



# Animal Welfare Institute

P.O. Box 3650 Washington, DC 20027-0150 [www.awionline.org](http://www.awionline.org)  
telephone: (202) 337-2332 facsimile: (888) 260-2271

August 31, 2010

Mr. Alfred V. Almanza  
Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service  
U.S. Department of Agriculture  
1400 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, DC 20250-3700

**Re: Non-Rulemaking Petition for Improving Humane Methods of Slaughter Act Enforcement**

Dear Mr. Almanza:

I write on behalf of the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) to request that the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) consider specific changes to its administration of the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA.) AWI is a nonprofit membership organization which, since 1951, has worked to promote the humane treatment of animals, including animals in agriculture. The organization represents citizens throughout the country who place a high value on the humane treatment of animals raised and slaughtered for food.

AWI conducted a survey and analysis of state and federal humane slaughter enforcement between November 2009 and March 2010. The survey was undertaken to update a comprehensive, ten-year review of humane slaughter enforcement published by AWI in May 2008.<sup>1</sup> The study aimed first, to determine whether humane slaughter enforcement increased in the aftermath of the well-publicized inhumane slaughter incidents at Westland-Hallmark Meat Packing Co. in early 2008; and second, to compare state and federal enforcement of humane slaughter laws. Data used to analyze humane slaughter enforcement were obtained through state public records, federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests, and information posted on the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) website.

Based on an analysis of state and federal humane slaughter enforcement, AWI wishes to offer four recommendations to FSIS regarding its administration of the HMSA. These recommendations are narrowly tailored to enable them to be implemented with limited expense

---

<sup>1</sup> D Jones, *Crimes without Consequences: The Enforcement of Humane Slaughter Laws in the United States*, Animal Welfare Institute, May 2008. <http://www.awionline.org/ht/a/GetDocumentAction/i/3589>. Accessed 6/29/10.

and without resort to the rulemaking process. AWI recommends that FSIS pursue the following actions:

- Issue guidance to FSIS district offices and inspectors recommending substantially longer suspensions for repeat violators of the HMSA.
- Develop procedures for referring alleged instances of willful animal cruelty to state or local law enforcement for prosecution.
- Work to achieve greater consistency among state-level humane slaughter enforcement programs.
- Post slaughter establishment suspension records on the FSIS website.

A. FSIS should issue guidance recommending longer suspensions for repeat violators.

Though equipped with suspension authority, FSIS has declined to take enforcement action in a manner that effectively deters violations of humane slaughter provisions. FSIS suspensions commonly last no more than one day. These brief suspensions have proven ineffective as a means of deterrence, as evidenced by repeated suspensions of individual slaughter establishments. Of the 169 federally inspected plants that have been suspended for humane slaughter violations since January 1, 2005, 50 (or 30 percent) have been suspended more than once within a one-year period, according to FSIS Quarterly Enforcement Reports. Of these plants, 10 were suspended between three and five times within a one-year period (see Appendix).

The pattern of repeat violations reveals a failure on the part of the present statutory and regulatory scheme to deter the most pervasive humane slaughter violations. To its credit, FSIS has mounted a commendable effort to increase enforcement at slaughter plants in the wake of the 2008 Hallmark recall. FSIS suspended eight times as many plants in 2008 as it had the previous year, and this trend continued in 2009. Short-term suspensions, however, have failed to compel compliance with humane slaughter laws. Stronger tools are necessary to penalize operations that repeatedly conduct slaughter in a cruel and inhumane manner.

Though the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) gives USDA the authority to assess monetary penalties against violators of the HMSA, they are largely insufficient to serve as a deterrent and (to our knowledge) have never been used. A catch-all provision in the FMIA provides that any person, firm, or corporation that violates any provision of the law for which no other criminal penalty is provided will, upon conviction, be subject to a maximum of a one-year prison sentence, a maximum \$1,000 fine, or both.<sup>2</sup> A fine this minimal is not likely to provide adequate deterrent effect.

---

<sup>2</sup> 21 USC §676.

Unless Congress mandates stronger monetary fines, FSIS's strongest enforcement authority lies in regulatory control actions,<sup>3</sup> withholding actions,<sup>4</sup> suspension of inspection,<sup>5</sup> withdrawal of inspection, and initial denial of the grant inspection as a result of inhumane handling or slaughtering of livestock.<sup>6</sup> The practical effect of suspension, withdrawal, or refusal of inspection is to render the meat and meat products processed by the establishment ineligible for use in commerce as long as inspection is suspended.

