

Rhodes, Suzette

From: oregonfieldmowing@hotmail.com
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 11:38 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - HACCP standards NOT appropriate for small and local meat processors

HACCP is NOT appropriate for small and very small as well as local meat processors. I live in Portland OR, and Kookoolan Farms is a local farm in Yamhill OR which uses a small local meat processor for slaughtering and turning animals into meat cuts. The clean humane meat made available via this arrangement is null and void when meat is sent to large slaughterhouse where there is no way to keep different animals from being co-mingled nor do the slaughterhouses do anything as regards safety and taking care of employees. I have read Joel Salatin's books from Polyface Farms in Swoope Virginia and I have watched Food Inc., read Omnivore's Dilemma by Michael Pollen and have been learning about clean food and the lack of its availability. We NEED clean small local meat processors for the clean local humanely raised chickens, pigs, goats, cows and rabbits to be properly turned into saleable meat products WITHOUT the known and constant risk of foodborne illness derived from slaughterhouses which are the opposite of the small ones. At these large facilities, HACCP standards MUST be perfected so we the citizens of this country WHO YOU SERVE will be protected. The huge expenses cannot be and should not be shouldered by those not responsible for contaminated food. But the ones responsible for the dirty work MUST PAY for cleaning up the mess they create.

Thank you and please exempt our local small meat processors all around the USA from this crushing undeserved burden and you can truly be part of the solution as most people assume you are.

Sincerely, James L Tyree II parent and involved Citizen of The U.S.A.

Rhodes, Suzette

From: JEFF GREENWELL [jeffmg@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 4:36 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Protect small farm meat!

Dear Secretary Vilsack,

"Know your farmer, Know your food" is a GOOD thing. The USDA is proposing new rules for small meat processors that would make it impossible for our small farmers, who we love and trust, to have their meat processed locally and affordably. Remember, not all of America wants the garbage meat found in supermarkets. But if you impose these costly rules on processors, then consumers have no choice. We want to KNOW our farmer. I do KNOW my farmer. I have his phone number, and he calls me to ask if I need beef this month. He processes in an approved center and we are very happy with our relationship. Please don't make rules on the "little guy" that will take away our choices. I'm all for safety regs, especially on big processors with large volume and poor quality control. But lets leave the little guys alone so American small farmers can continue to satisfy those of us who care about the source of our natural, organic meat.

Thank you.

Jeff and Emilie Greenwell
Sherburne County, MN

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

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Preston Meats [prestonmeats@netins.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 5:06 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Meat Safety Accountability Act

To Whom It May Concern,

The proposed Meat Safety Accountability Act from Montana Senator Tester, will undoubtedly cause excessive hardship on state inspected locker plants. FSIS and USDA with the proposed testing will put the state lockers soon out of business. These small lockers are depended upon by local farmers and taxpayers to purchase food and have food processed for their home use. More testing of product will only push the end product cost higher. Small lockers cannot afford the luxury (like the big packer) of a laboratory to run all the tests that this bill is proposing. The majority of the state inspected lockers that make products bearing the mark of inspection are using federal product to make these products out of. The costs will cause the small, independent business to pass the cost onto the consumer. The consumer will look to buy these products elsewhere. The small state inspected locker will close up and farmers will not have an outlet for processing their animals and will have to go to the Tyson's, Smithfields, and Cargills etc. of the world. Or you can consider the worse scenario of backyard butchering and processing to become more prevalent as the state inspected lockers start closing one right after the other because of more government control. More testing is NOT the answer.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Robert Kilburg, Owner
Preston Meats, Inc.
P.O. Box 275
Preston, IA 52069

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Jerry & Mary Sorensen [wclones@fmctc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 6:05 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: HACCP Validation Guidance

To whom it may concern

I represent two families who raise and sell processed lamb through local markets. Today I picked up lamb at our processor for a market. My local processor shown me the effect of the new HACCP rules on his locker. It will cost him over \$250,000 dollars to meet the requirements. He told me that would force him to quit state inspected harvest of not only lamb but also beef and pork. He questioned whether any Iowa processors would be able to stay in business. This would shut down our Patchwork Meats and we would no longer be able to provide local, natural lamb to our markets and consumers.

Please reconsider the cost of these changes to rural America and local foods.

Jerry Sorensen

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Norm Nieuwenhuis [normdn@orangecitycomm.net]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 6:38 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Cc: steveking@ushouse.gov; harkin@ussenate.gov; grassly@ussenate.gov
Subject: Comments-DraftGuidance on HACCP System Validation

Dear Mr. Almanza;

Very small plants such as our own would no longer be able to continue business if this requirement will be expected of us and would force us out of business, which we have been in since 1926. The good reliable work of your inspectors for the last 10 years should remain sufficient. There is no small plant that I know of in this area that could absorb this type of oppressive overregulation (no matter how well intentioned) that would require additional expense north of \$100,000 per establishment with expected annual costs of \$30,000. Only those large multi-national plants could afford such an expense, and then it would just get passed down to us their customers.

We hope this will ultimately be dismissed as not an acceptable solution.

