

Rhodes, Suzette

From: body@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 4:53 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - HACCP Systems Validation will kill small businesses

re: "Draft Guidance: HACCP Systems Validation," published by USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service FSIS on March 19, 2010

I am all for safety in the food chain, however, imposing testing regardless of health and safety records is an onerous burden for the small slaughterhouses. I believe this new regulation could actually decrease safety as it will lead to having just a few giant slaughterhouses where meat from many different animals will intermingle as opposed to the small slaughterhouse model where just a few or even a single cow is butchered at a time.

White, Ralene

From: marinabowsher@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2010 12:06 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - HACCP system validation

While I support the intent of the HACCP, I find that the new guidance document published by FSIS on March 19, 2010, regarding the HACCP system validation should not be beneficial to assuring safety standards of meet. The new rules would involve a significant cost increase for all slaughterhouses big and small regardless of whether any health concerns have been identified. The result would be to drive the smaller slaughter houses, who do not have the ability to absorb the cost, out of business. Because most of the beef recalls actually come from the larger slaughterhouses, the problem this is supposed to address will most likely be increased and not diminished. Perhaps a system based on prior problems would be more appropriate, giving all slaughterhouses the incentive NOT to have a problem in the first place in order to avoid the cost of this extra, more expensive, check mechanism.

White, Ralene

From: ryandittman@hotmail.com
Sent: Sunday, June 06, 2010 10:35 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - Re: Proposed rule changes for locker plants

Re: Proposed rule changes for locker plants

To Whom It May Concern,

My husband and I have a small farm where we raise and direct-market less than 60 pigs each year. It has come to our attention that the USDA has proposed a change in the rules governing meat processors, requiring more in the way of microbial testing and validation. This proposed rule change concerns us greatly as it will significantly drive up operating costs for meat lockers and increase our cost of production in turn.

We are very concerned that this costly change will result in our butcher closing his plant and us losing our farm business. When we began our business we checked with larger processing plants but found that they were unable to serve us due to the fact that we only process a few hogs at a time. The large plants in our area required at least 50 head at a time in order to process at their facilities. Our butcher is able to be much more flexible with the number and timing of animals to be processed, two things that are important to our business.

Small processing plants are vital to the health of rural communities who rely on them for safe meat and poultry production, and burdening them with stricter rules and regulations would only make it more difficult for them in an increasingly competitive market. Complicated rule changes are unnecessary as the US meat supply is already the safest in the world.

Thank you,
Ryan and Mikyla Dittman
Hospers, IA
heritageviewfarm.com

White, Ralene

From: Tim Larsen [tim@corningmu.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2010 12:39 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: additional testing requirments for meat processing

I would like to voice my concern for the additional costs that the USDA is proposing for meat lockers. There is a point where rewards and cost cross and only cost goes up. I personally have not heard of any consumer having any problems with their local lockers, so I don't know what would spark additional testing. Everytime our locker produces food for the general public, there is a state car sitting outside. I can't imagine what that costs. Someone feels there needs to be more? The USDA and the EPA are trying to make everything so sterile that when there is a problem which is just part of human nature which you can't regulate, our bodies won't be able to handle anything.

Sincerely

Tim Larsen
Corning, Iowa

White, Ralene

From: alan@leds.bz
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2010 8:43 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - Draft Guidance redefining validation for Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point HACCP systems

I would just like to say that small and very small meat plants are a vital part of many of our rural communities and our rural economy. I have serious concerns that this re-interpretation will impact their ability to stay in business and continue serving as a vital link between farmers and consumers. I commend your efforts through the "Know your Farmer, Know your Food" initiative to support small, local food producers, but I worry that these proposed guidelines could significantly setback the goals of that initiative.

You dont hear about any e coli problems from small lockers in rural areas, its the big packers that have to recall millions of pounds of product due to unsanitary conditions. The small lockers are more careful since many are family owned and operated and they see their customers face to face every day.

thank you,
Alan Johnson
Lake Mills, IA

Rhodes, Suzette

From: jamesandru@telus.net
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 6:25 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - HAACP validation

Small processing plant has posted cost estimate in six figures to comply with draft guidelines. In other words, they will go out of business.

The misguided ideal goal of "perfect food safety" is not possible.

System verification is fine for large, automated facilities. Evaluation of small and very small operations requires a deeper understanding of the site and the people that will never be satisfied by paperwork.

I do not believe the general public really wants to shut down small regional operations.

They are more concerned with the safety of the food they buy with no idea of source or standards.

Please give some careful thought to the implementation of this draft and potential ramifications to our food security.

Thanks.

White, Ralene

From: pchrisman@vermeer.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2010 8:32 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - HACCP

This proposed rules change, I feel is not needed and could hurt close local meat lockers. I am 42 years old, grew up on a farm, and for all of my life, I've eaten locally grown meat processed in local meat lockers, and I have NEVER had any health issues because of this.

I have also traveled the world for Vermeer Mfg. and can not say that I have never gotten sick from eating meat outside the USA. I strongly urge you to abandon this proposed rules change. I feel local meat lockers provide the local communities a great service and I would hate to see that stop.

