

March 26, 2003

William T. Sessions, Chief
Standardization Branch Livestock and Seed Program
AMS, USDA, Room 2603-S, STOP 0254,
1400 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20250-0254

Dear Chief Sessions,

I am writing to ask you to withdraw and reconsider USDA Agricultural Marketing Services' proposed livestock and meat marketing claims (Docket No. LS-02-02).

The current proposed labeling claims appear to benefit industrial style animal producers, who will be able to co-opt desirable meat marketing claims without having to significantly change their practices. If these claims are adopted, the losers will be consumers and the farmers and ranchers who now make their living by providing meat from animals raised by alternative methods.

The "no antibiotic residues" claim is unnecessary and should be abandoned. The claim "no antibiotic residues" ignores the real issue of antibiotic resistance. Antibiotic residues in meat are not major causes of resistance, and under current law, meat producers already must subject animals to a period of withdrawal from antibiotics prior to slaughter to avoid antibiotic residue.

The "not fed antibiotics" claim should be withdrawn. The proposed claims "not fed antibiotics" and "raised without antibiotics" are confusing to consumers. "Not fed antibiotics" can be claimed on any meat products from animals raised without "subtherapeutic" antibiotics. Unfortunately, the USDA does not define the term "subtherapeutic," so meat producers who use large amounts of antibiotics for growth promotion and other nontherapeutic purposes can still use the label "not fed antibiotics."

USDA has proposed that meat can be labeled "grass fed," even if animals receive as much as 20% of their nutrition from sources other than grazing. The "grass fed" claim and standard has implications for consumers concerned about antibiotic use. Cattle sent to industrial style feedlots in their final weeks before slaughter - a practice now the norm in the beef industry - are fed a diet consisting primarily of corn and other grains. This unnatural diet fattens the cattle faster, but can cause diseases such as liver abscesses. These diseases are one reason that feedlot owners lace feed with antibiotics - to treat illnesses created by their choice of feed and management techniques. By contrast, cattle that are truly grass fed throughout their lives require few antibiotics. Without further clarification, the proposed "grass fed" label could undermine the desire of consumers to purchase beef products from animals raised without unnecessary antibiotic use and undermine farmers who incur the additional time and costs associated with allowing cattle to fatten on a natural grass diet.

Please withdraw the proposal and consult with a broad range of stakeholders, including producers and consumers of alternative meat products.

Sincerely,

Robert T Daehnrich
2935 Cherokee Ct Erie CO 80516
303 666 6468