

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Mary Haskins [mehaskins@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 25, 2010 9:23 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** small meat processors

I am very concerned about the new testing regulations for slaughter houses being recommended.

Small abattoirs are hard to find.

Small businesses have far more to lose than the big operators.

The small operations we deal with are showing concerns over the money and time it will take to do the additional testing.

Small processors are not the problem, big factory operations are.

Please rewrite the new regulations to allow small operators to continue their important work. Take a closer look at the BIG guys, they are the problem.

Protect the small farmer!

Thank you

Mary Haskins

Middletown, VA

**Rhodes, Suzette**

---

**From:** Marisa ~ [marisabangs@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 14, 2010 1:07 PM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Draft Guidance on HACCP System Validation

To Whom it May Concern,

This legislation would severely cripple many small meat processors due to the new testing requirements that are being enacted to regulate the large factory farms where the tainted meats are actually coming from. The small processors who handle less than 100 animals a day do not have ecoli poisoned meat nor or they processing sick animals. I no longer eat meat that comes from those large meat operations or factory farms, only meat from small processors where the animal is treated humanely. If all of the small slaughterhouses are forced out of buisness I will no longer be able to eat American meat.

Thank you,

Marisa Bangs  
Portland, OR  
503-926-3718

---

Hotmail is redefining busy with tools for the New Busy. Get more from your inbox. [See how.](#)

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Marie Christine Gaud [ndarrow1@nycap.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 19, 2010 10:12 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Meat Processing Plants

Please when considering new rules to be applied to protect the safety of meat processing, make sure that the funds necessary to implement them are provided to small local processing plants. We do need those desperately.

Look at what our food system has done to our people. It is distressing to see how many sick people are walking in the streets today. More than half are overweight and obese. Lets put back real food on our table. What we need is many more small producers.

Marie Christine Gaud  
Saratoga Apple  
518 - 695 3131

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Margndavi@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, May 21, 2010 12:36 PM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** New Guideline for small meat processors

I am not a farmer. I am a consumer. I buy all the meat that I eat from several local producers either directly or from my local Farmers markets. The meat that I buy is very good. I know where it comes from since I have visited several of the farms and deal directly with the farmers. I have not eaten any commercial ground beef in years and have no intentions of doing so ever. Current protocol in the industrial meat industry makes ground meat in particular a problem. I am upset that USDA is contemplating new restrictions on small producers which will make it next to impossible for them to continue to provide products directly to the consumer. It is already impossible to buy unfrozen meat, which I don't like but put up with. The several recalls that have been in the news have nothing to do with small processors. Because they are close to their clients they go the extra mile to ensure that contamination is avoided. One major mistake and they are out of business unlike the big guys. In a time when more and more people are discovering the benefits of consuming local food from small producers which enhances the economy in many rural communities, the health of the consumers, and appreciation of the work of farmers, it seems counter productive to create regulations which work against these things. Please do not increase the oversight of small meat processors so much they can no longer stay in business. I want to be able to continue to eat meat.

Margie Richards  
St Louis Park ,MN

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Lucia Watson [lucia@lucias.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 14, 2010 4:34 PM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** regulation for processors

PLEASE! Do not change the USDA rule that will require all processors to conduct extensive microbial testing before and after processing each product that facility makes. This new rule would increase expenses for small family farms and processors and would spell disaster! Not only for small farms but for other small "MN. E-2" and USDA processors as well. Most processors would have no choice but to scale back to "custom only" status or go out of business. In other words farms would be regulated out of business by the USDA. This affects all farmers who need the processors as well as the consumers who want their products. Being a small restaurant committed to local foods and products this would be a disaster on so many levels. Please reconsider and do not allow this to happen.

Sincerely, Lucia Watson, Lucias Restaurant Minneapolis

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Liza Marzilli [lmarzilli@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 12, 2010 1:27 PM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** USDA Proposed Regulations will Hurt Small Meat Processors, Family Farmers & Consumers

To Whom it May Concern:

I'm concerned that the proposed validation regulations out of the Food Safety and Inspection Service will be costly for small meat processors, forcing them to increase prices for slaughter and processing, or worse, go out of business. USDA needs to rethink these new rules; they don't increase food safety and sure don't help local food systems or family farmers.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Liza Marzilli

231 High Street

Reading, MA 01867

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Mark Adelman [edmondschile@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 11, 2010 10:16 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Validation

We have been using Appendix a and Appendix b. We follow them exactly and have never had a bad lab test come back... I would assume that both appendixes are based on scientific facts and testing.... if I have to prove these known facts the cost of doing so will drive me out of business. What next ? Do I have to send up a satellite to prove that the world is round !!!! Why take Galileo's word for it. I've seen photos taken by NASA but they must be fake.... and we never walked on the moon either.... right ?

