# FOCUS AREA 8 WORKSHEET: Environmental Health Investigation



Complete this worksheet if "environmental health investigation" is a high-priority Focus Area for efforts to improve foodborne disease outbreak response in your agency or jurisdiction. (NOTE: The term "agency/ jurisdiction" refers to the entity for which your workgroup is making decisions. See your completed "Preliminaries" worksheet for a definition.)

List the individuals participating in the discussion of this Focus Area (and their affiliations).

To help you understand what is included in this Focus Area, review the following goals and keys to success. In practice, focus areas are highly related, so you may also be interested in Focus Areas 10 and 11.

### **GOALS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH INVESTIGATION:**

Agency/jurisdiction staff collect, analyze, and interpret information from the implicated facility or production site to determine the etiologic agent, mode of transmission and vehicle, source of contamination, contributing factors, environmental antecedents, and food supply chain.

#### **1. PRIORITIZE THE KEYS TO SUCCESS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH INVESTIGATION**

"Keys to success" are activities, relationships, and resources that are critical to achieving success in a Focus Area. Determining whether an agency/jurisdiction has a particular key to success in place is somewhat subjective. Metrics, such as measures of time (e.g., rapidly, timely, and quickly), have not been defined. Your workgroup should provide its own definitions for these terms, as is appropriate for your agency/jurisdiction, and use its best judgment in deciding whether a particular key to success is fully or partially in place. Rate the priority for implementing each key to success based on its likely impact on foodborne outbreak response at your agency/jurisdiction and available resources. Use a scale of 1 to 5 to rate each key to success (1=low priority for implementation, and 5=high priority for implementation). If a key to success is already in place in your agency/jurisdiction, check the appropriate box. If a key to success is not relevant to your agency/jurisdiction, select N/A.

	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation o Improvement in Your Agency/Jurisdiction LOW HIGH					tion
Staff skills and expertise							
• Staff have expertise in food production processes, HACCP Active Managerial Controls (AMCs), environmental health assessments, and root cause analyses.							
Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Staff have expertise in traceback and traceforward investigations (or have access to staff in other agencies with this expertise).							
Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

	Already in Place		y for Im Improv <u>r Ageno</u> W	emer	nt in	
<ul> <li>Staff have good interviewing skills to solicit information from facility managers and food workers.</li> <li>Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):</li> </ul>		1	23	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Outbreak investigation</li> <li>Agency/jurisdiction has a written protocol outlining the steps in the environmental health investigation of a foodborne disease outbreak. Staff have easy access to the protocol and are trained in its implementation.</li> <li>Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):</li> </ul>		1	2 3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Staff undertake environmental health assessments at facilities or production sites implicated during a foodborne outbreak (not routine food establishment licensing inspections) and identify appropriate contributing factors and environmental antecedents/root causes.</li> <li>Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):</li> </ul>		1	2 3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Staff undertake traceback and traceforward investigations (or have access to staff in other agencies that undertake these investigations).</li> <li>Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):</li> </ul>		1	2 3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Communication</li> <li>Staff quickly communicate and coordinate activities with opidemiology and laboratory staff</li> </ul>						
epidemiology and laboratory staff. Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):		1	23	4	5	N/A

	Already <u>in Place</u>	Priority for Implementation Improvement in Your Agency/Jurisdictio LOW HIGH				ion	
Making changes							
<ul> <li>Agency/jurisdiction involves investigation and response team members in a debriefing or after-action review following each outbreak response to improve future investigation practices and to prevent future outbreaks based on lessons learned.</li> <li>Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Agency/jurisdiction has performance indicators related to the environmental health investigation and routinely evaluates its performance in this Focus Area and tracks progress as part of its continuous process improvement program(s).</li> <li>Notes (activities, procedures, or comments):</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

#### 2. PRIORITIZE CIFOR GUIDELINES RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS

Having identified activities and procedures in need of improvement, review the CIFOR Guidelines recommendations related to this Focus Area (listed below). Rate the priority for implementing each recommendation based on its likely impact on foodborne outbreak response at your agency/ jurisdiction and available resources. Use a scale of 1 to 5 to rate each recommendation (1=low priority for implementation, and 5=high priority for implementation). If a recommendation is already in place in your agency/jurisdiction, check the appropriate box. If a recommendation is not relevant to your agency/jurisdiction, select N/A. *Refer to the blue underlined section number following each recommendation to view the recommendation as it appears in the CIFOR Guidelines.* 

	Already in Place	<b>J J I</b>			t in sdict	ion_	
Staff skills and expertise							
• Ensure that the environmental health investigator on the outbreak response team has a good understanding of factors necessary to cause illness, food vehicles, and possible contributing factors in the environment or operation that can contribute to the transmission of the disease agent. (3.2.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Ensure that the environmental health investigator knows how to collect environmental specimens and store and transport them properly. (3.2.2)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Provide continuing education to the environmental health investigator to maintain and improve skills within their specialty. (3.2.2)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

