

January 13, 2004



FSIS docket room – Docket 01-031F
US Dept Agriculture
Food Safety and inspection service
Room 102 cotton annex
300 12th street SW
Washington DC 20250-3700

01-031IF
01-031IF-1
Barbara Sachau

Re: 9 CFR part 592 – Ag marketing service
Docket 01-031F
RIN 0583 AC 94

Gentlemen:

I question whether any egg LAYing facilities are ever inspected as part of the approval of quality. How can you tell what the quality is if you do not inspect the cleanliness and wholesomeness of the facility where the egg is laid. I notice an absence of visits to these egg laying facilities and think that your NOT visiting these places is an invitation for chicken disease or flu to hit the American food industry exactly the way lax regulations allowed beef bovine spongiform encephalopathy to come to America. This is far too lax, the egg is a product of its home and visits to chicken laying facilities MUST BE THE FIRST PRIORITY. IT IS MY OPINION THAT A VISIT TO THE PLANT WHERE THE EGGS ALL LOOK THE SAME IS OF NO VALUE WHATSOEVER COMPARED TO SEEING WHERE THE HENS LIVE WHO MADE THAT EGG. PLEASE MAKE SURE USDA STOPS LAYING DOWN ON THE JOB AND MAKES SURE OUR FOOD SUPPLY IS SAFE WITH CHICKENS. I THINK TO DATE USDA HAS BEEN LAYING DOWN ON THE JOB SINCE THIS PROPOSAL MAKES NO MENTION OF VISITS TO EGG LAYING FACILITIES. WHAT IN HEAVENS NAME IS GOING ON WITH USDA – IT MAKES MONEY FROM INSPECTIONS THAT ARE MEANINGLESS?

The American public does not need the factories monitored as much as we need the chicken laying facilities monitored. Chicken laying facilities must be examined for cleanliness, wholesomeness, how the chickens are treated and whether they are clean or living in ammonia soaked where they pluck out each other's feathers and living under each other's excrement. All that goes into the quality of the egg. It is time for USDA to make sure we do have clean food – not the product of filthy farms.

Pg 1 of 3

Page 2 of 3

This is a complaint that the public is not allowed to comment using e mail. E mail is a valid recognized method of communication in 2004 and under GEPA producers can use it. This discrimination against its use by the public is absolutely outrageous.

This rule is SIGNIFICANT BECAUSE IT IMPACTS AMERICA'S FOOD SUPPLY AND ITS INDUSTRY. PLEASE DO NOT SAY IT IS NOT SIGNIFICANT THAT IS A MISCHARACTERIZATION. Look what happened when USDA did not pay attention to BSE in beef!!!!!!!!!!

Inspections of chicken laying facilities must be frequent, unannounced and a surprise to the chicken owner, rigorous and fines/jail time must be levied in huge amounts for those who would poison america's food.

I hope the USDA personnel saw the expose on old eggs that are being sold by the stores that was on tv recently on a major network. Instances of old and bad contaminated eggs were shown on this tv program. Why aren't fines high enough to prevent this kind of outrage. The tv show showed eggs being returned to the seller as being too old and then being wiped off and sent out to a second time to an unsuspecting buyer. That kind of situation does nothing for the egg industry.

On page 7 it is mentioned that eggs 60 days old are sold – THAT IS TOO OLD AND THIS NEEDS TOBE LOOKED AT FOR QUALITY.

I do not think any seal of approval should be issued because of a drawing of a product – that is too far removed from any semblance of inspection. It constitutes a scam on the American public to allow that distancing from the product's source.

Actually, certification according to these regulations seems to mean absolutely nothing, except an attempt to fool the American public into thinking the eggs have been carefully inspected, when all was done was pay a fee for a seal. The certifier apparently does not go to see the eggs laid all he knows is what the chicken farmer tells him and not even that since he goes to the plant!!!!!!!!!!

I note criminal penalties under the agricultural marketing act of 1946 with fines, etc. I would like an accounting made public of exactly how much was collected in fines in 2001, 2002, from which companies and their location. I bet it amounts to about \$100. in total. I do not believe this law is vigorously enforced and think the USDA is too lax.

Page 3 *of 3*

Comment on Political Activity – I would not allow any exceptions to this ban on political activity so take out “except as authorized by law or regulation of the department”. I would also add the following to this paragraph:

All employees when hired have been given a statement to sign agreeing to this ban on political activity and this statement is on file and available for inspection”.

The intensity of inspections should be several times a year, unannounced, surprise visits. Infrequent visits and inspections lead to dirty egg production facilities.

When visiting, inspectors shall monitor to see that chickens are humanely treated, including always having food and water available at all times, to be living in clean surroundings so that chicken feces from another chicken does not fall on it, etc.

The department should use certified mail for notices, NOT REGISTERED MAIL WHICH IS ALMOST TWICE THE PRICE. THIS COST IS BORNE BY AMERICAN TAXPAYERS AND VALUE SHOULD BE SOUGHT.


On page 13 where termination of service happens, and plant approval is terminated, this action should take place immediately of labels, seals, tags being destroyed.

Sect 592.200 debarment – (ii) shouldn’t the word be “inaccessible”.

Sect 592.240 – Inspection program employee shall report any violation of any law or regulation such as animal abuse, etc. Inspectors are representatives of the US citizen/public and must act as public watchdogs to insure clean wholesome food supply from clean wholesome animals not being abused. Anything less is treason to the American public.

I see no reason why the graphics were not included in this proposal.

Very truly yours,



Barbara Sachau

Copy

Rodney.frelinghuysen@mail.house.gov

Senator Frank Lautenberg

Senator Jon Corzine