

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 2, 1999 LB 474

flexibility comes the opportunity to depart from a regular inspection schedule significantly for one or more reasons. And I wanted to ask you, in making judgments about that departure from a regular inspection schedule, what exactly, in this context, is a risk-based inspection schedule; that is, what are the factors that would justify the regulatory agency from moving away from the statutory six month inspection?

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you. Thank you, Senator Beutler. I had some more information I wanted to present on the bill and I thought I would do that after the committee amendments were adopted.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Oh.

SENATOR DIERKS: So I will get to that and I think it'll answer your questions.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, why don't I give you the rest of my times, and we can pick up the conversation when you're finished.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay. As drafted, 47...LB 474 deletes the exclusion of institutions inspected by other agencies for food sanitation because the department found no other agency has statutory authority to do a complete inspection without relying on the Pure Food Act. I have already touched upon the purpose of 474. It's a clean-up bill from the Department of Agriculture. The department discovered that certain provisions simply were not workable and needed change. Most significantly, the bill adds standards and inspection provisions for food processors. Prior to the '97 change to the Pure Food Act, food processors were required to comply with the current Good Manufacturing Practice of 21 C.F.R., part 110. Because the FDA food code does not adequately cover this area, the bill seeks to again implement the current Good Manufacturing Practice for food processors. Technical changes to the bill also minimi...also specify minimum time and temperature specs for microwave heating of raw animal foods and microwave reheating of potentially hazardous and ready-to-eat foods. The bill also corrects the confusing omission in the current act. The specific sections of the '95 food code were not adopted by reference, but were reworded in the statute, itself. The violations are not