	Already in Place	Yo	Îm Jur Ag	or Imp prove gency	emen //Juri	it in sdict	on or <u>ion</u> iH
• Train the environmental health investigator in the agency's/ jurisdiction's outbreak response protocols and the environmental health investigator's team role. (3.2.2)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Assemble a reference library with information about foodborne diseases, enteric illnesses, and control measures. Where possible include electronic resources that can be accessed in the field. (3.4.5)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Assemble a list of resource persons with expertise in specific disease agents and environmental health investigation methodologies. (3.5.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Exercise outbreak response team members together to ensure each team member can perform their role according to agency-specific protocols and legal authorities and understands the roles and responsibilities of other team members. (3.2.2)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Ensure that all outbreak response team members regularly participate in outbreak investigation and control efforts, even if it means working with another jurisdiction because the team's home jurisdiction does not have many outbreaks. (3.2.1) (3.2.2) (3.3.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>If investigations are infrequent, centralize processes that require substantial experience for proficiency (e.g., regulatory tracebacks).</li> <li>(3.2.1) (3.2.2) (3.3.1)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Additional ideas:							
Outbreak Investigation							
<ul> <li>Prepare a written protocol outlining the steps in the environmental health investigation of a foodborne disease outbreak (3.2.1) (3.2.2) (3.4) (Table 5.1) (5.4.2 p.105) (5.4.2 p.108) and have it ready for use by the environmental health investigator when needed. (3.4.1) (3.4.2) (3.4.3) (Box 3.1)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Send environmental investigators into the field whenever there is credible evidence of an inadequately controlled food safety risk, in order to not miss opportunities to prevent additional exposures to contaminated food(s). (6.1)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Send at least two environmental health investigators to a food establishment implicated in an outbreak. One investigator can make certain that food about to be served is safe, and the second investigator can initiate the on-site environmental assessment/root		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

cause investigation. (Table 5.1) (5.4.2 p.108) (6.4.2)

	Already in Place		Im	or Imp prove gency	emen	t in	on or <u>ion</u> iH
<ul> <li>Use epidemiologic information to initiate and guide the environmental health investigation of a foodborne disease outbreak. Once an on-site investigation begins, sources of information include product information; written policies or procedures; direct observations and measurements; interviews with employees and managers; and laboratory testing of suspected foods, ingredients, or environmental surfaces. (Table 5.1) (5.4.2 p.108)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Data collection							
• Use standardized forms to collect environmental health information to provide comparable data for investigations that may involve multiple establishments. (3.4.3) (7.4.3)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Develop templates for forms before an outbreak occurs. (See Environmental Health Specialists Network [EHS-Net] website at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/ehs/EHSNet/</u> for examples.) (3.4.3) (7.4.3)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Train staff in the use of the standardized forms to ensure proper completion. (3.2.2) (3.4.3) (7.4.3)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Determine how confidential information will be stored and whether and how it can be shared with others in the outbreak response team. (2.3) (3.5.2)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Be familiar with and follow state and federal laws and practices that protect confidential information from disclosure. (2.3) (3.5.2)</li> <li>Additional ideas:</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Identify the etiologic agent (if unknown)							
• Obtain clinical specimens from members of the ill group. (4.2.5)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Interview management from the implicated facility to determine if it has noticed ill employees or circumstances that could be the cause of a foodborne illness. (Table 5.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Interview food workers to determine whether they have been ill and the clinical characteristics of their illness. (Table 5.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Obtain stool from ill or all food workers to establish an etiology through laboratory testing. (<u>Table 5.1</u>)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Collect and store samples of suspect food items and ingredients (using proper techniques) as soon as possible. Test samples when food has been implicated by epidemiologic or environmental health investigations. (2.6.2) (4.2.5) (Table 5.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Work with appropriate regulatory authority to ensure that food samples are collected and maintained with appropriate chain of custody. (3.4.3) (Table 5.1)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation of Improvement in Your Agency/Jurisdiction LOW HIGH				ion	
• Notify the facility from which the food samples are being collected so that it has the opportunity to collect companion samples. (6.3.3)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Determine whether the setting or suspect food item suggests a likely pathogen. (<u>Table 5.1</u>)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Additional ideas:							
Identify persons at risk							
• For establishment-related outbreaks, obtain a list of reservations, credit card receipts, receipts for takeout orders, or guest lists for events to identify exposed persons and additional cases. Where possible, obtain information electronically. (Table 5.1)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Review foodborne illness complaints to identify undiagnosed cases that could be linked to the outbreak. ( <u>Table 5.1</u> )		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Contact restaurants, grocery stores, or other points of final service visited by multiple cases to identify employee illnesses or foodborne illness complaints from patrons. (Table 5.1)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Additional ideas:

