

Milk Sanitation Honor Roll for 1959-61

Sixty communities have been added to the Public Health Service milk sanitation "honor roll," and 55 communities on the previous list have been dropped. This revision covers the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1961, and includes a total of 273 cities and 123 counties.

Communities on the honor roll have complied substantially with the various items of sanitation contained in the milk ordinance recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service. The State milk sanitation authorities concerned report this compliance to the Service. The rating of 90 percent or more, which is necessary for inclusion on the list, is computed from the weighted average of the percentage 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 are sold.

The recommended milk ordinance, on which the milk sanitation ratings are based, is now in effect through voluntary adoption in 500 counties and 1,423 municipalities. The ordinance also serves as the basis for the regulations of 36 States. In 16 States 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 communities operating under the

This compilation is from the Milk and Food Program, Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection, Public Health Service. The previous listing was published in Public Health Reports, April 1961, pp. 363-366. The rating method is described in PHS Publication No. 678 (Methods of Making Sanitation Ratings of Milksheds).

recommended ordinance to attain and maintain a high level of enforcement of its provisions, no comparison is intended with communities operating under other milk ordinances. Some communities might 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 are 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 recommended milk ordinance.

2. No community will be included on 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 this 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 and date of rating during
1959-61**

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

<i>Arkansas</i>	<i>Idaho—Continued</i>	<i>Iowa—Continued</i>	<i>Kentucky—Continued</i>
Fort Smith..... 8- 7-59	Lewiston..... 12-12-60	Pocahontas..... 10-20-59	Paducah-Mc-
<i>Colorado</i>	Pocatello..... 2-13-61	Rockwell City... 10-21-59	Cracken co.... 11-30-60
Boulder co..... 5-...60	Rigby..... 4- 6-60	Sanborn..... 1-25-61	Pendleton co... 8-10-60
Colorado		Sioux City..... 4-29-60	Princeton..... 7-20-60
Springs..... 10-...60	<i>Illinois</i>	Spencer..... 2-26-60	Russellville... 5- 1-61
Denver and	Elgin..... 12-20-60	Storm Lake..... 10-14-59	Shelbyville-
Denver co.... 2-...61	North Shore	Washington..... 7- 1-60	Shelby co.... 6-15-60
Las Animas-	municipalities	Waterloo..... 11-20-59	Smithland-
Huerfano cos. 1-...60	(Glencoe,	Webster City... 10-19-59	Livingston co. 3- 1-60
Northeast Dis-	Kenilworth,	<i>Kentucky</i>	Taylorsville-
trict (Logan,	Lake Bluff,	Ashland-Boyd co. 2-16-61	Spencer co.... 6-16-60
Morgan,	Lake Forest,	Bell co..... 8- 4-59	Webster co.... 6-20-60
Phillips,	Northfield,	Benton..... 3- 2-60	
