

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Barbara DiSalvo [bdisalvo@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 8:31 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: small meat processors

Please reconsider changes in testing by small meat processors. Local farms are critical to a sustainable future and small farms have not had problems similar to those of the large factory farms and processors. Do not make changes which would put these small farms and processors out of business.

Thank you,

Barbara A DiSalvo
8 Sunny Knoll Rd
Ithaca, NY 14850-9617

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Vivien Straus [vivienstraus@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 11:22 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Comments - Draft Guidance on HACCP System Validation

Dear Mr. Almanza,

As a small farm owner concerned with keeping our small farms and sustainable food systems viable, please keep in mind that safety regulations, while extremely important, should not make small meat plants unable to remain financially viable. We need the infrastructure in our area to maintain the viability of our dairy and beef industry. We are already struggling to maintain our current local system.

Vivien Straus
Managing Partner
Straus Home Ranch LLC
vivienstraus@gmail.com

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Dave Solomita [dsolomitaccny@stny.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 12:47 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: USDA Meat Processors Regulation

I support local and organically produced meat and produce. I take issue with with the proposed regulations regarding the requirement of every meat plant to perform testing at every point of processing by collecting samples and sending them to a lab. This additional cost to small famers would be cost prohibitive and put many small farmers out of business or cause them to raise their prices significantly, thereby reducing their profit margin. Please reconsider this proposed regulation and the devastating affects it would have on the small farmer. Thank you.

Dave Solomita
dsolomitaccny@stny.rr.com

White, Ralene

From: u2bonogirl@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 6:16 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - Small scale slaughter houses

Please do not use a one size fits all approach to the variety of slaughter houses. Regulations that fit for an industrial size business may not apply for a small one and will only drive it into oblivion. People who are concerned about the cleanliness and practices of industrial farming and slaughtering are going to smaller farmers and slaughterers to get their food, but it seems that those avenues are just being made more narrow and hard to get down, and may eventually be smothered by industrial scale regulations. The new HACCP guidelines will be unsustainable for small businesses and will kill them, the jobs they create, and the freedom of choices we have as consumers

White, Ralene

From: lovelyliat@gmail.com on behalf of Liat Zavodivker [lzavod@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 3:00 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Please allow small scale slaughterhouses to stay in business

To Whom it May Concern,

Having just read this article <http://www.foodrenegade.com/save-small-scale-slaughterhouses/> and this article <http://www.theatlantic.com/food/archive/2010/05/the-fight-to-save-small-scale-slaughterhouses/57114/> I am deeply disappointed by recent efforts to change testing regulations that would hurt the small scale slaughterhouses and force them to close due to lack of testing facilities. Recently, I have been avoiding large scale farming operations and slaughterhouses due to their negligence in preventing foodborne illness through unsanitary husbandry and slaughtering practices and I feel that small scale organizations are the only way I can trust the meat that I am receiving from a farm to table perspective. It is just as important to monitor the quality and humaneness of slaughtering procedures rather than testing for bacteria at the end, which may not reveal all the strains or potential toxins that can create foodborne illness. If smaller establishments close due to cost prohibitive laws, it would severely damage my faith in the United States Government to protect small farms and small slaughterhouses in providing quality products to the demanding consumer.

Thank you for your time,
Liat Zavodivker

White, Ralene

From: Hilary Billington [skylinezoo@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 12:20 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Separate regulations for small butchers

If small meat packers are subjected to the same testing requirements as large industrial plants, it will put the small processors out of business. It is hard enough for those of us wanting to buy meat from small local farms. Don't make it even harder, please!!!

**Hilary billington
Portland, or**

Sent from my iPhone

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Cindy Solomita [csolomita@stny.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:13 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: USDA Meat Processors Regulation

As a consumer of organic meat, I oppose the proposed regulations regarding the requirement of every meat plant to perform testing at every point of processing by collecting samples and sending them to a lab. This additional cost to small farmers would be cost prohibitive and put many small farmers out of business or cause them to raise their prices significantly thereby reducing their profit margin. Please reconsider this proposed regulation and the devastating affects it would have on the small farmer. Thank you.

Cindy Solomita
csolomita@stny.rr.com

White, Ralene

From: Leah McIntosh [leahjean4@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 11:35 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: New regs for meat processing plants

I am writing to express concern regarding the proposed revisions to regulations for meat processing plants known as the HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Point) food safety plan. It is very important for the USDA to distinguish between small, local meat processing plants and the mega-processors that work with many thousands of pounds of meat on a daily basis. However, the revision appears to require the same very expensive testing and monitoring of all plants, regardless of their size. This very expensive testing, while perhaps an answer to the repeated contamination and recall of meat that is produced by the large plants, presents prohibitive costs for smaller plants despite their history of safe, healthy processing of meat for their local markets. It is of course, possible for the mega-plants to just include this cost as a part of business and their economies of scale would make it possible for them to absorb. I urge you to consider separate guidelines for small, local, or artisan meat processors, distinct from the large plants that not only can better absorb the cost of these regulations, but whose large volumes of meats require closer monitoring than the smaller slaughterhouses.

