Milk Sanitation Honor Roll for 1952-54

Forty-five communities have been added to the Public Health Service milk sanitation "honor roll" and 65 communities on the previous list have been dropped. This revision covers the period from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1954, and includes a total of 285 cities and 68 counties.

Communities on the "honor roll" have complied substantially with the various items of sanitation contained in the Milk Ordinance and Code Recommended by the United States Public Health Service. The State milk sanitation authorities concerned report this compliance to the Public Health Service. The rating of 90 percent or more, which is necessary for inclusion on the list, is computed from the weighted average of the percentages of compliance. Separate lists are compiled for communities in which all market milk sold is pasteurized, and for those in which both raw milk and pasteurized milk is sold.

The recommended milk ordinance, on which the milk sanitation ratings are based, is now in effect through voluntary adoption in 406 counties and 1,573 municipalities. The ordinance also serves as the basis for the regulations of 34 States and 2 Territories. In 11 States and the 2 Territories it is in effect statewide.

The ratings do not represent a complete measure of safety, but they do indicate how closely a community's milk supply conforms with the standards for grade A milk as stated in the recommended ordinance. High-grade pasteurized milk is safer than high-grade raw milk because of the added protection of pasteurization. The second list, therefore, shows the percentage of pasteurized milk sold in a community which also permits the sale of raw milk.

Although semiannual publication of the list is intended to encourage This compilation is from the Division of Sanitary Engineering Services of the Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service. The previous listing was published in Public Health Reports, March 1954, pp. 327–330. The rating method was described in Public Health Reports 53: 1386 (1938). Reprint No. 1970.

communities operating under the recommended ordinance to attain and maintain a high level of enforcement of its provisions, no comparison is intended with communities operating under other milk ordi-Some communities might nances. be deserving of inclusion, but they cannot be listed because no arrangements have been made for determination of their ratings by the State milk sanitation authority concerned. In other cases, the ratings which were submitted have lapsed because they were more than 2 years old. Still other communities, some of which may have high-grade milk supplies, have indicated no desire for rating or inclusion on this list.

The rules for inclusion of a community on the "honor roll" are:

1. All ratings must be determined by the State milk sanitation authority in accordance with the Public Health Service rating method, which is based upon the grade A pasteurized milk and the grade A raw milk requirements of the Public Health Service milk ordinance. (A departure from the method described consists of computing the pasteurization plant rating twice that of the raw milk intended for pasteurization.) 2. No community will be included in the list unless both its pasteurized milk and its retail raw milk ratings are 90 percent or more. Communities in which only raw milk is sold will be included if the retail raw milk rating is 90 percent or more.

3. The rating used will be the latest submitted to the Public Health Service, but no rating will be used which is more than 2 years old. (In order to promote continuous rigid enforcement rather than occasional "cleanup campaigns," it is suggested that when the rating of a community on the list falls below 90 percent, no resurvey be made for at least 6 months. This will result in the removal of the community from the subsequent semiannual list.)

4. No community will be included on the list whose milk supply is not under an established program of official routine inspection and laboratory control provided by itself, the county, a milk control district, or the State. (In the absence of such an official program there can be no assurance that only milk from sources rating 90 percent or more will be used continuously.)

5. The Public Health Service will make occasional check surveys of cities for which ratings of 90 percent or more have been reported by the State. (If the check rating is less than 90 percent, but not less than 85, the city will be removed from the 90-percent list after 6 months unless a resurvey submitted by the State during this probationary period shows a rating of 90 percent or more. If the check rating is less than 85 percent, the city will be removed from the list immediately. If the check rating is 90 percent or more, the city will be retained on the list for 2 years from the date of the check survey, unless a subsequent rating during this period warrants its removal.)