Sedgwick,	Wilmette,	Bowling Green-	<i>Mississippi</i>
Yuma cos) ... 1-...61	Winnetka).... 6-21-60	Warren co.... 11-16-60	Biloxi..... 10- 8-59
Pueblo co..... 8-13-59	<i>Indiana</i>	Campbellsville... 1- 2-61	Booneville.... 10-12-60
Weld co..... 1-26-61	Evansville..... 5-26-60	Covington..... 3- 1-61	Brookhaven.... 1-26-60
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<i>Iowa</i>	Cynthiana-Har-	Canton..... 6- 9-60
Washington..... 12-11-59	Ames..... 3-15-60	rison co..... 8- 9-60	Cleveland..... 7-14-60
<i>Georgia</i>	Anamosa..... 12- 9-59	Danville-Boyle	Columbia..... 5-25-60
Albany..... 8- 5-60	Atlantic..... 10- 7-59	co..... 2-11-60	Columbus..... 5- 4-60
Athens-Clarke	Boone..... 3- 4-60	Elizabethtown-	Eupora..... 9-24-59
co..... 8-11-60	Burlington.... 3-17-60	Hardin co.... 11-23-59	Greenville.... 7-25-60
Atlanta-Fulton	Cedar Falls.... 11-25-59	Flemingsburg-	Greenwood.... 2- 2-60
co..... 11- 1-60	Cedar Rapids... 8-18-60	Fleming co... 8- 8-60	Grenada..... 9-17-59
Augusta..... 2-17-61	Clarion..... 10-22-59	Frankfort..... 10- 8-59	Gulfport..... 10- 8-59
Brunswick-	Clear Lake..... 12- 8-60	Fulton co..... 1-19-61	Hattiesburg... 2-23-60
Glynn co.... 12-15-60	Clinton..... 8-27-59	Glasgow..... 12-15-60	Iuka..... 10-13-60
Cairo..... 3-22-60	Corydon..... 2- 2-60	Georgetown-	Kosciusko.... 4-25-60
Calhoun-Gordon	Davenport.... 5-12-60	Scott co.... 10- 9-59	Laurel..... 4-20-61
co..... 7-27-60	Des Moines.... 6- 3-60	Greenville.... 3-30-60	Lucedale.... 8-17-60
Cartersville-	Dubuque..... 4- 7-60	Henderson co... 7-10-59	Meadville.... 8-23-60
Bartow co... 12- 1-60	Dyersville.... 12- 8-59	Hodgenville.... 9- 6-60	Meridian..... 11-18-59
Chatham co.... 9-23-60	Eagle Grove... 10-19-59	Hopkinsville-	Monroe co.... 5- 3-61
Columbus..... 10-14-60	Estherville... 6-10-60	Christian co. 4-21-60	Morton..... 5-11-61
Dalton..... 2- 5-60	Fort Dodge.... 5-10-61	Louisville-Jef-	New Albany... 8-27-59
Fitzgerald.... 12-16-60	Grinnell..... 6- 1-61	ferson co.... 12-11-59	Oxford..... 5- 2-61
Macon..... 4-14-61	Humboldt.... 10-20-59	Lyon co..... 3- 1-60	Pascagoula... 8-18-60
Quitman..... 6- 9-61	Ida Grove..... 4-22-60	Mayfield..... 12- 2-60	Picayune..... 4-18-61
Thomasville... 3-18-60	Iowa City..... 8-25-60	Maysville-	Starkville.... 1- 9-61
Troup co..... 10-13-60	Lake View..... 4-20-60	Mason co.... 12-20-60	State College... 1- 9-61
Valdosta..... 2-10-61	Le Mars..... 1-28-60	McLean co.... 3-28-60	Tupelo..... 9-20-60
Washington... 12- 9-60	Lytton..... 10-21-59	Monticello-	West Point... 5-18-60
Waycross..... 3-11-60	Manning..... 4-20-60	Wayne co.... 4-21-60	
<i>Idaho</i>	Maquoketa.... 12- 9-59	Morgantown... 11-24-59	<i>Missouri</i>
Blackfoot..... 4- 5-60	Marshalltown... 10-21-59	Murray-Cal-	Cape Girardeau 8-16-60
Caldwell..... 12- 8-60	Mason City.... 1-20-60	loway co.... 1- 7-60	Chillicothe... 8-19-59
Grangeville... 12- 8-60	Mount Pleasant 5-16-60	Newport..... 2-28-61	Hannibal..... 8-19-59
	Ottumwa..... 10- 7-60	Owensboro.... 2- 5-60	Kansas City... 10-27-59
	Paullina..... 7-20-60	Owenton..... 8-12-60	Rolla..... 11-29-60
			St. Joseph.... 1-27-60
			St. Louis..... 3- 7-61

**Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more and date of rating during
1959-61—Continued**

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED—Continued

<i>Missouri—Continued</i>	<i>North Carolina—Continued</i>	<i>Tennessee—Continued</i>	<i>Texas—Continued</i>
St. Louis co. 7-19-60	Mecklenburg co. 10-23-59	Loudon 5-23-60	Tyler 2- 8-61
Sikeston 12-10-59	Montgomery co. 4- 7-60	McMinnville 4-24-61	Wichita Falls 10-21-60
Springfield 3-21-60	Moore co. 7-13-60	Manchester 10-12-60	
	Nash co. 10-14-59	Maryville and	<i>Utah</i>
<i>Nebraska</i>	New Hanover co. 12-10-59	Alcoa 3-29-60	Logan 6-10-60
Omaha 8-26-60	Northampton co. 8-16-60	Memphis 5- 3-60	Ogden 2-25-60
	Pamlico co. 8-28-59	Morristown 5-25-60	Salt Lake City 5-26-60
<i>New Mexico</i>	Pasquotank co. . . 6- 9-60	Mount Pleasant . . . 9-26-60	Utah co 3-23-60
Albuquerque 7-21-60	Perquimans co. . . 6- 9-60	Murfreesboro 5-22-61	
Artesia 11- 1-60	Pitt co. 7- 7-60	Nashville-David-	<i>Virginia</i>
Carlsbad 11- 2-60	Randolph co. . . . 5-11-60	son co. 10-21-59	Alexandria 5-11-61
Clovis 8- 4-60	Richmond co. . . . 5-12-60	Paris 11-21-60	Blacksburg 9-22-60
Farmington 7- 8-60	Rockingham co. . . 5- 3-60	Pulaski 8- 3-59	Christiansburg 9-22-60
Portales 10-29-60	Rocky Mount . . . 10-14-59	Rogersville 4-26-60	Colonial Heights . . . 4-14-61
	Rowan co. 2-20-61	Sevier co. 1- 5-61	Hampton 4-20-61
<i>North Carolina</i>	Sampson co. 11- 1-60	Sparta 7-14-60	Newport News 5-10-61
Alamance co. 9-16-60	Scotland co. 6-23-60	Sullivan co	Norfolk 6- 3-60
Alexander co. . . . 11-29-60	Stokes co. 5-24-60	(Bristol and	Petersburg 11- 7-60
Alleghany co. . . . 6-28-60	Swain co. 4-19-61	Kingsport) 4-18-61	Portsmouth 2-24-61
Anson co. 8-31-60	Tyrrell co. 2-18-60	Tallahoma 10-10-60	Radford 9-22-60
Ashe co. 6-28-60	Union co. 8- 3-60	Waverly 8-22-60	Richmond 4-25-60
Bertie co. 6- 9-60	Wake co. 5- 3-61		Roanoke 7- 8-60
Brunswick co. . . . 1- 3-61	Warren co. 10-13-60	<i>Texas</i>	Staunton 3- 8-60
Burke co. 9-27-60	Washington co. . . 2-18-60	Amarillo 5- 3-60	Waynesboro 4-21-60
Cabarrus co. 11- 8-60	Watauga co. 6-28-60	Beaumont 4- 4-61	
Camden co. 6- 9-60	Wayne co. 11- 5-59	Big Spring 8-21-59	<i>Washington</i>
Catawba co. 11-29-60	Wilkes co. 5-25-60	Bryan 7-17-59	Everett 10-28-59
Chowan co. 6- 9-60	Wilson co. 8-28-59	Burkburnett 8-11-59	Spokane 9-27-60
Cleveland co. 9-12-60		College Station . . . 7-16-59	Tacoma 8-25-59
Craven co. 4-10-61	<i>Oklahoma</i>	Dallas 12-14-60	Whitman co. 10-27-60
Cumberland co. . . 11-27-59	Mangum 11-12-59	Edinburg 1-25-60	
Currituck co. . . . 6- 8-60	Oklahoma City . . 10-28-60	El Paso 9-11-59	<i>West Virginia</i>
Dare co. 6- 8-60	Okmulgee 10- 4-60	Falfurrias 9-10-59	McDowell co 8- 1-60
Durham co. 12-18-59	Ponca City 9-30-60	Galveston 1-24-61	Ohio co. 11-14-59
Edgecombe co. . . . 3-15-61		Gonzales 7-24-59	
Forsyth co. 6-24-60	<i>Tennessee</i>	Grand Prairie 4-19-61	<i>Wisconsin</i>
Gates co. 7-21-60	Athens 9- 3-59	Greenville 5-15-61	Appleton 1- 5-61
Guilford co. 3-31-61	Cleveland 9- 2-59	Harlingen 9-10-59	Eau Claire 2-10-61
Halifax co. 2- 9-61	Columbia 9-28-60	Houston 6- 8-60	Intercity Control
Harnett co. 8-11-60	Cookeville 6-30-60	Lubbock 9- 2-60	Council (Bur-
Haywood co. 3-30-60	Covington 11-29-60	McAllen 1-26-60	lington, Elk-
Henderson co. 8-30-60	Fayetteville 6-30-60	Mercedes 1-26-60	horn, Fort
Hertford co. 7-21-60	Greeneville 4-27-60	Midland 8-21-59	Atkinson) 12- 2-60
Iredell co. 12-11-59	Huntingdon 10-26-60	Mineral Wells 7-10-59	Kaukauna 1- 4-61
Jackson co. 4-19-61	Jackson-Madison	Odessa 8-21-59	La Crosse 8-12-60
Lenoir co. 1-20-61	co. 9- 1-60	Paris 3-10-61	Madison 4-10-61
Lincoln co. 11-29-60	Jamestown 10-17-60	San Angelo 9- 4-59	Neenah-
Macon co. 4-19-61	Kingston 8-16-60	San Antonio 4-12-61	Menasha 11-10-60
Madison co. 6-15-60	Knoxville 5- 2-61	San Benito 9-10-59	Racine 12-15-60
Martin co. 7- 7-60	Lewisburg 10-25-60	Sweetwater 9-25-59	Stevens Point 2- 1-61
		Texarkana 4- 7-61	Wausau 8-26-60

**Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more and date of rating during
1959-61—Continued**

BOTH RAW AND PASTEURIZED MARKET MILK¹

<i>Arkansas</i>	<i>Kentucky</i>	<i>Oklahoma</i>	<i>Texas—Continued</i>
Little Rock (99.8)..... 10-14-59	Lexington-Fayette co. (99.7) . 5-12-60	Lawton (99.5).... 1-15-59	Palestine (99.79)..... 7-10-59
<i>Georgia</i>	Madisonville-Hopkins co. (99.8)..... 7-21-60	Shawnee (98.98).. 1-29-60	Waco (99.97) ... 9-25-59
Macon (99.85).... 11- 9-59	Somerset-Pulaski co. (96)..... 6-10-60	<i>Oregon</i>	<i>Virginia</i>
Moultrie (96.8).... 3-17-61		Portland (99.9).... 9-18-59	Charlottesville (99.7)..... 10-15-59
Newnan (98.1).... 4- 5-61	<i>Missouri</i>	Harriman (95).... 8-16-60	Danville (99.6).... 10-28-60
<i>Idaho</i>	Joplin (98.5).... 1-31-61	<i>Tennessee</i>	<i>Washington</i>
Ada co. (95) 12-12-60	<i>North Carolina</i>	<i>Texas</i>	Benton-Franklin cos. (98.5).... 10-24-60
Canyon co. (98.2)..... 12-12-60	Buncombe co. (99.1)..... 9-20-59	Abilene (99.67).. 7- 2-59	
Nampa (99)..... 12- 8-60	Caldwell co. (97.7)..... 6- 7-60	Austin (99.9).... 11-19-59	<i>West Virginia</i>
<i>Iowa</i>	Robeson co. (98.2)..... 2-24-60	Brownsville (99.3)..... 8-27-59	Monongalia co. (98.4)..... 7-15-60
Carroll (98.5).... 5-14-60		Denton (97.7).... 7-30-59	
		Hereford (97).... 3-27-59	

¹ Figures in parentheses show the percentage of the milk pasteurized.

ordinance recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service.

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

Notice 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, whether commercially or at home, before it is consumed.

Federal Employees' Health Plans

Almost 6 million persons are enrolled in the two health benefits programs administered for Federal Government employees and annuitants, and dependents of these two groups, by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. This enrollment constitutes 4.5 percent of the 132 million persons in the United States having some form of health benefits protection.

About 5,397,500 persons were enrolled in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program as of March 31, 1961. Of these, 1,779,000 were employees, 26,000 were employee and survivor annuitants who continued their health benefits coverage, and 3,592,500 were dependents of employees and annuitants.

The Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Program had an enrollment of 236,000 employee or survivor annuitants as of July 1, 1961. More than 150,000 dependents are also covered under this program.

