



Day 1, Tuesday, Feb. 5th, 2019

3:00pm: Produce Safety Workgroup- Regulatory Focus

Filtered farm inventory data sets:

- Purpose to give overview of how data sets filtered and created
- Recommendations for filtered data set
- Set up account to get data sets
- List of farms with farm data inc data
- Huge file tough to use so have filtered through
- Two data sets- all and filtered
- Filtered should be more usable
- Created filtered subset of data to determine commodities would be covered
- 51 of 85 are covered
- Based off of rarely consumed raw list
- Filtered off of produce sales also, use greater than 1million produce sales
- Can filter data on your own
- Data seems accurate and focuses on active produce farms
- Dunn and Bradstreet (D and B) data can be used to create farm inventory
- D and B can be used for cross checking farms, verifying
- Sales data not totally accurate
- Gathering data from public data bases and contacting businesses via email or phone
- Filter data given end of December
- Account will be decommissioned soon, delayed after shutdown
- Will get a new web portal
- Tucker from Vermont filtered original data set and handpicked commodities, new jersey also filtered by hand
- Once Vermont filtered had 700 farm, before had thousands
- Had a lot of useless data before filter
- USDA pays for data like a subscription for access, want to make sure is being used

Discussion items:

1. Abbey Willard from VT

- Vermont team thinking of OFRR- would it be valuable to gather what is being seen on farms after inspections
- To achieve consistency across country
- What surprised to see or what are seeing in compliance
- What resources need to develop, what assistance is needed

Maine department of agriculture

These notes are provided in an attempt to capture the conversations and spirit of the Annual Meeting. It is difficult to capture such events with complete accuracy in writing. If you see an error please make us aware of it by email at necafs@uvm.edu and we will revise the notes.



- Wondering how many phone calls cover same info
- If talking about same things, should not replicate topics on calls
- Can have calls one time
- Can share info with other groups if more regional

Tucker Vermont

- Don't have a good way to keep track of trends or observations from inspections
- Have mechanism for OFRR so should consider for inspections
- There are workgroups to aggregate inspectional data

Aaron NY

- Put educators and regulators on the same page

Rhode Island

- Difference between data and opinion to collect for data from inspections

Aaron NY

- What data should be shared?
- Defined by what data want to keep track of

Vermont

- Following inspection, need to provide support to growers and see where there are challenges and develop resources on, tell extension
- Can also share as a region
- If the end goal is compliance, states and trends will help where need to fill in resources

Does a state have a way to aggregate data?

- Rhode Island- constantly filter their data and enter into excel so can constantly update what they need to do. Use excel with filters. Transcribe into map form now, categorize into topics
- Aaron NY- added new spreadsheet with filters that is saved to FDA version, may start mapping
- Rhode island- mapping good management tools, can filter who need to contact for concerns

Are chain stores willing to help with farm inventory?

- Would have to be checked

Insurance companies as farm data?

These notes are provided in an attempt to capture the conversations and spirit of the Annual Meeting. It is difficult to capture such events with complete accuracy in writing. If you see an error please make us aware of it by email at necafs@uvm.edu and we will revise the notes.



- Might not work out as well
- No other states use

2. Qualified exemptions

- Have you come across farms that don't want to claim exemption?
- RI- some farms want to be qualified and covered since doing it anyway, no big deal for record keeping
- NY- take word for how much they say they are making to be covered or not
- Use calculator to see if people are exempt
- Conn.- register farms with self- identification, inspect anyone who requests it even if not covered
- Maine- also making calculator, fact sheet, link radius with calculator. Would only inspect for minimum of rule if non-compliant requested inspection
- Conn- would want inspection because then buyers may request it. Fear of smaller growers being outed by larger ones that are inspected. Some sellers won't let sell unless inspected
- RI- if federal minimum standards required then should be for all food- what buyers ask. People don't want to be squeezed out if not inspected
- NY- all buyer driven to do this. NY would inspect every two years for suppliers so buyers like it. Farm would have to ask for inspection. Farms eligible for exemption must maintain that they are yearly
- Vermont- based on forms for exemptions, not meant to have market access outcome from inspections. Develop strategy to reach out to buyers
- NY- all stakeholders should be in line with what inspections are
- MA- support uncovered crops if they ask for an inspection
- Conn- if someone asks for inspection it must be given
- Vermont- can condemn adulterated product doesn't matter what it is
- Doreen- cap pays for covered funding, if doing something outside of that, then must tell her
- MA- same infrastructure for covered and uncovered so inspect commons areas
- Conn- do have authority to find a problem reported?
- Vermont- can enter farm if has adulterated even if uncovered- pre PSR, or farms would call and ask, still resides at secrecy level

