

# Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board

## Meeting Summary

Thursday, November 1, 2018

9:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Minnesota Counties Intergovernmental Trust, St. Paul, MN | Vidyo (remote option)

### Members Present and Absent:

Name	Organization	Present	Absent
Dawn Beck (co-chair)	Olmsted County	X	
Amanda Buell	Hennepin County		X
Daniel Disrud	Anoka County	X	
Ruth Greenslade	Goodhue County	X (remote)	
Bill Groskreutz	Faribault County Commissioner	X	
Tom Hogan (co-chair)	Minnesota Department of Health	X (remote)	
Kristine Lee	Countryside Public Health	X (remote)	
Jeff Luedeman	Minnesota Department of Agriculture	X	
Sarah Reese	Polk County	X (remote)	
John Tracy	Stearns County	X	
John Weinand	City of Minnetonka	X	

### Other Meeting Participants:

*Paul Allwood, Minnesota Department of Health, Environmental Health Division; Ryan Krick, City of Minneapolis; Kari Oldfield, Local Public Health Association (LPHA); Amy Zagar, Hennepin County*

### Facilitators:

*Megan Drake-Pereyra, Chelsie Huntley, and Kerri Sawyer, Minnesota Department of Health, Center for Public Health Practice (PHP)*

### Welcome and Introductions

The Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board's (EHCIB) co-chair, Dawn Beck, Olmsted County, welcomed everyone to the November meeting.

Ms. Beck reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives.

Meeting Objectives:

1. Test FPLS statewide conversations.
2. Review EPH Framework.
3. Determine new membership structure.

Ms. Beck continued by asking meeting participants to introduce themselves. She acknowledged both EHCIB members and other meeting participants and invited everyone to fully participate in the meeting.

## **FPLS Statewide Performance Measures**

At its September 2018 meeting, the EHCIB decided to host statewide conversations to help identify potential statewide performance measures that demonstrate FPLS' impact on reducing the risk of illness. At this meeting, the EHCIB did a pilot test of the conversation questions.

Megan Drake-Pereyra, MDH PHP, shared the general purpose and plan for the statewide conversations. Then meeting participants tested one set of discussion questions and debriefed about how it went. The overall purpose of the statewide conversations is to:

- Gain a better understanding of what is most important to prevent foodborne illness outbreaks in the context of food inspections – and why.
- Identify examples of how programs go about their work, including innovative ideas that have proven successful.
- Identify how the EHCIB may want to measure and track this work in biannual FPLS statewide performance measure reporting in the future.

MDH PHP staff developed three sets of discussion questions based on who will be participating in the conversations. MDH and MDA food safety staff will be one group. Locally delegated FPLS staff are another group. Local non-delegated public health leaders are the third group.

At this meeting, participants tested the questions designed for MDH and MDA staff, which were similar to those designed for locally delegated FPLS staff ([Appendix A](#)). After testing the questions, they reflected on how the conversation went. Overall, meeting participants felt the questions made sense, were challenging yet able to be answered, and were excited about the information the conversations will provide. The only change participants recommended was to clarify the difference between outreach and engagement – possibly pick just one to focus the questions. Meeting participants also recommended that MDH, MDA, and locally delegated programs be together in the same conversation; there is no need for separate conversations.

Meeting participants continued by reviewing the questions designed for local non-delegated public health ([Appendix B](#)). Overall, questions one through four about food safety seemed hard to answer

and intimidating for people who do not consider themselves experts in food safety. The questions may need to be removed or changed to reflect measures that may be possible. The second section of questions focused on getting feedback on the 2017 FPLS statewide performance measures reports. Meeting participants felt this might be a better place to start the conversation. After more discussion, meeting participants felt the purpose of the conversation with non-delegated local public health might be different from the original intent. It may be a better use of time to focus on understanding their needs and requirements concerning communication and what they need to know. Based on this, MDH PHP staff will create a new set of questions and share them with the EHCIB at its January 2019 meeting.

Lastly, meeting participants discussed how to recruit for these statewide conversations. There was agreement that having a variety of perspectives and multiple levels of representation at these conversations is important. Meeting participants' preference was to hold these conversations in-person and that at least one EHCIB member could attend each. One suggestion was to attach the conversations to meetings already scheduled in order to reduce travel burden (e.g. LPHA, regulators breakfast, food safety partnership, etc.). MDH PHP staff will inquire about 2019 meetings and try to schedule the conversations. Once scheduled, EHCIB members will try to recruit via their constituencies.

