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Overview

Protecting the safety and integrity of the food supply is one of the oldest functions of government, one that the American people expect their government to perform and perform well.

The current food safety regulatory system in the United States is the shared responsibility of local, state and federal partners. In some cases, the federal government has delegated the responsibility for ensuring food safety to states and municipalities, which are often more nimble and able to respond quickly to localized public health problems. Approximately 80% of food safety inspections in the nation, for example, are completed at state and local levels. All 50 states hold the primary responsibility for ensuring the safety of milk and the sanitary operation of restaurants. In other areas, states have passed unique food safety standards that address local concerns or fill important gaps in food safety regulation left open by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and other regulatory agencies. As federal agencies become increasingly under-funded and influenced by powerful corporate interests, the states’ role in maintaining the food safety net grows ever-more important.

The following are just a few examples of how the state of South Carolina has enacted standards to ensure the safety of the food supply in South Carolina and protect the health of its residents.

Milk and Other Dairy Products

In the early 20th century, adulterated and spoiled milk caused a range of diseases and illness, including tuberculosis and diphtheria. States and municipalities responded to this problem by passing standards for how the dairy industry gathered, processed, distributed and sold milk in the United States. To this day, the states hold the primary responsibility for milk safety. FDA provides guidance to the states in the form of model codes,1 and the states may adopt these codes voluntarily. But the federal government has not established any mandatory national safety standards for Grade A milk; no national law even regulates the sale of raw unpasteurized milk. That has been left up to states and localities, which are best equipped to regulate, monitor and inspect the local dairy industry and respond to local reports of adulterated milk.

South Carolina’s milk safety standards regulate the sale of milk, milk products, raw milk and raw milk products; the production, processing, labeling, storing, handling and transportation of milk and milk products; and the sanitary conditions at any dairy or other facility and in any truck or other vehicle in which milk or milk products are produced, processed, handled or transported.2 The South Carolina Division of Food Protection regulates all Grade A facilities in the state involved with production, hauling, processing, packaging, and distribution of milk products. The division makes quarterly unannounced physical inspections of facilities and tests samples of raw and finished products and water supplies at the facilities.3 South Carolina’s milk standards protect the state’s residents from the outbreaks of milk-borne diseases that were common in the early 20th century.
A key component of state milk safety standards, including South Carolina’s standards, is the provision empowering the state to prevent the sale of contaminated or adulterated milk. Whether milk becomes contaminated or adulterated by accident or intent, the state’s authority to remove these products from the marketplace is critical for public health.

**Food Safety in Restaurants and Other Food Establishments**

Almost everyone experiences a food-borne illness or food “poisoning” at least once in their lifetimes after eating out at a restaurant or other food service establishment. These food-borne illnesses, caused most often by inadequate cooking, improper holding temperatures, poor personal hygiene, contaminated equipment and food from unsafe sources, can cause symptoms ranging from the uncomfortable to the life-threatening, particularly for the elderly and those with compromised immune systems. The Centers for Disease Control estimates that food-borne disease causes 325,000 hospitalizations and 5,000 deaths each year.

The federal government has promulgated no mandatory requirements for the safety of restaurant and food service establishment food, devolving this responsibility to the states. All 50 states—generally through their health, small business or agriculture departments—regulate and inspect restaurants, schools, nursing homes, and other food service establishments to ensure the safety of food served. State and local agencies are the main line of defense against food-borne disease.

South Carolina has established statutes to protect the public from food contaminated by food service establishments or retail food stores during storage, preparation, service, or display, and to ensure that food service establishments and retail food stores have adequate facilities for the storage, preparation, service, or display of food. The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control’s Division of Food Protection conducts more than 74,000 regulatory inspections of retail food establishments annually. State regulations governing retail food establishments require that each permitted facility be inspected at least once per year; the state average routine inspection rate is between two and three per year. Grades (A, B, or C) are posted in each permitted facility after each inspection and reflect the sanitation level of that facility at the time of inspection.

**Food and Color Additives**

Most packaged foods on grocery store shelves contain numerous food or color additives. A food additive is “any substance the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result – directly or indirectly – in its becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food.” A color additive is any dye, pigment or substance that can impart color when added or applied to a food.
FDA has the primary legal responsibility for determining the safe use of food and color additives and setting standards for what constitutes a “safe” level of an additive. Several states, including South Carolina, have enacted laws in effect reserving the right to go above and beyond federal standards to protect public health. Although no states have used this authority to date, states may need to resort to enacting more protective health standards for certain additives if FDA fails to do so in the future. Debate is currently brewing over the use of carbon monoxide in meat, for example. Without a formal review process, FDA allowed the meat industry to start spiking packaged meat with carbon monoxide to keep it looking pink and fresh for weeks. Consumer advocates argue that this could make spoiled meat look fresh, endangering public health. Since FDA has no plans to set standards or labeling guidelines for meat treated with carbon monoxide, states may step in to fill this gap.

**Shellfish**

Shellfish are filter feeders; they get food and oxygen by pumping large quantities of water across their gills. During feeding, shellfish take in bacteria, viruses and chemical contaminants, which can bioaccumulate in their bodies. As a result, some shellfish harvested from polluted areas may pose a health hazard if consumed, causing diseases such as typhoid, hepatitis and salmonellosis.

No federal laws exist to regulate shellfish harvesters and processors to ensure that shellfish are safe; as such, states are responsible for adopting laws and regulations to ensure that shellfish are grown, harvested and processed in a safe and sanitary manner. FDA’s National Shellfish Sanitation Program has created a model ordinance for states, but this serves only as guidance and is not mandatory.

Approximately 16 states have adopted shellfish safety standards, including South Carolina. South Carolina’s regulations outline requirements for all producers, processors, and transporters of shellfish and prohibit the sale and distribution of “adulterated” shellfish, which includes shellfish harvested from polluted areas and shellfish not grown, harvested, stored, treated, transported, handled, shucked, packed, or offered for sale in compliance with the state’s regulations. The federal government has not established a similar mandatory standard; FDA regulations merely prohibit the interstate transport of shellfish that are likely to contribute to the spread of communicable disease from one state to another.

**Conclusion**

The South Carolina food safety standards discussed here and others are important for several reasons:

- They help protect public health from food-borne illnesses and other risks by filling gaps left in federal law;
• They give consumers the power to make informed choices about the food and beverages they
purchase for themselves and their families; and

• They help protect local industries by ensuring the safety and purity of their products.

The FDA and other federal agencies do not have the resources—and often do not have the political
will—to monitor all aspects of food safety. In fact, the number of full-time FDA employees dealing
with food safety has fallen steadily from 3,167 in FY 2003 to 2,843 in FY 2006; the president’s
proposed FY 2007 budget for FDA would further reduce that number to 2,757.14 As such, states
will continue to play a pivotal role in ensuring that America’s food supply remains among the
safest in the world.
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