## Identify mode of transmission, vehicle, and source of contamination

• For event- or establishment-related outbreaks, conduct an environmental health assessment/root cause analysis of the food preparation site as early as possible, to include obtaining a menu from event or establishment; interviewing food workers to determine their food-preparation responsibilities and practices before the outbreak exposure, whether they or their close contacts have been ill, and the clinical characteristics of their illness; evaluating (and observing if possible) the food flow for the implicated meal or food item to identify a contamination event; and collecting and reviewing documents on the source of the food. (Table 5.1) (5.4.2 p.108)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• For event- or establishment-related outbreaks, if no contamination event is identified at food preparation site, trace ingredients of implicated food back through distribution to source of production to identify contamination event. Conduct an environmental health assessment/root cause analysis of the likely source of contamination. (Table 5.1) (5.4.2 p.108)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Already in Place	Yo	Îm Sur Ag	prove gency	emen y/Juri	t in sdict	ion
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	<u>in Place</u>	in Place       Ye         1       1	in Place       Image: Margin Alignment Alignme	in Place       Improve Your Agency LOW         1       2       3          1       2       3          1       2       3	in PlaceImprovement Your Agency/Juri LOW123412341234123412341234123412341234123412341234123412341234	in Place       Improvement in Your Agency/Jurisdict LOW         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3       4       5         1       2       3

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

	Already in Place	Yo	Im our Ag	prove gency	oleme emen y/Juri	t in sdict	on or i <u>on</u> iH
<ul> <li>Ensure the environmental health investigator knows the other members of the outbreak response team before an outbreak occurs. (<u>3.2.2</u>)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Establish and use routine procedures for communicating with outbreak response team members and their organizational units before an outbreak occurs. (3.2.2) (3.5.2) (6.0.2) (6.1) (7.4.2)		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Maintain close communication and coordination with members of the outbreak response team during an investigation. Update all members of the outbreak response team daily. Make sure suspicious new exposures are adequately considered by all team members and that the public information officer is routinely updated to ensure appropriate messaging to the public and media. (5.1.5) (5.3.4) (6.2.1)</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Additional ideas:

### Making changes

<ul> <li>Participate in a debriefing/after-action meeting following each outbreak investigation with all members of the outbreak response team to identify lessons learned and compare notes on ultimate findings. Identify factors that compromised the investigation and clarify changes to procedures, resources, training, and agency structure to optimize future investigations. (6.6.4) (Box 6.6)</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
• Work with outbreak response team to summarize investigation findings, conclusions, and recommendations in a written report consistent with the size and complexity of the investigation, including lessons learned and action items for follow-up and quality improvement. (6.6.5) (7.5)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Work with outbreak response team to submit summary data about the outbreak to CDC's National Environmental Assessment Reporting System and CDC's National Outbreak Reporting System (NORS) database using CDC's form 52.13. Make every effort to complete both Part 1 and Part 2. (<u>6.6.5</u>)</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Track relevant corrective action items as part of agency/jurisdiction continuous quality improvement program(s). (6.6.4)</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<ul> <li>Consider sharing reports with unusual findings more broadly to improve future response or prevention efforts. (6.6.7)</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Additional ideas:

#### 3. MAKE PLANS TO IMPLEMENT SELECTED CIFOR GUIDELINES RECOMMENDATIONS

For each CIFOR Guidelines recommendation selected in the previous steps (or idea formulated by the workgroup), identify who will take the lead in implementing the recommendation and the time frame for implementation (e.g., a specific completion date or whether the change is likely to require short-, mid-, or long-term efforts). If certain actions must precede others, make a note of this and adjust the time frame. In addition, consider factors that could positively or negatively influence implementation of the recommendation and ways to incorporate the recommendation into your agency's/jurisdiction's standard operating procedures.

CIFOR recommendations or other ideas from previous steps	Lead person	Time frame for implementation	Notes (e.g., necessary antecedents, factors that might influence implementation, ways to incorporate the recommendation into standard operating procedures)

One person should be given responsibility for monitoring progress in implementing the above CIFOR Guidelines recommendations. Follow-up should occur at specified checkpoints (e.g., 3, 6, 9, and 12 months after the start of the Toolkit process), and results should be shared with the entire workgroup.

DATE WORKSHEET COMPLETED: \_\_\_\_\_

NEXT DATE FOR FOLLOW-UP ON PROGRESS: \_\_\_\_\_