*My e-mail account is shared by my family. Please be respectful as to the content of what you send. Thanks and God bless.*

Mark Adelman, Edmonds Chile Co., St. Louis, MO  
Work 314.772.1499 \*\*\*\* Cell 314.753.9263

**Rhodes, Suzette**

---

**From:** matt swain [matt\_swain@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 25, 2010 7:41 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** HACCP

Dear USDA policy makers,

Please consider more flexible allowances for small slaughterhouses while revising the HACCP regulations. I don't like eating big agriculture, narco-"farmacy," doped-up Frankenmeat, and I will get very fussy if my already-limited options are reduced (read, "your jobs are on the line" in as much as it will be in consumer's power to draw lines).

I'm also a signatory to Lauren Gwin's excellent letter in this regard, and I'm sending a duplicate of this message to my two senators and HR member, with Lauren Gwin's letter attached.

Thanks,  
Matt Swain,  
Lucerne, CA

---

Hotmail: Trusted email with powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** Ron Vandevanter [ron@montanajerkyco.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 06, 2010 11:59 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Validation Guide

I am a small businessman in Columbia Falls and have been working in this business for 33 years, as an owner I a'm writing to you because the new Validation Guidance proposed by USDA

([http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/HACCP\\_Validation\\_Ltrs.pdf](http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/HACCP_Validation_Ltrs.pdf)

). AAMP The American Association of Meat Processors has estimated that this will cost a little plant like mine \$26,800 not counting the time to collect and keep track of the records involved. there is no way I could afford to do this and It would put me out of business and 8 more full time jobs gone and 10 part time jobs from Sept to Jan.

Thank you for you time

Ron Vandevanter

Vandevanter Meats

In business since 1945

**Riley, Mary**

---

**From:** Ashley Starr [ashley.l.starr@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 03, 2010 10:52 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Proposed Regulations

I'm concerned that the proposed validation regulations out of the Food Safety and Inspection Service will be costly for small meat processors, forcing them to increase prices for slaughter and processing, or worse, go out of business. USDA needs to rethink these new rules; they don't increase food safety and sure don't help local food systems or family farmers. The real concern lies with the large operations of Tyson, Smithfield, Cargill, etc. These new changes could severely hamper the growth of local and regional food systems which are the only source of meat I trust anymore.

--

Take Care,  
Ashley Starr\*

"We did not inherit the earth from our ancestors; we borrowed it from our children."

**Riley, Mary**

---

**From:** Lauren Hom [zenlauren@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Friday, April 23, 2010 10:19 PM

**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments

**Subject:** HACCP

Hello,

I would like to submit my comments on the HACCP plan. As an American citizen and meat consumer I absolutely do not believe the same rules for giant, industrial meat producers should be applied across the board. The rules would absolutely wipe out many small butchers whose meat is often safer than the meat offered in the grocery store. There were 16 recalls on beef in the past year- that is just ridiculous! Small, local meat producers don't have this problem. I believe that stronger rules should be applied to industrial meat production, but don't ignore the hardships that small meat producers will face if you make the rule blanket everyone across the board. That is shortsighted and stupid. The demand for locally produced meat is growing every day and putting them in an adverse economic position means you take away the option local, healthy meat from thousand of people.

Make the rules stronger for industrial production, but devise different rules for small, local producers.

Thank you,  
Lauren Hom

## White, Ralene

---

**From:** Bruce & Sherry Plaetz [bsplaetz@redred.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 06, 2010 9:26 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** new meat testing guidelines

As a livestock producer, putting more regulations on small slaughter facilities will not improve food security. It will increase their costs causing them to leave the industry. Put more controls on imported meat and food products. Bruce Plaetz

## Rhodes, Suzette

---

**From:** eitburg@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 18, 2010 1:56 PM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Local Meats

How about helping the local farmers rather than raise another impossible obstacle to keep us from buying the food that is locally produced by our farmers. I understand that many are in the pocket of corporate food companies but come on lets work together and make the sustainable movement work as a healthy alternative...why are you trying to keep us from local foods...thanks Chef Eileen M. Hughes Executive Chef, Cornell University

**White, Ralene**

---

**From:** Andy Smith [atsmith@colby.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 03, 2010 7:30 AM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** Rule changes

To whom it may concern,

Recently I learned that the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service has proposed new rules that would require all slaughter facilities to do more testing of their product before moving it to market. This announcement concerns me as a farmer because this will add costs to already strained local meat processing facilities which in turn harms small farmers such as myself. When making rules, the USDA must avoid overregulating small processors and producers such as myself. We are producing superior products that are safer than those coming from large facilities. It is these large operations that breed human disease outbreaks, not small pasture-based farms and family butcher shops. The USDA must find ways to work with small processors by factoring scale of production into regulations.

Regards,  
Andrew Smith

**White, Ralene**

---

**From:** Joseph F. Toman Jr. [tomancitymarket@excite.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 04, 2010 3:24 PM  
**To:** Draft Validation Guide Comments  
**Subject:** comments on guidelines

from what I read due to the fact that I own a small small plant I would have to support the idea that the samples that you pull should be enough because its not cost effecient for me to spend more money other than the products that you use for testing.