In order to deter recurrent humane slaughter violations, AWI recommends that the FSIS issue guidance to inspectors and district offices delineating a scheme of escalating suspension times for each successive offense within a one-year period. The Animal Care program of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) recently developed an action plan to provide more uniform enforcement against repeat violators of the Animal Welfare Act. AWI believes that similar action is necessary for FSIS to target problematic slaughter establishments.

AWI recommends that after one violation, an establishment should remain suspended until the problem has been adequately addressed. A second suspension within one year should result in withdrawal of inspection for no less than 30 days and retraining of relevant staff in humane handling and slaughter practices. A third suspension within the same one year period should result in withdrawal of inspection service from the establishment and refusal to provide inspection to any establishment under the same ownership for a period of three years.

Such a scheme, if properly enforced, could have led to the withdrawal of inspection from 10 plants over the past five years, including Bushway Packing, Inc. in Grand Isle, Vermont, where two slaughterhouse employees were charged with cruelty to animals and the plant was ultimately shut down. Incidents at these plants may have been avoided altogether had the establishments received longer suspensions and retraining of staff after a second violation. A scheme of increasing suspensions would target the worst plants and provide the deterrence necessary to ensure a higher degree of HMSA compliance.

B. FSIS should develop procedures for referring alleged instances of willful animal cruelty to state or local law enforcement for prosecution.

Current HMSA enforcement mechanisms do not utilize criminal penalties for individuals who violate humane handling and slaughter regulations, even in cases of extreme and intentional animal cruelty. While slaughter establishments may be shut down for varying periods of time in response to humane slaughter violations, individual workers who commit egregious acts of

---

<sup>3</sup> "A 'regulatory control action' is the retention of product, rejection of equipment or facilities, slowing or stopping of lines, or refusal to allow the processing of specifically identified product." 9 CFR 500.1 (a).

<sup>4</sup> "A 'withholding action' is the refusal to allow the marks of inspection to be applied to products. A withholding action may affect all product in the establishment or product produced by a particular process. 9 CFR 500.1 (b).

<sup>5</sup> "A 'suspension' is an interruption in the assignment of program employees to all or part of an establishment." 9 CFR 500.1(c)

<sup>6</sup> 9 CFR 500.1-500.8

cruelty are not penalized in any way. Some of these individuals may have a propensity for violence and represent a threat to animals and people in their community.

It has also been suggested that slaughterhouse workers suffer serious psychological trauma in the workplace, as illustrated by “the countless stories of slaughterhouse employees inflicting pain on animals ‘just for fun.’”<sup>7</sup> Criminology professor Amy Fitzgerald has theorized that a spillover of violence occurs from the slaughterhouse into the surrounding community. Her recent analysis of crime statistics from 581 U.S. counties found that slaughterhouse employment increases total arrest rates, arrests for violent crimes, arrests for rape, and arrests for other sex offenses.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, it is incumbent upon federal officials working in slaughter establishments to help local authorities identify individuals who have been involved in acts of cruelty to animals and pose a risk of committing additional violent acts outside the slaughterhouse.

While five states<sup>9</sup> generally exempt the slaughtering process from coverage under their animal cruelty statutes, prosecution could be pursued, potentially, for incidents of inhumane handling of animals up to the point of slaughter. Thirty states have passed humane slaughter laws; however, most of these have not been revised in decades and provide only for very minor penalties.<sup>10</sup> All states possess laws against animal cruelty, and forty six states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands now have laws making certain types of animal cruelty a felony offense.<sup>11</sup> Approximately two dozen states have exempted accepted agricultural practices from their animal cruelty laws; however, this exemption does not preclude prosecution of inhumane slaughter cases, as the meat industry itself has promulgated clearly defined guidelines for the humane handling and slaughter of animals raised for food.<sup>12</sup>

Attempts to pressure state and local officials to prosecute inhumane handling and slaughter under state animal cruelty codes have proven largely unsuccessful. In its 2008 report on humane slaughter enforcement, AWI profiled 15 cases where animal welfare advocates sought prosecution of inhumane handling and slaughter under state anti-cruelty laws.<sup>13</sup> Prosecution was successfully pursued in only two cases. In four cases, inadequate evidence was cited by local or state authorities as the reason for not bringing charges; and in five cases, the officials argued that

---

<sup>7</sup> J Dillard, A slaughterhouse nightmare: psychological harm suffered by slaughterhouse employees and the possibility of redress through legal reform, *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (2008). [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1016401](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1016401). Accessed 6/29/10. Dillard argues that “the under-regulation of the animal industry provides a green light for legalized (or ignored) animal cruelty.”