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1952–June 1954 100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating
Alabama		Indiana—Continued		Kentucky-Continued	
Auburn	9-24-1953	Calumet regions	6-12-1953	Newport and Campbell	
Birmingham-Jefferson		Gary	0 12 1000	County	
County				Owensboro and Davies	
Gadsden-Etowah		Hammond		County	
County		Cooperative grade A		Owenton and Owen	
Arkansas		milk program		-	
Fort Smith		Holland	91952		4- 2-1953
Fort Simth	10-10-1952	Huntingburg		Paducah and McCrack-	
Colorado				en County	8-18-1953
		Jasper	10 0 1070	Pendleton County	4- 2-1953
Colorado Springs	1-20-1954	Crawfordsville		Williamstown and	
Denver	11- 3-1953	Edinburg	121953	Grant County	4- 2-1953
Grand Junction and		Elkhart	111952	Mississing	
Mesa County	41954	Evansville	6-30-1953	Mississipp	1
Las Animas-Huerfano		Fort Wayne	101952	Aberdeen	10- 7-1953
Counties	3- 9-1954	Franklin	121953	Amory	10- 7-1953
Weld County	11-25-1953	Huntington	9-25-1953	Booneville	9- 9-1953
		Indianapolis	10-31-1952	Brookhaven	3- 4-1954
District of Colu	mbia	Lebanon	61953	Canton	10- 1-1952
-		Madison	7- 2-1954	Clarksdale	9-25-1952
Washington	3-15-1954	Martinsville	11-20-1953	Cleveland	9- 3-1952
171		Mount Vernon	1-16-1953	Columbia	7-17-1952
Florida		Muncie	1 - 28 - 1953	Columbus	3-26-1954
Pinellas County	1-29-1953	Nappanee	111953	Corinth	6-11-1953
	1 20 1000	New Castle	21953	Greenville	8-25-1952
Georgia		Peru	8-27-1952	Houston	5-28-1953
	F 00 10F0	Richmond	5-15-1953	Iuka	7-9-1953
Albany	5-28-1953	Rushville	61953	Louisville	9-16-1953
Athens	4-16-1953	Shelbyville	81952	Natchez	12-17-1952
Atlanta	10-17-1953	Tell City	11- 5-1953	Okolona	5-28-195 3
Augusta-Richmond	10 00 1070	Valparaiso	7-31-1952	Tupelo	4- 8-1953
County	10-30-1953	Vincennes	9- 4-1953	Winona	11-24-1953
Bainbridge	8- 6-1953		0 1 1000	winona	11-24-1905
Cairo	12-18-1952	Iowa		Missouri	
Calhoun, Gordon		Des Moines	8-12-1953		
County	8-11-1953	Dubuque	11-14-1952	Kansas City	12 - 5 - 1952
Camilla	11–18–1952	Marshalltown	1-29-1953	Lebanon	2 - 13 - 1953
Columbus	2 - 23 - 1953	Mason City	10- 3-1952	North Kansas City	12 - 5 - 1952
Elberton	2 - 9 - 1954	Sioux City	9-18-1953	St. Joseph	7-16-1953
La Grange	3-18-1953	Waterloo	10- 7-1953	St. Louis	12-10-1953
Quitman	4- 9-1953		10 1 1000	Springfield	3 - 2 -1954
Savannah	8-15-1952	Kansas		Warrensburg	12- 5-1952
Swainsboro, Emanuel		Dodge City	4-20-1953		
County	5- 5-1954	Hillsboro		Nebraska	
Fifton	6-18-1953	IIIIISDOFO	11- 7-1952	Grand Island	9-18-1952
Waycross	2- 4-1954	Kentucky			0 10 1002
······································		-		North Carolin	a
Idaho		Bowling Green	1- 7-1954		
Magaan.	0 1059	Frankfort and Franklin		Alleghany County	9-10-1952
Moscow	91953	County	7–23– 1953	Avery County	1 - 15 - 1954
. Indiana		Fulton County	1 - 21 - 1954	Burke County	1-15-1954
		Hickman	1-20-1954	Charlotte	1- 4-1954
Anderson	6-18-1953	Hopkinsville	12-10-1953	Chatham County	11-19-1953
Bedford and Orleans	8- 4-1953	Louisville and Jefferson		Clay County	1 0-27-1 953
Berne	3- 3-1953	County	4- 7-1954	Craven County	2-12-1954
Bloomington	11-26-1952	Morgantown	1- 8-1954	Davie County	10- 1-1952
Bluffton	3- 6-1953	Murray	4-29-1954	Durham County	7-18-1952
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1952–June 1954---Con.

