

A Nationwide Database of Retail Food Safety Inspections



Phillip Leslie
Prof. Strategy
UCLA Anderson
PhD, Yale



Ginger Jin
Prof. Economics
University of Maryland
PhD, UCLA




Ben Bederson
Prof. Computer Science
University of Maryland
PhD, NYU

Funded by
the Sloan Foundation (2011-2014) &
The Maryland Innovative Initiative 2014-2015

Maintained by



Data posted online by
local jurisdictions
(as of 2012)



Our Data Warehouse Coverage (2015)

- 87 local health departments
- 34 States
- 895K unique establishments
- 6.8M inspection records
- 18.5M violations


Heterogeneity and Fragmentation

- Out of 87 jurisdictions with online posting of data:
 - 12 provide no numerical count of violations (due to pdf publishing and other non-numerical formats)
 - 23 provide explicit grading in either letter grades or numerical points
 - Number of inspection records per establishment ranges from 1 to 38
 - Number of violations per inspection ranges from 0.066 in San Diego County to 9.35 in Fort Worth City, TX

Example insights from our database

- Of NYC inspections *41%* report at least one violation whose description contains the words *rodent, vermin, flies, mice, pests, rats, or insects*.
 - Compared to *11%* in DC, *8%* in LA (County), and *6%* in Seattle (King County).
- From lowest to highest violations (on average), restaurants with the following words in their establishment names:
sandwich, salad, burger, pizza, pasta, japan/sushi, china/chinese.
- Half of our covered jurisdictions indicate whether an inspection is a re-inspection. Among these jurisdictions,
 - on average *10.6%* of routine inspections led to a re-inspection
 - *15.1%* of the violations found in the routine inspection recurred in the re-inspection.
 - Both numbers range greatly across jurisdictions.

Consistency



Further evidence for consistency

(11 jurisdictions in NY, WA, AK, AZ, OH and FL, 2010-2011)

Poisson Model	Dependent Variable = # of hospitalizations due to intestinal infection per zip code per year		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
# of violations per inspection (standardized)	0.066***	0.076***	0.075***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.022)
ZIP pop	x	x	x
# of inpatients due to other digestive illnesses		x	x
# of inpatients due to all other illnesses			x
Year FE	x	x	x
Jurisdiction FE	x	x	x
Standard error	robust	robust	robust
N	2678	2678	2678

To summarize

- Online posting of government-collected data is only the first step
 - Significant effort is needed in centralization, cleaning, documentation, archive, and continuation
- Large potential to utilize the “big data”
 - For research
 - For government policy evaluation
 - For enhanced compliance
- We welcome data request!