<sup>8</sup> A Fitzgerald et al., Slaughterhouses and increased crime rates: an empirical analysis of the spillover from “The Jungle” into the surrounding community, *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 158-184 (2009).

<sup>9</sup> Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Rhode Island. *Crimes without Consequences*, op cit, p. 75.

<sup>10</sup> *Crimes without Consequences*, op cit, pp. 63-68.

<sup>11</sup> Humane Society of the United States, *State Animal Cruelty Chart*, August 2009.

[http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/abuse/state\\_animal\\_cruelty\\_laws\\_080109.pdf](http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/abuse/state_animal_cruelty_laws_080109.pdf). Accessed 6/22/10.

<sup>12</sup> T Grandin, *Recommended Animal Handling Guidelines and Audit Guide*, American Meat Institute (AMI) Foundation, 2010. <http://www.animalhandling.org/ht/a/GetDocumentAction/i/58632%20>. Accessed 6/23/10.

<sup>13</sup> *Crimes without Consequences*, op cit, pp. 75-81.

state charges were not appropriate because slaughter is a regulatory issue under the jurisdiction of the USDA.<sup>14</sup>

AWI believes that state and local law enforcement would handle requests for prosecution very differently if USDA were to refer cases and/or support the filing of animal cruelty charges. However, AWI is not aware of any instances where USDA has referred incidents of inhumane handling or slaughter to local or state law enforcement officials for prosecution. In the two prosecuted cases profiled in AWI's 2008 report, charges were brought at the request of humane society officials or animal advocates. In another more recent case, animal advocates registered a complaint regarding the inhumane handling of calves at the Bushway plant in Vermont that resulted in two individuals being charged with cruelty to animals.<sup>15</sup>

The Animal Care program of the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has announced that it intends to develop a policy for referral of alleged violations of the federal Animal Welfare Act to states that have felony level animal cruelty statutes.<sup>16</sup> AWI commends APHIS for taking this step and encourages FSIS to follow suit with a similar policy for humane slaughter violations.

C. FSIS should work to achieve greater consistency among state-level humane slaughter enforcement programs.

In 2008, AWI published a survey of state-level enforcement programs. Of the 28 states operating meat inspection programs during the years 2002 through 2004, only 10 provided any evidence of humane slaughter enforcement. AWI's most recent survey, covering the years 2007 through 2009, documented a significantly higher enforcement level, with 20 of 27 states submitting evidence of enforcement.<sup>17</sup> Not only did more states submit evidence of enforcement, but the number of enforcement records per state increased significantly as well. The total number of

---

<sup>14</sup> Id. In one case the county prosecutor noted that the issue needed "to be handled more on a regulatory end than prosecuting someone criminally." "This is more appropriately dealt with through federal and state regulations dealing with slaughterhouses," the prosecutor explained in refusing to file charges.

<sup>15</sup> Office of the Attorney General of Vermont, *Arrest Warrants Issued in Cruelty to Animals Case* (news release), June 4, 2010. <http://www.atg.state.vt.us/news/arrest-warrants-issued-in-cruelty-to-animals-case.php>. Accessed 6/23/10.

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service, *APHIS Enhanced Animal Welfare Act Enforcement Plan* (web page), no date. [http://www.aphis.usda.gov/newsroom/content/2010/05/AWA\\_enforcement\\_plan.shtml](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/newsroom/content/2010/05/AWA_enforcement_plan.shtml). Accessed 6/23/10.