More information about the statewide conversations and the FPLS statewide performance measures is forthcoming.

## **Environmental Public Health Framework**

The EHCIB's efforts to develop an environmental public health framework for MN align with the State Community Health Services Advisory Committee's (SCHSAC) efforts to [Strengthen Public Health in Minnesota \(http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/opi/pm/schsac/wkgrp/strengthen.html\)](http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/opi/pm/schsac/wkgrp/strengthen.html). As part of this work, SCHSAC is working with public health staff across MN to identify foundational public health services in all areas of public health. To introduce EHCIB meeting participants to foundational public health services, Chelsie Huntley, MDH PHP, shared this [video about Foundational Public Health Services \(https://vimeo.com/204406975\)](https://vimeo.com/204406975). Ms. Huntley then explained that the EHCIB would complete an activity to help identify the foundational public health services in the area of environmental health. This activity would help to further the EHCIB's efforts to develop an environmental public health framework for MN.

For this activity, meeting participants looked at a foundational public health services national model and three other states' models (Washington, Oregon, and Kansas). They looked at these models thinking about what governmental public health in MN must do and what language worked best for MN. From this, they created a draft of foundational public health services in environmental health for MN. MDH PHP staff will summarize all the input and create a clean draft. This draft will be brought back to the EHCIB for review.

## EHCIB Membership Structure

Based on feedback at the September 2018 EHCIB, Ms. Drake-Pereyra presented a new membership structure ([Appendix C](#)). The purpose of changing the EHCIB's membership structure is to:

- Get more faces at the table
- Include members who represent other areas of EH, outside of FPLS
- Increase representation from non-delegated jurisdictions
- Improve other state agency involvement

Meeting participants discussed the new membership structure. Overall, they liked the regional division because it will help to increase feedback and involvement across the state. However, some felt the membership still seemed dominated by FPLS and it did not specifically include other areas of environmental public health. It also does not bring in other groups outside of government. Since the EHCIB's charge is to fundamentally advance the state-local partnership in environmental public health, participants felt this was okay and others could be brought in as needed. It was also noted that in this structure the metro and non-metro delegated community health boards (CHBs) each lose one member and non-delegated CHBs gain two members. Meeting participants felt this was okay given the purpose of changing the membership structure.

Meeting participants also brought up the challenge this membership structure may encounter: getting more non-delegated people to be members. Because many do not feel they are experts in environmental public health, they are uncertain how they contribute to a group like the EHCIB. To help recruit new members, the EHCIB co-chairs will meet with LPHA staff and leaders to discuss a recruitment strategy.

With all present EHCIB members in favor, the EHCIB's charter will be updated with the new membership structure. Ms. Beck and Tom Hogan, MDH EH, will present the new membership structure for approval by SCHSAC at its upcoming meeting in December.

## Business Items

### Member Updates

There were no member updates.

### Word on the Street

The MDA delegation agreement has not progressed too much. The field evaluation piece is the main area still in negotiation.

### Constituent Engagement

Ms. Beck and Mr. Hogan provided an update to SCHSAC at its October 2018 meeting, which occurred the day before the Community Health Conference. A couple environmental health professionals and groups were presented with awards at the Community Health Awards Ceremony.

Ruth received some feedback from her constituents. She had asked for feedback on the reports or other ways they hear about FPLS information in their communities. Most liked the reports and often share them with their boards. One CHB has quarterly in-person meetings with MDH EH staff. Another CHB noted that they mostly hear from the public, not from MDH directly.

#### FPLS Program Evaluation Workgroup Update

There were two, 30-minute phone calls scheduled: October 1, noon, and October 2, 11 a.m. Ms. Beck, Mr. Hogan, and Jason Kloss, SWHHS, lead the calls. The calls provided an update and snapshot of what is coming.

The workgroup plans to have all the details complete and ready to share at the January 2019 EHCIB meeting.

#### 2019 Meeting Venues

We were able to secure MCIT again for all six EHCIB meetings scheduled in 2019. The back-up venue is DHS, which has Vidyo rooms available for use. Because DHS has limited parking and is a secure building (making entry a little more complicated), the EHCIB will use MCIT and its portable Vidyo unit again in 2019.

