieve compliance. Additionally, poor hand hygiene has been shown to be a significant cause of food contamination and only one third of employees wash their hands when they should (Lipcsei & Kambhampati, 2016).

Although use of the *Food Code* is not legally mandated, NEHA recommends complete adoption and implementation of the most current version. Benefits associated with complete adoption of the current *Food Code* include ensuring better retail food service compliance, relying on up-to-date scientific knowledge, and improving public health performance of restaurants. In addition, adoption of the current version is associated with improved consumer knowledge and reduced costs to society (FDA, 2020). Provisions in the *Food Code* also support objectives of Healthy People 2030, a set of national public health promotion goals established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Nationwide uniform implementation of the most current version of the *Food Code* ensures that evidence-based research used to promote food safety will reduce the incidence of foodborne illness and the economic burden associated with foodborne illness for industry, health agencies, and the public.

References

- Angelo, K.M., Nisler, A.L., Hall, A.J., Brown, L.G., & Gould, L.H. (2017). Epidemiology of restaurant-associated foodborne disease outbreaks, United States, 1998–2013. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 145(3), 523–534. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268816002314>
- Bean, N.H., Goulding, J.S., Lao, C., & Angulo, F.J. (1996). Surveillance for foodborne-disease outbreaks—United States, 1988–1992. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, CDC Surveillance Summaries*, 45(SS-5). <https://www.cdc.gov/foodsafety/fdoss/pdf/mmwr-surveillance-for-foodborne-disease-outbreaks-united-states-1988-1992.pdf>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014, June 3). *Norovirus is the leading cause of disease outbreaks from contaminated food in the U.S.* [Press release]. <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2014/p0603-norovirus.html>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2018). *FDA report on the occurrence of foodborne illness risk factors in fast food and full-service restaurants, 2013–2014.* <https://www.fda.gov/media/117509/download>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2020). *Benefits associated with complete adoption and implementation of the FDA Food Code.* <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/FoodCode/ucm494616.htm>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2021). *Retail food protection.* <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/ucm2006807.htm>

Food and Drug Administration. (2022). *Standardization of retail food safety inspection personnel*. <https://www.fda.gov/food/retail-food-protection/standardization-retail-food-safety-inspection-personnel>

Hoffman, S., & Ahn, J.-W. (2021, April 2). Economic cost of major foodborne illnesses increased \$2 billion from 2013 to 2018. *Amber Waves*. <https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2021/april/economic-cost-of-major-foodborne-illnesses-increased-2-billion-from-2013-to-2018/>

Lipcsei, L., & Kambhampati, A. (2016). Improving food safety through prevention: CDC's food safety prevention status report. *Journal of Environmental Health*, 79(2), 46–48. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29116709/>

Marcason, W. (2014). Was there a recent update to the FDA Food Code? *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 114(2), 336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2013.12.007>

Shaw, F.L. (2017, March 22). Confessions of a health inspector: What is that mystery meat? *Food Management*. <https://www.food-management.com/management/confessions-health-inspector-what-mystery-meat>

Truitt, K.W. (2018, September). The importance of standard operating procedures. *Camping Magazine*. <https://www.acacamps.org/resource-library/camping-magazine/importance-standard-operating-procedures>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Food and Drug Administration. (2017). *Food Code: 2017 Recommendations of the United States Public Health Service Food and Drug Administration*. <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/food/guidanceregulation/retailfoodprotection/foodcode/ucm595140.pdf>

Originally Drafted in 2019 by NEHA Committee Members

Eric Bradley, MPH, REHS, CP-FS, DAAS

Environmental Health Coordinator
Scott County Health Department

Mary Cartagena

Team Leader, Retail Food Policy Team
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition/Office of Food Safety

Casey Gardner, MESH, REHS, CP-FS

Environmental Health Technical Specialist/District Standardization Officer
Peninsula Health District

Donald Howell

Director of Quality Assurance, Food Safety
Ascent Hospitality Management, Huddle House Restaurants & Perkins Bakery & Restaurants

Adam Kramer, MPH, ScD, RS, CFS

U.S. Public Health Service
Water, Food, and Environmental Health Services Branch, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Glenda R. Lewis, MSPH

Director, Retail Food Protection Staff
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition/Office of Food Safety

CDR Jeff Tarrant

U.S. Public Health Service

D'Ann L. Williams, MS, DrPH, LEHS

Chief, Center for Food Emergency Response and Defense
Maryland Department of Health

Updated in 2022 by NEHA Food Safety Program Committee Members and Staff

Yuma Argo, MPH, REHS

Health and Safety Specialist
Stanford University

Eric Bradley, MPH, REHS, CP-FS, DLAAS

Deputy Director
Linn County Public Health

Christopher Eddy, MPH, REHS, CP-FS

All 1 Health Systems LLC
Grand Canyon University

Donald Howell

Director of Quality Assurance, Food Safety
Ascent Hospitality Management, Huddle House Restaurants & Perkins Bakery & Restaurants

Tom Sidebottom

Regulatory Consultant

Rebecca Wynne, CP-FS, REHS

Director of Total Quality
Darden Restaurants

Laura Wildey, CP-FS

Senior Program Analyst, Food Safety
National Environmental Health Association

Edited by:

Kristen Ruby-Cisneros

Managing Editor, *Journal of Environmental Health*
National Environmental Health Association