

IOM

Workshop on Review of National
School Lunch and School
Breakfast Program Meal Patterns
and Nutrient Standards

July 9, 2008

- Jean D. Harris, Ph.D.
- maryjean@bellsouth.net
- 1-800-553-0282 extension 227
- The following represents input from a variety of sources: competitors, colleagues, food service directors, USDA, state directors etc.

Industry Perspective

Guiding Principles for Industry:

- We support science-based national nutritional standards that are pre-emptive at the federal level.
- We believe that all items served in school meal programs should be appealing and acceptable to students. “Nutritious meals” don’t build strong bodies and minds if they get tossed in the garbage cans.

Guiding Principles for Industry Continued...

- We are concerned about the child's present and future health—they are our own children, nieces, nephews and our future employees-which has a direct impact on health care costs
- We support the need for additional funding for schools to serve meals that meet the new standards which require lower fat, lower sodium, lower sugar, additional fruits and vegetables as well as increased whole wheat grain products.

Guiding Principles for Industry Continued...

- School meals are but one component of childhood obesity. The entire school community (mandated physical education) and the community at large should also be held accountable. Placing the burden solely on the school meal program is inappropriate as; overall, school meals provide the healthiest options throughout the typical day for a child.

Key issues:

Cost

Examples:

- Breadings and batters have increased in cost three fold
- Oil is 2.5 times previous costs
- Soy costs have almost doubled (a common means to reduce fat and add texture and moisture retention in products necessary to meet the broad range of environmental challenges in school settings)

Key Issues Continued...

- For a reduction of each percentage of fat in beef and poultry, the cost goes up exponentially while the palatability decreases
- Whole egg has escalated to triple its previous value
- Removing HFCS by adding additional fruit, sugar, fruit juice, or maltodextrin will add approximately 35-40% to the cost.

Confusion in the market place

Examples:

- There is naturally occurring transfat in beef
- Is High Fructose Corn syrup the latest media “hot button”? How can we better educate consumers? What is the “real data/science”? *
- What really is the data to support the prescribed levels of sodium? Would we be better off to provide directional guidance rather than a firm number? The current options for sodium replacement are limited (e.g. potassium chloride) and add about 10% cost to the item with a concomitant loss in flavor and texture. Sodium provides many benefits such as: moisture retention, functions as a preservative and reduces potential bacterial growth

Confusion in the market place continued...

- Do we have consensus between FDA and USDA on whole-wheat definition? How are products to be labeled to insure that consumers get what they are paying for and that a “level playing field” exists? The 51% whole grain was established for cereal products and is being applied to bread products. It is more difficult to produce a “kid acceptable” and affordable 51% whole grain roll for schools.
- Would we be better off defining items in terms of grams of fat rather than in percentages?

Phase in or “date certain”—a quandary?

Pluses for “date certain”:

- One target for NPD
- **No overlap of SKU’s (reduce distribution/warehouse fees)**
- One menu analysis for fsd-not continually tweaking
- Retooling menu planning software programs is very costly and numerous adjustments will be expensive
- New standards may require alternative equipment—both large and small to prepare new food items

Negatives for “date certain”:

- Dramatic change for students in terms of fat and sodium impacts palatability and acceptance
- Could result in decreased participation/negative perception of the school meal programs
- Could result in loss of revenue for the meal program
- Loss of sales for industry

- *June 18, 2008 AMA delegates backed a resolution that argues that there's no scientific proof that high fructose corn syrup deserves the blame for obesity more than sugar or other caloric sweeteners.
- “At this time, there is insufficient evidence to restrict the use of high fructose corn syrup or label product that contain it with a warning.”