#### Approve September 2018 Meeting Summary

John Weinand, City of Minnetonka, made a motion to approve the [September 2018 meeting summary \(http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/2018/sepsummary.pdf\)](http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/2018/sepsummary.pdf) and Dan Disrud, Anoka County, seconded the motion. No additional changes were made.

## **Take-home Points, Action Items, and Adjournment**

Meeting participants agreed on the following take-home points and action items.

#### Take-home points:

- The Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board (EHCIB) welcomes all members and guests to participate in its meetings. A remote participation option is now available for all EHCIB meetings. A link to join remotely is included with each meeting agenda and all that is required is an internet connection via a smartphone, tablet, or computer. Consider joining the next meeting on Thursday, January 3, 2018, 9:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. More details and the agenda will be posted on the [EHCIB website \(http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/#materials\)](http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/#materials) at least one week prior to the meeting.
- New Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board (EHCIB) members are needed! Consider applying to be part of a team working to improve the state-local partnership in environmental public health. Watch for more information on how to apply in early 2019.

- The Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board (EHCIB) agreed on a new membership structure. The EHCIB plans to present its new membership structure for approval by the State Community Health Services Advisory Committee (SCHSAC) at SCHSAC's December 2019 meeting. As the EHCIB expands its focus into other environmental health topic areas, more participation is needed from a broader set of stakeholders. The EHCIB thinks its new membership structure better represents the breadth of environmental health topics and the different regions in Minnesota. A copy of the new membership structure is included in the full November 2018 meeting summary on the [EHCIB website \(http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/#materials\)](http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/#materials).
- Watch for more information about the [Food, pools, and lodging services \(FPLS\) statewide performance measures \(http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/#performance\)](http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/#performance). They will be reported again in spring 2019 (2018 data). Changes from 2017 reporting (2016 data) include:
  - Only staff qualifications and on-time inspections will be reported.
  - Staff qualifications (number of inspectors standardized, etc.) will be reported by agency or jurisdiction. This means multi-jurisdiction FPLS programs will not have to separate staff qualifications information by county as they did in 2017. MDH and MDA will also report staff qualifications overall since staff cover multiple counties.
  - On-time inspections will be reported the same as before, by county. MDH and MDA will provide their on-time inspections data by county as well.
  - Conversations will be conducted with public health leaders and FPLS program staff across the state. These conversations will help to identify potential statewide performance measures that demonstrate FPLS' impact on reducing the risk of illness. Watch for more information about how to participate.
- The Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board (EHCIB) reviewed foundational public health services in the area of environmental health from a national model and three other states (WA, OR, KS), and created a draft for MN. The activity furthered the EHCIB's efforts to develop an environmental public health framework for MN and aligns with the State Community Health Services Advisory Committee's (SCHSAC) efforts to [Strengthen Public Health in Minnesota \(http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/opi/pm/schsac/wkgrp/strengthen.html\)](http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/opi/pm/schsac/wkgrp/strengthen.html). More to come on this work in the future.

Action Items

- MDH PHP staff will do the following:
  - Continue to work with MDH EH staff to update or create draft inventories of other EH topics for the EPH framework
  - Coordinate meetings with LPHA and SCHSAC regarding the EHCIB's new proposed membership structure and recruitment strategies
  - Continue to prepare for the FPLS statewide performance measures by:
    - Completing the instructions
    - Developing communications plans and materials
    - Scheduling the statewide conversations in coordination with LPHA and other EH meetings around the state
    - Developing a new proposed set of questions for non-FPLS delegated local health department participants

The next EHCIB meeting is Thursday, January 3, 2018 at MCIT in St. Paul, MN (free parking is available). A remote option is offered using Vidyo, which can be accessed via computers, tablets, mobile devices.

## Appendix A: MDH/MDA Statewide Conversation – Draft Questions

### Food Safety – General

1. What do you consider most meaningful or important to promoting and ensuring food safety?  
Prompt: Why?
2. What does a high quality, food-safety program look like to you?  
Prompt: What are some key elements? What are some examples of how you could demonstrate or understand these elements are going well?
3. What are some examples of how your programs address the causes of foodborne illness risk?  
Prompt (for promising examples): How might we more broadly disseminate your approaches throughout the system?  
Prompt: How would you want to learn more about what your colleagues are doing across the state? (e.g., case examples, communities of practice, etc.)
4. Who do you consider are your primary audiences when addressing violations and foodborne illness risk factors?  
Prompt: Are any of these audiences more or less important?
5. Which strategies have been most effective in addressing the causes of foodborne illness risk?  
Prompt: Which strategies haven't been as effective?
6. How do you know your strategies/approaches are making a difference? What additional information would you like to have to know that your strategies are making a difference?
7. We're interested in making sure we have data to support system-wide improvement efforts. What examples or approaches to measurement do you think the EHCIB should consider for tracking risk factors, violations, or the causes of foodborne illness statewide?  
Prompt: Are there any specific measures or data elements we should track every two years?
8. What would tell you that Minnesota's food safety efforts are making a difference?