<sup>17</sup> The number of states operating meat inspection programs dropped from 28 in 2002-2004 to 27 in 2007-2009 as a result of New Mexico losing its accreditation in August 2007. USDA, FSIS, *Listing of States Without Inspection Programs* (web page), August 13, 2007. [http://www.fsis.usda.gov/regulations\\_&\\_policies/listing\\_of\\_states\\_without\\_inspection\\_programs/index.asp](http://www.fsis.usda.gov/regulations_&_policies/listing_of_states_without_inspection_programs/index.asp). Accessed 6/29/10.

state noncompliance records increased from 72 to 410 from 2002-04 to 2007-09, and suspensions increased from 4 to 12 from 2002-04 to 2007-09.<sup>18</sup>

Of the seven states not supplying records for 2007-09, one (Delaware) had no licensed meat slaughter plants during the period; one (Virginia) submitted federal but no state records, two (South Dakota and Utah) did not respond to the AWI public record request, and two (Arizona and Louisiana) indicated they had no records for the time period in question. None of these states had submitted records for AWI's previous state review, indicating that these states were either unable or unwilling to provide any evidence of enforcing humane slaughter regulations under their respective meat inspection programs for the entire six year period in question.<sup>19</sup>

AWI suspects that part of the increase in reporting of state enforcement is due to improvements in state recordkeeping systems and the ability of state inspection programs to more easily search records for violations of a certain type. However, notable differences between the various state programs are apparent, making comparisons difficult. Some states have shifted to all electronic reporting while others still use paper forms, and the information contained on the forms varies as well. In addition, while many states appear to have adopted the federal Humane Activities Tracking System (HATS) to document time spent on humane enforcement efforts, others have indicated they are not on the system.

AWI has examined FSIS's most recent review of state meat and poultry inspection programs,<sup>20</sup> which includes a section on humane handling enforcement. The 2009 review noted no humane handling deficiencies or areas of weakness for any of the state inspection programs, including those that did not provide evidence of enforcement in response to the AWI public record request for enforcement documentation.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, none of the state reviews address the failure of inspection personnel to take appropriate action in response to potentially egregious incidents, even though AWI's assessment of state noncompliance records identified this as a problem area for several state enforcement programs.<sup>22</sup> While suspensions at state inspected plants are up

---

<sup>18</sup> *Humane Slaughter Update*, op cit, p. 5.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Safety & Inspection Service, Office of Program Evaluation, Enforcement & Review, Federal/State Audit Branch, *FSIS Review of State Meat and Poultry Inspection Programs: Fiscal Year 2009 Summary Report*, March 2010. [http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/Review\\_of\\_State\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/Review_of_State_Programs.pdf). Accessed 6/28/10.

<sup>21</sup> See reviews for Arizona, Louisiana, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont and Virginia. The reviews for Louisiana and Virginia specifically note that noncompliance records were reviewed; however, neither of these states provided any noncompliance records in response to AWI's public record request. USDA, FSIS, OPEER, *Annual Comprehensive Review and Determination Report: Louisiana*, March 2010, p. 16; USDA, FSIS, OPEER, *Annual Comprehensive Review and Determination Report: Virginia*, March 2010, pp. 15-16.

[http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/Review\\_of\\_State\\_Programs\\_Portfolio.pdf](http://www.fsis.usda.gov/PDF/Review_of_State_Programs_Portfolio.pdf). Accessed 6/28/10.

<sup>22</sup> *Humane Slaughter Update*, op cit, pp. 16-17.

generally, they remain far below suspensions at the federal level, another indication that egregious incidents are not being adequately dealt with by state inspection programs.<sup>23</sup>

AWI commends the recent increase in state level enforcement and encourages FSIS to work toward greater consistency in humane slaughter enforcement among state inspection programs and, in particular, to address the issue of state regulatory response to egregious violations.

D. FSIS should make slaughter establishment suspension records available to the public via the FSIS website.

FSIS produces Quarterly Enforcement Reports that are posted to the USDA website in a consistent and timely manner.<sup>24</sup> These reports provide enforcement data, including a table of plant suspensions for the most recent quarter. Although a column for humane handling offenses is included in the table, details are not given. Consequently, it is not possible for animal protection advocates or other members of the public to determine what specific humane handling deficiencies are occurring at slaughter establishments without submitting FOIA requests to obtain a particular establishment's suspension records.