Sincerely,
Leah McIntosh
805 Ridge View Dr
Leander TX 78641

The New Busy is not the old busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Get started.](#)

White, Ralene

From: asalaugh@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 9:19 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: Message from Internet User - new HACCP requirements

To whom it may concern:

I am deeply concerned for the welfare of small slaughterhouses in our country. The draft published by the FSIS on March 19, 2010 is unfair and will result in the loss of many jobs. For me personally, it will mean that I will no longer be able to purchase high-quality, humanly raised and processed meat. When the FSIS imposes regulations that lump large-scale meat slaughterhouses with small-scale slaughterhouses in the same category, it looks like the FSIS is not actually concerned with food safety, but instead is trying to push small slaughterhouses out of business. Small slaughterhouses are very concerned with food safety but will not be able to meet the very expensive demands as outlined in the FSIS draft.

Please reconsider and come up with a legislation that will allow small scale slaughterhouses to remain in business.

**Sincerely,
Sarah Laughlin**

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Anna [bigcreeksausage@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 10, 2010 4:59 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: comments

Please do not pass this, because we are a very small business and we can not afford to pay for these tests ourselves. We don't make very much but it does pay our bills and that is all we ask for it to do for us. So, if you could please understand that we can not afford to pay for these tests ourselves.

Thanks for your time.

Big Creek Sausage Co., Inc.

Barry Lee
274 Ammons Loop
Hoboken, GA 31542

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Marcia and CB Bassity [cbb@ionet.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2010 11:15 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: comments on draft guidance on HACCP System Validation

Docket Clerk, FSIS
Room 2-2127
5601 Sunnyside Avenue
Beltsville, MD 20705

Dear Mr. Almanza:

Regarding the Draft Guidance on HACCP System Validation publically released on March 19, 2010.

I am told that you are currently considering changing the enforcement of the HACCP system validation, yet the current system has produced a safe meat supply when following the current HACCP plans. These plans use the FSIS standards, FSIS Federal Register documents and peer reviewed studies to maintain reliable processes.

As consumers in rural Oklahoma, my family and I depend on small-scale meat processors to deliver high-quality meat products. Formerly, for the many years that I was a farmer-rancher, I depended on the same operations to process my own home-raised meat animals. These processors would be adversely affected by the Draft Guidance on HACCP System Validation, to the point that many if not all would be forced out of business. I strongly urge that the the draft be revised to clearly state that no in-plant microbial testing is required when an establishment is following the long-standing, safe processes of HACCP.

Sincerely,

Mr. CB Bassity
1528 S. 19th St.
Chickasha, OK 73018

Rhodes, Suzette

From: bballhawg@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2010 7:02 PM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments

It seems that the purpose of this is to make it economically unfeasible for small plants to implement these changes. As a small plant that is struggling to survive in the day and age these changes could drive my cost through the roof and slow volume to the point of closing. Careful consideration should be made to what these changes do to those of us without financial resources to cover the additional cost. While food safety is one of the main goals of all plants it can't be what shuts them down.

Farron Mitchell
Mitchell's Sausage Roll
#20023

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Barbara.Rauschenbach@esc.edu
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 8:12 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: New Regulations for Meat Processing

Dear U.S.D.A. Representative:

I am dismayed to hear that there is a new interpretation of the regulations for meat processing that will make it difficult or impossible to get local meat. Meat safety is definitely an issue but it is the large meat producers, with their factory farms, that create the problems. This regulation will result in fewer small meat producers, just the opposite of what should be happening. You should be encouraging small, local producers who generally produce meat in a much more environmentally and healthful way than factory farms.

I urge you to reconsider this move.

Sincerely,

Barb Rauschenbach

Rhodes, Suzette

From: John Foose [timebuilderz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 7:01 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments

I'm writing in reference to the new regulations you are planning to impose on slaughterhouses. I hope that you recognize the difference between "real farms" and farm factories. Here on our family farm we raise about 200 chickens have 50 laying hens keep about 30 katahdin cross ewe's, raise 2 hogs and a load of meat rabbits each year. These large factory farms are giving us small sustainable farmers a bad name...If it is not bad enough it already costs us double the prices to raise our stock compared to these corporate farms these new regulations would raise the costs of our products beyond the grasp of most people effectively shutting down small farm America. We may not have the funds to run ads and pack the pockets of politicians with wads of cash like the large corporate farms can but we can and do vote in each election and you can bet any representative that supports further regulating small family farms is losing our vote. I am in support of regulating these corporate farms but a distinction needs to be made between corporate farming and family farms. The USA was built on the family farm and it should stay that way.

John Foose
2479 Bennett road
Hop Bottom, PA 18824

Rhodes, Suzette

From: Christi Jennings [jithacamama@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 2:35 AM
To: Draft Validation Guide Comments
Subject: changes will hurt small farms!

To whom it may concern,

I was recently made aware of the potential for changing how meat reaches the consumer... an emphasis on LARGE FACTORY farming instead of local farm-raised animals. In an effort for convenience, we will be selling out small business and the health of the community. I am from Ithaca, NY and love how the community is invested in supporting farms and local, healthy food... and the people who struggle to provide it.

Thank you, Christen Jennings

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Learn more.](#)