Sincerely,

**J. Phillip Chrisman
Segment Manager
Vermeer Forage Solutions**

Rhodes, Suzette

From: GVonBargen@aol.com
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 11:08 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: New meat processing regs proposed

I understand that the Food Safety of the USDA is proposing that many additional tests be performed on meat products, though I truthfully don't have a clear understanding of them. Because I raise sheep, I worry that new rules will make our local meat processing houses too greatly burdened to stay in business and they will be unable to turn our animals into table products for us.

I moved to the country specifically to have more control over the food my family and I eat.

I want the meats I eat to be raised on grass and humanely raised and slaughtered.

I want to buy locally, I want to support local rural economies. Therefore I oppose rules that will put small butcher facilities out of business.

Gail Von Bargen
Hamburg, MN

White, Ralene

From: Elizabeth Pierson [epierson@suscom-maine.net]
Sent: Saturday, June 05, 2010 8:10 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: don't hamstring small, local meat processors

To whom it concerns:

It will be a great tragedy for consumers who care about where their food comes from if small-scale meat processors are forced out of business by the overly burdensome regulations of the USDA. A one-size-fits-all approach is not necessary for meat processing. For years, many small slaughterhouses have been doing a much better job than the mega-slaughterhouses at turning out bacteria-free meat.

I eat meat only if I know where it has come from, how the animal has been grazed, and where it has been slaughtered. This means no meat from a mega-slaughterhouse -- only from small, local slaughterhouses that I know I can trust. Please don't let the USDA and Big Business put these folks out of business.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Pierson

Elizabeth C. Pierson
Editor & Writer
656 Harpswell Road
Brunswick, ME 04011
Tel: 207-729-4473
epierson@suscom-maine.net

White, Ralene

From: evan grant [evangrant13@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 05, 2010 10:07 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Oppostition to increasing slaughterhouse regulation

To Whom it May Concern,

I am righting to express my oppostion to a proposed increase in regulation for small slaughterhouse operations. As a patron of small local meat producers I understand the difficulty of making ends meet for these farmers. Profit margins are small for small meat producers and new regulations would increase the cost of processing reducing this low margin and most likely increasing the price of the finished product, which is already high in comparision to large industrial meat operations. I would like to see small farming operations deregulated to make it more feasible for these farmers to compete with the larger industrial meat operations. I personally am much more concerned with the food saftey of industrial meat farms tending to many animals then the small farmers I know by name looking after a few dozen animals raised integrity. Please keep these farmers in bussiness, don't increase regulations.

Sincerely,

Evan Grant
Round Pond, ME

The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars with Hotmail. [Get busy.](#)

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Ryan Carlson [ryanrcarlson@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 22, 2010 9:53 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: HACCP validation guidance

Hi,

I am writing because I am concerned that the places I have chosen to buy my meat from may be run out of business due to some unfair regulations. I know my farmers and I know my food. I get to talk to the farmers directly at farmer's markets, at monthly delivery spots, through their newsletters, and by email. I want to continue to buy their food because it is healthier for me, the animals, and the environment. Please don't run them out of business by one-size fits all regulations.

Regards,
Ryan Carlson

8174 Shadyview LN N
Maple Grove, MN 55311
763-234-9354

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Sandra Shaner [wrgma2@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 15, 2010 6:25 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Cc: Sandra Shaner
Subject: Please create 2 levels of meat processing standards

I'm one of those folks who won't buy or eat factory farmed and processed meat products for reasons of food safety and inhumane animal practices. I buy my meat from known providers who must use small processors to prepare their animals for resale to me. While I applaud the new regulations to safeguard those who buy supermarket meat and the mixtures of many animals, that isn't what I buy. It is my understanding that the same rules are proposed to apply to both the largest and smallest processors, and that those rules can result in many of the small processors incurring costs beyond their revenues and leaving the business. At a time when there is an emphasis on "buying and eating locally" for many reasons, this is not a time to run small providers -- whether the humane animal farmers or processors -- out of business.

Please consider consumers like me and the small producers as you review your draft regulations.

Sandra Shaner
110 Hickory
Wood River, IL 62095

Russell, Linda

From: Jeffers, Mary Katherine
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 3:47 PM
To: Russell, Linda
Subject: FW: FSIS testing

Please draft response.

Mary Katherine Jeffers
Issues Analyst
USDA/Food Safety and Inspection Service
Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Education
Executive Correspondence & Issues Management Staff
1400 Independence Ave SW, Room 1166
Washington D.C. 20250
Phone 202-690-3626

From: susan.hancock@ingfp.com [mailto:susan.hancock@ingfp.com]
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2010 12:08 PM
To: FSIS
Subject: FSIS testing

I am writing to urge you to consider the impact this law would have on small businesses. The state inspector visits these business
Several times a week, surely there is a better way to resolve this issue that a one size fits all program. If this mandate goes
Through as it is currently it will close businesses or raise prices so much that they will eventually have to close as the costs will be to high
For the average consumer to afford. I purchase my meat through the local locker plant and several plants around the area, have
Never had any issues and do not want to see them being forced to close. Please I urge you to find a better more affordable
Way for this to be done.

Sincerely,

Susan Hancock