In the past, FSIS's response to routine FOIA requests has been extremely slow. Narrow requests for a small number of pages can take up to a year, while response times of between one and two years are typical for broader requests involving a larger number of pages; response times greater than two years are not unheard of.<sup>25</sup> FSIS's failure to make records available in a timely manner violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the FOIA law. A description of AWI's most recent experience with FSIS FOIA requests follows:

- 20 FOIA requests filed between November 2009 and March 2010 requesting suspension records for 20 individually named establishments: Three sets of establishment documents received to date;
- 1 FOIA request filed in December 2009 requesting 2009 humane slaughter Quarterly Enforcement Report(s) prepared by the Office of Data Integration and Food Protection: No documents received to date; and

---

<sup>23</sup> In 2009, only 4% of state humane slaughter noncompliance records resulted in plant suspension, while 17% of federal noncompliances resulted in suspension. See *Humane Slaughter Update*, op cit, p. 8.

<sup>24</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Safety & Inspection Service, *Quarterly Enforcement Reports*. [http://www.fsis.usda.gov/regulations\\_&\\_policies/Quarterly\\_Enforcement\\_Reports/index.asp](http://www.fsis.usda.gov/regulations_&_policies/Quarterly_Enforcement_Reports/index.asp). Accessed 6/28/10.

<sup>25</sup> In one case, FSIS did not fill a request for 18 months' worth of establishment noncompliance records until 30 months after receipt. High demand does not appear to be the cause of such long delays, as the workload of the FSIS FOIA office appears moderate at best. For example, in May 2010 FSIS received a total of 26 requests, 8 of which were requests from the Animal Welfare Institute for single establishment records. See USDA, Food Safety and Inspection Service, *Freedom of Information Act Requests Received: May 1, 2010 to May 31, 2010*. [http://www.fsis.usda.gov/FOIA/FSIS\\_Electronic\\_Reading\\_Room/index.asp#request](http://www.fsis.usda.gov/FOIA/FSIS_Electronic_Reading_Room/index.asp#request). Accessed 6/29/10.

- 2 FOIA requests filed in January 2010 requesting records related to District Veterinary Medical Specialist (DVMS) slaughter establishment visits: No documents received to date.

Unlike APHIS's Animal Care program, which posts Animal Welfare Act licensee inspection records online,<sup>26</sup> no information regarding compliance by individual U.S. slaughter establishments with food safety and humane slaughter requirements is made available to the public, with the exception of the limited data contained in Quarterly Enforcement Reports. In fact, although the FSIS was slated to produce a quarterly analysis of humane slaughter compliance, the report has not been made available to the public, either online or otherwise.<sup>27</sup>

Despite the Obama Administration's pledge of transparency and open government, FSIS has not improved public access to information. Upon taking office on January 21, 2010 President Obama issued a "Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies" on the Freedom of Information Act, which reads in part:

*The presumption of disclosure also means that agencies should take affirmative steps to make information public. They should not wait for specific requests from the public. All agencies should use modern technology to inform citizens about what is known and done by their Government. Disclosure should be timely.*<sup>28</sup>

Posting information regarding slaughter plant compliance with food safety regulations would serve several purposes. First, as noted by the Attorney General in a memorandum for heads of executive departments and agencies, providing information online will reduce the need for individual FOIA requests and thereby reduce FOIA staff workloads and shorten FOIA response times.<sup>29</sup> Second, posting information will increase FSIS's effectiveness by disseminating information about humane slaughter enforcement to members of the public possessing expertise that, when shared, will allow the agency to make better decisions regarding humane slaughter enforcement. Third, posting of food safety compliance data will assist the public in making more informed decisions about the food products they purchase and consume. And, finally, making slaughter plant enforcement records available to the public on the FSIS website will serve to encourage compliance by slaughter establishments with humane handling and slaughter regulations.

---

<sup>26</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service, *AWA Inspection Information* (web page). [http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal\\_welfare/inspections.shtml](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/inspections.shtml)

<sup>27</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General, Great Plains Region, *Audit Report: Evaluation of FSIS Management Controls over Pre-Slaughter Activities*, Report No. 24601-0007-KC, November 2008. <http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/24601-07-KC.pdf>. Accessed 6/29/10.

<sup>28</sup> The White House, *Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: Freedom of Information Act*, January 21, 2010. [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/FreedomofInformationAct/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/FreedomofInformationAct/). Accessed 6/29/10.

<sup>29</sup> Office of the Attorney General, *Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: The Freedom of Information Act*, March 19, 2009. <http://www.justice.gov/ag/foia-memo-march2009.pdf>. Accessed 6/29/10.