Federal Publications

Highlights of Research Progress in General Medical Sciences, 1960. *PHS Publication No. 815; 45 pages; 25 cents.*

A concise review of important research findings in biochemical problems, environmental health, and clinical medicine is presented. In addition, major organizational changes and programs in research grants, research training, and aging research are described.

National Institutes of Health Scientific Directory, 1960, and Annual Bibliography, 1960. *PHS Publication No. 831 (Public Health Bibliography Series No. 34); 144 pages; 45 cents.*

This publication, intended for reference use by research workers in the biomedical sciences inside and outside Federal Government, presents the broad outlines of NIH structure, names professional staff, and lists more than 1,600 scientific and technical papers from laboratory and clinical research during 1960.

Included also are two indexes, a listing of staff members and authors, and a subject index, reflecting the scope of NIH research and providing quick reference to research areas.

Cancer Motion Picture Guide. *PHS Publication No. 848; 1961; 162 pages; \$1.*

Approximately 1,100 domestic and foreign cancer films and filmstrips for professional and nonprofessional audiences are listed alphabetically by title under appropriate subject categories. All foreign film titles have been translated, and all titles are followed by a brief abstract of contents.

Research Programs in Aging. *PHS Publication No. 836; 1961; 24 pages; 15 cents.*

Prepared as background material for submission at congressional hearings on appropriations, this report covers, in narrative form, all intramural and extramural studies in

gerontology supported or conducted by the National Institutes of Health during 1960.

Comparative statistical summaries are given showing the number and cost of grants for a 4-year period. A bibliography lists papers on aging by staff members of NIH, Duke University, and Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Progress Against Cancer, 1960. *PHS Publication No. 812; 1961; 57 pages.*

Brief summaries of research findings reported by staff scientists and grantees of the National Cancer Institute deal with viruses, environmental cancer, diagnosis, chemical and other therapy, survival rates, leukemia, cancer cells, and tumors in animals. Prepared for presentation at congressional hearings on appropriations, the report also contains the full text of the opening statement by the director of the institute.

Private Support for Mental Health: A study of the support, by foundations and other private national granting agencies, for mental health and related disciplines. *PHS Publication No. 838; by Jeanne L. Brand; 1961; 45 pages; 35 cents.*

Fields of research supported, types of support awarded, comparative amounts of support, and policies of the agencies concerned are discussed. An annotated appendix lists 142 agencies which have support available for mental health.

The publication is designed for the use of private and governmental granting agencies, as well as individuals interested in funds for mental health programs from nongovernmental sources.

Research Highlights in Aging, 1960. *PHS Publication No. 854; 1961; 50 pages; 25 cents.*

Selected papers on research in aging supported or carried out by the National Institutes of Health are reviewed. The research ranges

from fundamental studies in the biology of aging to studies concerned with physical, psychological, and social problems.

Reviews of new literature, important meetings, programs of five major multidisciplinary centers for aging research, and training programs are included.

Pollution-Caused Fish Kills in 1960. *PHS Publication No. 847; 1961; 20 pages.*

The estimated number of fish killed by pollution in lakes, streams, and rivers is tabulated by State. Locations of kills, sources of pollution, and extent of damage are also given. The narrative section of the report covers reporting methods and quotes from State reporting agencies on causes of kills and suggested remedies.

Activities of the National Institutes of Health in the Field of Gerontology, January 1961. *PHS Publication No. 841; 46 pages; 35 cents.*

Grants for all research in aging active on January 31, 1961, are arranged in two categories, those primarily and those secondarily related to aging. In each category the grants are classified as general, major multidisciplinary research, structural aspects of aging, physiological and biochemical aspects, psychological aspects, social aspects, identifiable disease processes, and training.

This section carries announcements of new publications prepared by the Public Health Service and of selected publications prepared with Federal support.

Unless otherwise indicated, publications for which prices are quoted are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Orders should be accompanied by cash, check, or money order and should fully identify the publication. Public Health Service publications which do not carry price quotations, as well as single sample copies of those for which prices are shown, can be obtained without charge from the Public Inquiries Branch, Office of Information, Public Health Service, Washington 25, D.C.

The Public Health Service does not supply publications other than its own.
