

**Appendix F:
Responses to Open-Ended Questions
Taken From Survey to Non-Program States**

	What do you see as the main disadvantages to state meat and poultry inspection? Who are the main beneficiaries and how do they benefit?	What do you see as the main disadvantages to state meat and poultry inspection? Who incurs these disadvantages and how are they adversely affected?	In your opinion, should a consumer have more, less, or equal confidence in state-inspected meat and poultry products than in Federally-inspected ones?	What are the main reasons that state inspection has not been (re)adopted [in your state]?	Would you like to see a state meat and/or poultry inspection program initiated in your state? Why or why not?
California	“State programs are more cost-effective and are better able to respond to the needs of very small operations. The main beneficiaries are small businesses and consumers.”	“Cost to states.”	“Equal or greater confidence.”	“Insufficient industry support.”	“Yes, because such a program would benefit many small operations and producers by opening new markets for them.”
Colorado	“The main advantage is local control. Processors have more input into their regulation. State has ability to adapt to conditions more rapidly than Federal government.”	“At present, [the lack of] interstate shipment would affect the processors’ marketing. Taxpayers would bear cost of inspection.”	“I see this as a non-issue. I don’t believe the average consumer even knows there is state inspection vs. Federal inspection.”	“Financial considerations.”	“Not at present. There is currently no processor interest and for sure no extra money in state budget to fund such a program.”
Connecticut	“None. The few small slaughter operations in CT are custom-exempt.”	“Cost to implement program. Consumers will pay additional costs.”	“Consumers should have equal confidence in state-inspected program.”	“No large slaughter operations located in Connecticut.”	“Not necessary due to low volume of meat and poultry processed in state.”

Florida	“Small plants and start-up firms benefited from a more flexible schedule and training provided by state program. Overtime and exotic inspection fees are also lower.”	“Cost to the state for a service that can be provided at no cost to the state from USDA.”	“Products from state-inspected plants are of the same safety and quality as meat from Federally-inspected plants. Consumers should have equal confidence.”	“The state meat inspection program was given up three years ago [in 1997] as a way to reduce state cost and government. That political philosophy has not changed in Florida.”	“We dismantled an excellent program in 1997; many of our key employees took higher-paying jobs with USDA. It would be a major undertaking to establish a program.”
Hawaii	“State program was more ‘user-friendly’ (flexible). Federal program more rigid and unwavering.”		“In this state, the consumer has not voiced any preference. I imagine they don’t care one way or the other.”	“Cost.”	“No. Cost.”
Idaho	“Better handle on custom-exempt facilities.”	“Not a big issue.”		“Monetary.”	
New Hampshire	“None.”	“None.”	“The NH Department of Agriculture, Markets & Food is very satisfied with FSIS handling the meat inspection program.”	“Budget.”	“No. We do not have the funds. We could not justify a state meat or poultry inspection program with only two slaughter establishments. They do not operate their facilities a total of 40 hours a week.”
Kentucky	“I see no advantage to having two agencies involved in the inspection process.”	“Since FSIS has total responsibility for meat and poultry inspection in Kentucky, the adoption of a Kentucky inspection program would be cost-prohibitive.”	“Since the Federal inspection program has worked well for KY producers [and] processors for approx. 30 years, it would be difficult for the state to adopt a program with equal or greater quality than the FSIS program.”	“The state would have to request revenue for a program.”	“No.”

Michigan	<p>“States may devote additional resources to ensure producers have <u>easy access</u> to technical assistance for problem-solving.”</p>	<p>“ 1. Increased cost to taxpayers. 2. Potential to drain resources away from regulation of other foods when state budgets are tight.”</p>	<p>“State meat and poultry inspection programs could greatly enhance food safety by 1) increasing resources available to regulate small and very small volume processors and 2) providing greater regulation of establishments exempted from Federal inspection. Appropriate oversight to ensure uniformity would be essential.”</p>	<p>“Insufficient demand to date [from consumers and meat industry] to justify expenditure of resources.”</p>	<p>“Michigan is still evaluating this option. Farmers, small volume processors, and producers of non-amenable species have suggested that a state program is needed. Given the significant resources needed to develop and maintain a credible program, we are carefully reviewing this issue at this time.”</p>
Missouri	<p>“State meat inspection is much more user-friendly than the Feds. State inspection lends to value-added marketing much more than FSIS inspection. The main beneficiaries are small livestock producers seeking the access to end markets, and small processors increasing their plant value and profitability.”</p>	<p>“The cost of establishment, no need for duplicate programs, FSIS is very negative, the inability to ship interstate.”</p>	<p>“There should be no food safety concerns; in fact my experience is that state inspectors are much more professional than Federal inspectors. Hire well and your state should have a superior program.”</p>	<p>“No interest from the agriculture community until the pork industry problems in 1998.”</p>	<p>“We have already. We will have our approval within the next two months [by January 2001]. So far our program has been received with very positive support.”</p>
New Jersey	<p>“N/A.”</p>	<p>“N/A.”</p>	<p>“N/A.”</p>	<p>“Economic. We have very few establishments and are happy with USDA Inspection.”</p>	<p>“No – we are entirely satisfied with the present system.”</p>

New York	“Limited – no significant benefits over Federal inspection.”	“Cost [adversely affects] state taxpayers. Restriction on interstate sales [adversely restricts] state producers and processors.”	“The quality of state programs varies from state to state and therefore consumer confidence in the Federal program is probably greater.”	“Cost and limits on interstate sales.”	“No – cost – restriction on interstate sales.”
Oregon	“I see no benefits. We have not had a program for 20 years and there is no interest expressed in reintroduction of a program.”	“High expense and increased personnel and decreased marketability of product. Additionally, another entire set of regulations to administer, and increased liability to state.”		“Federal inspection allows for interstate commerce.”	“No.”
Pennsylvania	“There are no benefits other than to support effective programs that are already in place in those states with programs. Small processing or slaughter plants are the main beneficiaries.”	“Cost incurred by the state.”	“Minimal impact on food safety. Consumers should have equal confidence.”		“No – small plants that could not cope with Federal are already out of business. Those remaining have met Federal standards. Why create a less-than-even playing field by reinstating a state program? State resources are already stretched thin.”