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Community	Date of rating	g Community	Date of rating	Community	Date of rating
North Carolina—Continued		Tennessee—Continued		Texas—Continued	
Edgecombe Count	y	Decherd	10-17-1952	Victoria	7-24-1952
(excluding Rock)		Dyersburg	10-23-1952		9-30-1952
Mount)	. 7-16-1952	2 Fayetteville	6-2-1953		
Forsyth County	. 7-16-1952		7- 8-1953		- 4- 6-1954
Granville County	. 7-21-1953		8-27-1952		- 1 0 1554
Guilford County	. 8- 6-1952	Kingsport	10- 8-1953	Utah	
Henderson-Transyl		Knoxville	8- 6-1953	Ogden	- 11-10-1953
vania Counties	2-18-1954		8- 1-1952	Salt Lake City	- 3-30-1954
Iredell County		Livingston	1-27-1954	Utah County	- 6-10-1953
Lee County			10-17-1952		1000
Mitchell County	10-23-1953		3-25-1954	Virginia	
Nash County (exclud-		Murfreesboro	7- 2-1953	Abingdon	- 11- 5-1953
ing Rocky Mount)			. 2 1000	Blacksburg	- 8- 7-1952
New Hanover County			10-28-1953	Bristol	
Onslow County		Newbern	10-23-1953 12-23-1952	Buena Vista	- 8- 4-1953
Orange County		Pulaski	6-3-1953	Front Royal	- 8- 7-1953
Person County	3-17-1953			Lexington	- 8- 4-1953
Pitt County		Spring City	5- 5-1954	Luray	8- 7-1953
Rockingham-Caswell	5-15-1555	Springfold	5-14-1953	Marion	11-18-1953
Counties		Springfield Sweetwater	7- 6-1953	Narrows	8-8-1952
Rocky Mount		Trenter	9-16-1952	Norfolk	
Wilson County	9-18-1953 9-18-1953		5- 6-1953	Pearisburg	8-8-1952
Yadkin County		Tullahoma	10-17-1952	Portsmouth	5-18-1954
radkin County	10- 1-1952	Union City	8-12-1953	Pulaski	8-7-1952
Oklahoma		Winchester	10-17-1952	Radford	8-7-1952
Ardmore	6-19-1953	Texas		Richmond	4-16-1954
Duncan	1-19-1954			Roanoke	9-19-1952
Mangum	12-17-1953	Brenham	4-10-1953	South Boston	3- 8-1954
Okmulgee	10-13-1953	Commerce	9- 2-1952	Staunton	
Seminole	8-29-1953	Corpus Christi	9-27-1952	Suffolk	9-26-1952
Sulphur	2-18-1953	Corsicana	8- 6-1952	Williamsburg	10- 0-1053
		Dallas	1- 8-1953		
Oregon		Donna	2 - 25 - 1953	Washington	
Eugene	6-11-1953	Edinburg	2 - 25 - 1953	Bellingham	8-21-1953
Pendleton	6-19-1953	El Paso	10-21-1952	Cowlitz County	7-30-1953
South Dakot	<i>a</i>	Falfurrias	5- 5-1953	Everett	
		Gladewater	7-26-1952	Port Angeles	
North Hill Unit:	7-20-1953	Harlingen	6-1-1953	Spokane	
Belle Fourche		Kerrville	7-31-1952	Walla Walla	10-15-1953
Deadwood		Kilgore	7-26-1952		
Lead		Lufkin	3- 9-1953	Wisconsin	
Spearfish		McKinney		Beaver Dam	2-27-1953
Sturgis		Mercedes	2-25-1953	Burlington	3 -26-195 3
ioux Falls	10-25-1952	Mineral Wells	2 - 11 - 1953	Delavan	3-26-1953
		Mission	2-25-1953	Eau Claire	3- 5-1953
Tennessee		Mount Pleasant	9-24-1952	Elkhorn	3-26-1953
thens	7-16-1952	Nacogdoches	9-20-1952	Fontana	3-26-1953
bristol	11- 5-1953	Pampa	4- 7-1953	Green Bay	9-17-1953
hattanooga	11-13-1952	Pharr	2 - 25 - 1953	Lake Geneva	3-26-1953
larksville	1-30-1953	San Antonio	3 - 25 - 1953	Madison	10-26-1953
leveland	10- 1-1952	San Benito		Manitowoc	6- 4-1953
linton	4-21-1954	San Juan		Ripon	2-27-1953
ookeville	6-16-1953	Sweetwater		Sheboygan	6-19-1953
ovington	10-22-1952	Texarkana		Tomah	5- 6-1953
owan	10-17-1952	Texas City		Waupun	2-27-1953
andridge	11-10-1953	Tyler		Williams Bay	2-27-1953 3-26-1953
					0-70-1999

Vol. 69, No. 9, September 1954

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1952–June 1954—Con.