3. What records will states use for exemptions?

- NY- PSA template would be submitted by owner of farm. If they don't get a qualified exempt form then assume the farm is covered. Must submit the form annually
- Vermont- requirement is for farm to do assessment once a year and keep but don't have to submit it

These notes are provided in an attempt to capture the conversations and spirit of the Annual Meeting. It is difficult to capture such events with complete accuracy in writing. If you see an error please make us aware of it by email at necafs@uvm.edu and we will revise the notes.



- RI- annual review, you are covered unless you say you aren't
- Conn- documents go with registration, have to maintain documents, but don't have to email them to them
- MA- collect info when registering farm, get sales info
- WV- take word in maintaining records, but don't send to them
- Delaware- registration, self- report, if there is a problem would recognize it
- Maine- use what they want as forms that must be submitted annually

4. FDA survey for readiness

- NY- verified 375 farms, 80 large farms, short of goal
- Vermont- exceeded estimation, verified 18 farms
- RI- estimate 310 farms, think is underreported, 1/3 verified, 10 large covered farms
- Maine- supposed to have 2200 produce farms and 500 covered, 14% of farms info have
- Delaware- 150 covered farms, may have more or less, do not have a lot of info on
- Maryland- use gap audits to get list
- Conn- trying to take multi-faceted approach
- NY- regulatory authority store, adopted by reference most subparts of the rule, some did not because thought would be FDA
- Conn- have state law with legislation, perform inspections based off of state law
- Vermont- authority to enforce PSR, citation fixes and more details that legislatures wanted, don't go into details about regulation, just authority for PSR
- MA- statutory authority on supplemental budget, writing before inspections start
- NJ- FDA authority
- NY- wasn't part of deliverables, 150 large farms, goal is to inspect all large farms
- Maine- 30 large farms, will inspect all of them
- Vermont- 18 large farms will inspect all
- NJ- 1300 covered farms, plan to do 35 inspections or more
- Delaware- still identifying farms, probably around 10
- Maryland- 40 inspections of large farms
- Conn- 10 verified large farms, 30 to 50 in Conn
- MA- 53 large covered farms, inspect all
- RI- 10 large covered, will inspect all of them
- NY- has hired all of safety inspectors- have five

These notes are provided in an attempt to capture the conversations and spirit of the Annual Meeting. It is difficult to capture such events with complete accuracy in writing. If you see an error please make us aware of it by email at necafs@uvm.edu and we will revise the notes.



2019 NECAFS Annual Conference Notes

Albany, New York, 02/04/19 through 02/06/19

- Vermont- 2 inspectors hired, maybe a third
- New Hampshire- 2 inspectors
- NJ- 3 inspector, 2 in training
- CA- 5 inspectors
- Ohio- 24 inspectors
- Conn- 3 inspectors with at least 1 more
- MA- 5 inspectors
- Delaware- 1 inspector
- Maryland- 5 inspectors
- RI- 2 inspectors
- Maine- 4 inspectors
- Regulators should attend webinar update
- MA- inspector training, PCQI, harmonized gap, sprouts, audited 20 farms a piece
- NJ- iso training
- Maine- plumbing backflow protection for growers

5. How to adopt enforcement

- Conn- took from other enforcement revisions
- MA- same as Conn
- NY- compliance and food safety divisions, letters and monetary, does not have produce safety specific needs

These notes are provided in an attempt to capture the conversations and spirit of the Annual Meeting. It is difficult to capture such events with complete accuracy in writing. If you see an error please make us aware of it by email at necafs@uvm.edu and we will revise the notes.