### Food Safety – Engagement/Outreach Activities

9. What are the most common outreach and engagement activities you do?
10. Who are your target audiences for outreach and engagement activities?  
Prompt: Are any audiences more or less important?
11. What are the most important messages to convey through outreach and engagement efforts?  
Prompt: Do these differ by audience?
12. Who do you collaborate with on your outreach and engagement efforts?  
Prompt: How much outreach and engagement efforts do you provide in coordination with local jurisdictions? Would you like to see more coordinated messaging between state and local entities?
13. Which outreach/engagement approaches have been most effective?  
Prompt: Which approaches have been less effective?
14. How do you know your outreach/engagement approaches are making a difference? What additional information would you like to have to know that they are making a difference?

15. We're considering how to best measure outreach/engagement efforts for system-wide improvement activities. What, if anything, would be valuable to know statewide regarding outreach/engagement?

Prompt: Which measures would be most meaningful to track? Which measures or indicators should we consider collecting every two years?

Wrap Up

16. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about food safety and/or your program?

## Appendix B: Non-Delegated CHB Statewide Conversation – Draft Questions

### Food Safety

1. What do you consider most meaningful or important to promoting and ensuring food safety?
2. What does a high quality, food-safety program look like to you?  
Prompt: What are some examples of how you could demonstrate or understand these elements are going well?
3. We're interested in making sure we have data to support system-wide improvement efforts. What examples or approaches to measurement do you think the EHCIB should consider for tracking the performance of its food safety efforts across Minnesota?  
Prompt: Are there any specific measures or data elements we should track every two years?
4. What would tell you that Minnesota's food safety efforts are making a difference?

### Feedback on 2017 Reports

You may recall that after reporting in 2017, you received a report for your jurisdiction that included information on inspection staffing, on-time inspections, engagement/outreach and violations. The following questions relate to those reports.

5. Do you recall receiving a jurisdiction-specific report in 2017?  
Prompt: Perhaps have a hard copy report on hand to distribute??
6. What was most helpful or interesting in your report?
7. What else would you have liked to see included in your report?  
Prompt: What is most important for you to know about food safety in your jurisdiction?
8. How did you use or share your report within your jurisdiction?  
Prompt: Within your health department? With your county elected officials? Other policymakers? Establishments? General public?

### Wrap Up

9. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about food safety?

## Appendix C: EHCIB Member Structure Option

### EHCIB’s current membership structure (11 members):

- Delegated FPLS programs (6): 2 metro CHBs, 3 non-metro CHBs, and one city (non-CHB)
- Non-delegated FPLS CHBs (2)
- MDH (1)
- MDA (1)
- SCHSAC (1, have been looking for another)
- 2 year terms
- LPHA administers an application process to fill vacant, CHB spots

### New membership structure aspirations:

- More faces at the table
- Members who represent other areas of EH, outside of FPLS
- Better representation from non-delegated jurisdictions
- Other state agency involvement

### EHCIB new membership structure (10 + ad-hoc):

- Regional representation, as indicated in chart below, is ideal.
- If regional representation is not possible, member position can be filled by someone from a different region.
- 4 FPLS non-delegated representatives is ideal. If 4 cannot be found, 1 member position can be filled with a FPLS delegated agency representative or left vacant.
  - Non-delegated minimum = 3, ideal = 4
  - Delegated minimum = 4, maximum = 5 IF vacant non-delegated position exists.

<b>Region:</b>	<b>NW</b>	<b>NE</b>	<b>WC</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>SW</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>Metro</b>
<b>Agency:</b>								
<b>FPLS Delegation City (non-CHB)</b>	1							
<b>FPLS Delegation (CHB)</b>	1					1		1
<b>FPLS Non-delegated CHBs</b>	1		1		1			1
<b>SCHSAC</b>	1 (or a split 2)							
<b>MDH</b>	1							
<b>Other State Agencies</b>	Ad-hoc							