AWI is committed to educating the public about the treatment of animals in U.S. slaughter plants. Because of this commitment, the organization will continue to request FSIS enforcement records despite the agency's lengthy response times, and continue to post the documents received on the AWI website. AWI encourages FSIS to make slaughter establishment inspection documents – specifically those related to notices of intended enforcement, suspensions, withdrawals, civil actions, and criminal actions – available to the public on the USDA website.

#### Conclusion

AWI recognizes and applauds the increased humane slaughter enforcement undertaken by FSIS over the past several years. The fact remains, however, that far too many plants repeatedly violate the HMSA without meaningful consequences, leading to the needless suffering of thousands of animals. Adopting the above recommendations will allow FSIS to further strengthen enforcement by deterring repeat violations, assisting state and local governments in the prosecution of animal cruelty, better informing the public of specific suspensions for humane slaughter violations, and working with states to improve their inspection programs. I appreciate your consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

Cathy Liss

President



# Animal Welfare Institute

P.O. Box 3650 Washington, DC 20027-0150 [www.awionline.org](http://www.awionline.org)

telephone: (202) 337-2332 facsimile: (888) 260-2271

## Slaughter Plants with Repeated Suspensions for Humane Violations

*The following federally-inspected plants received more than one suspension for humane slaughter/humane handling violations within a 1-year period since January 1, 2005.*

Plant Name	Location	Size*	Suspensions	# of Days
<b>A &amp; D Meat Processing</b>	Chapel Hill, TN	Very small	03/20/08	1
			04/17/08	4
			05/09/08	3
			05/19/08	4
			06/27/08	20
<b>Berry Packing</b>	Crossett, AR	Small	04/13/05	1
			09/16/05	**
<b>Bright Oak Meats Inc</b>	Springfield, OR	Small	10/01/09	<1
			11/19/09	1
<b>Brown Packing Co</b>	Gaffney, SC	Small	05/08/09	3
			08/14/09	<1
<b>Bushway Packing Inc</b>	Grand Isle, VT	Very small	05/12/09	1
			06/24/09	1
			07/01/09	1
			10/30/09	
<b>C &amp; F Meat</b>	College Grove, TN	Very small	04/16/08	1
			07/01/08	1
			04/15/09	<1
<b>Cabrito Market Inc</b>	Mission, TX	Small	09/13/07	<1
			10/29/07	1
			06/10/08	3
<b>Chaudhry Meats Inc</b>	Staley, NC	Very small	02/11/10	<1
			06/08/10	<1

<b>Plant Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Size*</b>	<b>Suspensions</b>	<b># of Days</b>
<b>Clougherty Packing Co</b>	Vernon, CA	Large	09/07/06 09/08/06	<1 <1
<b>Cloverdale Foods Co</b>	Minot, ND	Small	11/25/09 01/13/10	<1 1
<b>Coleman Natural Products</b>	Limon, CO	Small	01/06/06 07/08/06	4 3
<b>Columbia Packing</b>	Dallas, TX	Small	11/12/08 05/18/09	1 1
<b>Countryside Quality Meats</b>	Union City, MI	Very small	02/12/08 04/08/08 09/11/08	15 <1 5
<b>Florida Beef</b>	Zolfo Springs, FL	Small	07/16/09 06/22/10	<1 <1
<b>H &amp; P Meats</b>	S Pittsburg, TN	Very small	11/13/07 03/25/08	6 6
<b>Hays Meat Company</b>	Lexington, TN	Very small	04/18/08 02/27/09	4 3
<b>Heritage Acres Foods</b>	Pleasant Hope, MO	Very small	06/26/09 08/04/09	3 1
<b>Huse's Processing Inc</b>	Malone, TX	Very small	03/26/08 04/10/08	1 4
<b>JC Peters &amp; Sons</b>	Loretto, TN	Very small	03/12/08 06/11/08	6 23
<b>JNB Inc.</b>	Sioux Center, IA	Very small	06/03/08 06/18/08	<1 2