Respectfully,

N.D. Nieuwenhuis

Owner, President; Woudstra Meat Market & Lockers, Inc

Orange City, IA 51041

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Andres Arroyo [aa17@cornell.edu]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 4:57 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: response

I'm writing to express my opposition to the USDA reinterpretation of meat safety rules. It is my understanding that additional compliance requirements will cripple the ability of small producers to compete. The USDA regulatory infrastructure should accommodate as many small producers as the market will bear, not force them to scale up for participating in a compliance regime trending toward fewer inspections of larger operations.

Thank you.

Andres Arroyo
Ithaca NY

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Elisa Miller-Out [millerout@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 18, 2010 1:19 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: USDA Rules for Small Meat Farms/Processors

I've heard recently that the USDA is planning to apply stricter, more expensive standards to meat processors. I'm a resident of Ithaca, NY and I'm concerned that this will affect my ability to eat local foods and support my local farmers. While it is important that there be strict safety regulations at larger plants, the smaller plants should have a separate set of regulations. The smaller farmers and smaller processors can't afford the same regulations as the bigger processors and they may not need to be held to the same standards because in many cases the smaller farms are more likely to have safer meat b/c they have healthier animals who don't need as many antibiotics, etc. Anyway, I urge you to consider the impact these regulations will have on our small local farmers and please provide standards that keep consumer's safe while not bankrupting our local farmers.

Sincerely,
Elisa Miller-Out

Riley, Mary

From: nekihas@gmail.com on behalf of Kahina Selmouni [kahina.selmouni@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2010 9:11 AM

To: Draft Validation Guide Comments

Subject: Food Safety Regulations

Hi,

I believe that the USDA's new proposed regulations will disproportionately affect local meat producers, and that this is not justified to achieve more consumer safety. It will make it practically and financially difficult for me, a consumer who wants to eat local, human-produced food rather than industrially produced food, to buy local meat.

Regards,

Kahina Selmouni

Riley, Mary

From: Sue Trussell [buffie133@mac.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 7:51 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Food Safety and Inspection Service New Reg

To whom it may concern;

I want you to know that these proposed rules affect family farmers and could negatively impact local and regional food systems and family farmers. These new guidelines run *absolutely counter* to the "Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food" campaign USDA had been trumpeting. Our family is very much in touch with where our food comes from, how it is raised and how it is processed. I do not want any more regulation put onto our family farmers. As drafted, these new regulations I believe will drive small meat processors out of business. Many will not be able to manage the financial or administrative burdens the new regulation will require. As a result these rules are put in place farmers' options will be further limited.

Sincerely,

Sue A. Trussell
1390 Jefferson Terrace
Bedford, VA 24523
540-587-6611

4/28/2010

White, Ralene

From: Eric and Ann Franzenburg [eafran@netins.net]
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 10:24 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: new meat testing regulations

To Whom It May Concern:

We're worried 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. These new guidelines run absolutely counter to the "Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food" campaign.

Sincerely,
Eric and Ann Franzenburg
Van Horne, IA

White, Ralene

From: Jerry Depew [depew@ncn.net]
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 8:54 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: comment on meat processing

I believe federal food safety regulations should be strict in proportion to the market share of the processor: strict rules and high standards for those with regional reach and significant market share; higher standards for those with national market share; lesser standards for those with local markets.

Small meat processors cannot afford to meet the same standards as national companies. Nor should it be necessary for public safety.

--

Jerry Depew, Laurens, IA

Riley, Mary

From: scott.shapiro@gmail.com on behalf of Scott Shapiro [scott_shapiro@mba.berkeley.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 10:16 PM

To: Draft Validation Guide Comments

Subject: HACCP will hurt small family farms

To whom it may concern:

I strongly urge the USDA to really think about the impact that the HACCP system would have on small and local producers of meat. While the regulations may have an impact on large factory farmed and CAFO operations, small farms that provide much higher quality meat do not need to be threatened by such rules. HACCP will destroy the only sources of grass finished meat, which is far healthier and sustainable than the linear production methods that factory farms use.

Please reconsider the HACCP.

Thank you,
Scott

--

Scott Shapiro
MBA Candidate 2011
Haas School of Business | UC Berkeley
<http://www.linkedin.com/in/scottashapiro>
scott@scottshapiro.com
213.785.7230

Riley, Mary

From: Dena Amos [dena.amos@ymail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 7:49 PM

To: Draft Validation Guide Comments

Subject: Too much REGULATION WILL put small farmers OUT of business....Please put a stop to it as soon as possible!

RE:

**ISSUE*: The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) of the USDA is drafting new meat testing regulations for small food processors. It appears the new regulations will require before and after microbial testing and procedures that will be costly for state and federally inspected meat processors. The concern is these heavy-handed regulations may force small meat processors to reduce the number products they offer, increase prices for processing, discontinue processing under inspection, or worse, shut down altogether.*

Please say enough is enough!

Thank you for saying NO more regulation!

Dena Amos

1255 Sawmill Rd

Bedford, VA 24523

540.529.0734