BOTH RAW AND PASTEURIZED MARKET MILK

Community and percent of milk		Community and percent of milk		Community and percent of milk		
pasteurized	Date of rating	pasteurized	Date of rating	pasteurized	Date of rating	
Alabama		Jackson, 98.6		Tennessee		
Lanett, 97.8		Laurel, 93.6	8-13-1952	Alcoa, 99.5	9-17-1952	
Lanett, 97.0	11- 0-1952			Dayton, 92.1	5-14-1953	
Arkansas		Montana		Elizabethton, 93.6	11-25-1952	
Little Rock, 99.3	4-20-1953	Missoula, 99.4	91952	Harriman, 98	10-15-1953	
2		North Carola	•	Jackson, 98.6	11- 5-1953	
Florida				Kingston, 96	10-14-1953	
Dade County, 99.99	1- 8-1953	Ashe County, 78.7	9- 9-1952	Maryville, 99.5	9-17-1952	
Manatee County,		Buncombe County,	0 05 1050	McMinnville, 90	5- 5-1954	
99.57	8-21-1953	97. 8	6-25-1953	Ripley, 96.9	10-22-1952	
<i>.</i>		Davidson County, 96.4	7-28-1953	Texas		
Georgia		Haywood County, 95	1-28-1953 11-5-1953			
Brunswick-Glynn		Kings Mountain, 83.8	8-18-1952	Amarillo, 97	5-11-1954	
County, 96	11- 6-195 2	Lenoir County, 78.4	1-30-1953	Beaumont, 99.9	8-15-1952	
Cartersville, 97	12–11–195 2	Macon County, 91.5	11- 7-1952	Brownsville, 96	5-29-1953	
Gainesville - Hall		Vance County, 91.2	7-22-1953	Childress, 87	2- 4-1953	
County, 92.2	4- 9-1954	Wake County, 99.3	3- 4-1953	Cleburne, 95.5	7-31-1952	
Marietta, 96.2	5- 4-1954	Wilkes County, 91.9	9- 2-1953	Greenville, 98	9-27-1952	
Pelham, 88.8	11-18-1952	whiles county, bilble	0 2 1000	Laredo, 80	9-18-1952	
Thomasville, 99.5	6-17-1953	Oklahoma	:	Longview, 99.4	7-26-1952	
Toccoa-Stephens		Ada, 87	7- 8- 195 3	Lubbock, 99	8-25-1952	
County, 88	4- 9-1954	Elk City, 99	4-17-1953	Marshall, 91	4-26-1954	
Washington-Wilkes		Enid, 96.6	3-30-1954	Paris, 92.6	9-25-1953	
County, 99	9-24-1953	Henryetta, 88	1-16-1953	Virginia		
Winder, 97.9	1 - 23 - 1953	Hobart, 90	1-23-1953	Virginia		
Kentucky		Lawton, 99	12- 1-1953	Harrisonburg, 96	11-12-1952	
•		Norman, 98	2-19-1954			
Princeton and Cald-	61953	Oklahoma City, 97.8	9-28-1953	Washington		
well County, 94.7		Ponca City, 92.6	2 - 4 - 1954	Seattle-King County,		
Somerset, 91	21953	Shawnee, 98.9	12-17-1953	▶ 99.7	6-23-1953	
Louisiana		Stillwater, 98	4-29-1953	Tacoma, 99.7	8-13-1952	
		2		racoma, 99.7	8-10-1904	
Shreveport, 99.9	81952	Oregon		West Virginia		
Mississipp	·	Astoria, 97.9	4-22-1953	(1) (1	0 16 1059	
••		Portland, 99	5-28-1953	Clay County, 88	9-16-1952	
Hattiesburg, 96	7-31-1952	Salem, 99.3	4- 6-1953	Nicholas County, 55	9-18-1952	

Note: In these communities the pasteurized market milk shows a 90-percent or more compliance with the grade A pasteurized milk requirements, and the raw market milk shows a 90-percent or more compliance with the grade A raw milk requirements, of the Milk Ordinance and Code Recommended by the United States Public Health Service. Note particularly the percentage of the milk pasteurized in the various communities listed. This percentage is an important factor to consider in estimating the safety of a city's milk supply. All milk should be pasteurized, either commercially or at home, before it is consumed.

.