<b>Plant Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Size*</b>	<b>Suspensions</b>	<b># of Days</b>
<b>Kapowsin Meat Packers</b>	Graham, WA	Very small	04/06/09 08/10/09	1 <1
<b>Kiowa Locker Systems</b>	Kiowa, KS	Very small	01/26/10 01/29/10	1 6
<b>Krehbiels Specialty Meats</b>	McPherson, KS	Very small	12/16/09 05/13/10	<1 <1
<b>Lakeview Packing Co</b>	La Grange, NC	Small	07/08/09 10/15/09	5 6
<b>Lebanese Butcher/Slaughter</b>	Warrenton, VA	Very small	03/13/08 02/26/09 04/06/10	1 5 2
<b>North Star Beef Inc</b>	Buffalo Lake, MN	Small	03/14/08 12/17/08	<1 1
<b>Noura Halal Meat Inc</b>	Imler, PA	Very small	04/10/08 10/17/08	21 3
<b>Odoms Tennessee Pride</b>	Little Rock, AR	Small	02/17/10 02/19/10	<1 1
<b>Pine Ridge Foods</b>	Micro, NC	Small	09/12/08 09/03/09	5 5
<b>Puget Sound Meat</b>	Tacoma, WA	Very small	11/10/09 12/01/09	2 17
<b>R &amp; D Custom Slaughtering</b>	Dunlap, TN	Very small	08/20/09 10/1/09	<1 4
<b>Randolph Packing Co</b>	Asheboro, NC	Small	07/01/08 12/09/08	<1 1

<b>Plant Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Size*</b>	<b>Suspensions</b>	<b># of Days</b>
<b>Robersonville Packing Co</b>	Robersonville, NC	Very small	05/02/07	1
			05/09/07	5
			04/23/08	1
			05/01/08	<1
			07/09/08	2
			10/23/08	4
			07/22/09	2
	11/09/09	1		
<b>Seaboard Foods</b>	Guymon, OK	Large	02/27/08	<1
			03/07/08	1
			04/03/10	<1
			05/22/10	<1
<b>Sessoms Packing</b>	Ahoskie, NC	Very small	03/20/08	<1
			07/10/08	<1
<b>Snapps Ferry Packaging</b>	Afton, TN	Very small	03/30/09	2
			07/29/09	<1
<b>Southeastern Provisions</b>	Bean Station, TN	Very small	02/06/09	3
			08/28/09	3
			10/20/09	2
<b>Stagno's Meat</b>	Modesto, CA	Small	05/24/07	13
			03/11/08	10
			02/10/09	3
<b>Sunray Quality Meats</b>	Sunray, TX	Very small	10/02/08	1
			09/17/09	1
<b>Swaggerty Sausage Co</b>	Kodak, TN	Small	05/14/08	<1
			08/07/08	<1
<b>Swift Beef Co</b> (JBS Swift)	Greeley, CO	Large	07/02/08	1
			10/16/08	<1
<b>Swift Pork Co</b> (JBS Swift)	Worthington, MN	Large	04/04/08	1
			05/06/08	1
			07/16/08	<1

<b>Plant Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Size*</b>	<b>Suspensions</b>	<b># of Days</b>
<b>The Pork Company</b>	Warsaw, NC	Small	06/09/06	<1
			09/05/06	1
			04/09/08	1
			08/02/08	2
<b>Thomas Brothers</b>	N Wilkesboro, NC	Very small	10/28/09	?
			02/09/10	1
<b>Tyson Fresh Meats</b>	Columbus Junction, IA	Large	09/02/08	<1
			09/30/09	<1
			05/18/10	<1
<b>Tyson Fresh Meats</b>	Lexington, NE	Large	11/20/08	1
			09/11/09	<1
<b>Tyson Fresh Meats</b>	Madison, NE	Large	06/12/08	1
			03/13/09	<1
			05/20/10	<1
<b>Tyson Fresh Meats</b>	Storm Lake, IA	Large	05/01/08	<1
			03/26/09	<1
<b>West Missouri Beef</b>	Rockville, MO	Small	02/04/09	2
			03/13/09	<1
			09/09/09	1
<b>White House Packing Co</b>	Fairmont, NC	Small	03/27/09	<1
			04/09/09	4
			10/13/09	<1

\* USDA defines “very small” plants as fewer than 10 employees or annual sales of less than \$2.5 million, “small” plants as 10 to 500 employees and “large” plants as those with more than 500 employees.

\*\* Plant voluntarily withdrew from federal meat inspection program.

Source: USDA-FSIS Quarterly Enforcement Reports