

Recall Notices Leave Critical Questions Unanswered



DR. DARYLL E. RAY
Agricultural Economist
University of Tennessee

Meat recall notices warn consumers not to purchase or use specific meat products from specific processors or locations. And, just during this calendar year there have indeed been a number of recalls.

Between January 1, 2009 and August 17, 2009, in addition to the JBS Swift recall of 380,000 pounds of as-

sorted primal beef cuts, 9 smaller recalls were issued for *E. Coli* O157:H7 in ground beef or bench trim. The smaller recalls involved nearly 152,000 pounds of product. The largest was nearly 96,000 pounds while the smallest was 75 pounds.

But there are many questions that go unanswered in those recall notices.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food Safety and Inspection Service's (FSIS) recall notices do not indicate either whether the meat was slaughtered onsite or if it came from a slaughter facility. And if the meat came from a slaughter facility, it does not indicate either the plant that was the source of the material or the lot number from which the contaminated ground beef or bench trim came.

These questions need to be answered in order to determine whether or not a scientific link can be made between the *E. coli* that is allowed on primals and subprimals and the resulting *E. coli* contamination of ground beef and bench trim. For many, the connection seems painfully obvious, but one USDA official told us that the packing industry could sue the USDA if the USDA determined that *E. coli* was an adulterant in the absence of an evidential link between the presence of *E. coli* on primals and its subsequent presence in ground beef.

Perhaps that is the rationale behind the USDA's decision to take 1,500 test samples of bench trim over the next year. Under the protocol developed for this testing, upon a laboratory confirmation of a presumptive positive the testing personnel are "to begin collecting the information regarding the suppliers of the source materials used in the production of the product... This information will be used in the event that the results are confirmed positive."

According to Dan Engeljohn, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Policy, Program and Employee Development, the determination that *E. coli* is an adulterant in ground beef was upheld in court because the USDA was able to show that the average household cook considered a hamburger to be done at a temperature that was less than the temperature required to effectively kill the *E. coli* O157:H7 bacteria.

With the announced bench trim testing and the five questions that FSIS Deputy Administrator Kenneth Petersen gave further processors at an August industry meeting in Chicago, the USDA may be in the process of accumulating the evidence needed to sustain a court challenge if they declare *E. coli* an adulterant on pri-

mals and subprimals.

Ann Bagel Storck, in an article on meetingplace.com, summarized the five questions as follows:

1. What verification methods are your beef suppliers using to provide assurance that *E. coli* O157:H7 is being adequately controlled? Petersen pointed out that receiving a letter of guarantee or third-party audit on an annual basis does not provide meaningful verification.

2. Are letters of guarantee from each supplier and third-party audit results current?

3. Has there been ongoing communication with suppliers about their food safety controls for *E. coli* O157:H7? Petersen noted some suppliers make such information available online, although he cautions further processors to make sure the information is plant specific, not corporate specific.

4. What do you want or need to know about a supplying establishment's production practices, in-plant testing program and methods used to notify receiving establishments about *E. coli* issues?

5. What, if any, measures may need to be taken after receiving product to further support that *E. coli* is at a less than detectable level in products being produced?

On the other hand, some bloggers commented on meetingplace.com that this set of expectations is further evidence that USDA is reluctant to confront the major packers and is instead putting pressure on the downline plants as they have since the development of HACCP (Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points) as the means of assuring the safety of the US beef supply.

One blogger wrote, "Since FSIS allows slaughter plants to ship intact meat into commerce which is surface contaminated with *E. coli*, and still bear the mark of inspection, the answer to [an earlier] question is that the mark of inspection has lost all value and meaning. Suggestion: under HACCP, the official USDA Mark of Inspection should be replaced with a mark which states 'Produced at HACCP Plant # 99999,' for example. I am totally serious. Since the agency deregulated the industry – allows the industry to police itself – while FSIS removed its command and control authority (only at the big plants), placing any mark on meat which states the meat was 'INSPECTED' by the USDA is non-compliant with truth in advertising laws."

One saw the rules as a means of driving the small operator out of business so that the "big grinder" can take over the business.

While food safety has not garnered the public attention given the current health care/health insurance debate here in the US, it clearly is a hot issue with passions running high.

Given the intensity of the discussion and the ongoing spate of ground beef and bench trim recalls for *E. coli* contamination, it seems reasonable that this issue will not go away until a whole host of questions are addressed and the problem is solved, either through regulation or significant changes in the process of decontaminating beef carcasses. It will not go away as long as people are hospitalized as the result of *E. coli* contamination of ground beef. △

DR. DARYLL E. RAY: Agricultural Economist, University of Tennessee