Milk Sanitation Honor Roll for 1962–64

Forty-three communities have been added to the Public Health Service milk sanitation "honor roll" and 47 communities on the previous list have been dropped. This revision covers the period from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1964, and includes a total of 189 cities and 110 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 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 are sold.

The recommended milk ordinance, on which the milk sanitation ratings are based, is now in effect through voluntary adoption in 520 counties and 1,435 municipalities. The ordinance also serves as the basis for the regulations of 37 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

This compilation is from the Milk and Food Branch, Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection, Public Health Service. The previous listing was published in Public Health Reports, March 1964, pp. 273–275. The rating method is described in PHS Publication No. 678 (Methods of Making Sanitation Ratings of Milksheds).

of the list is intended to encourage 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 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 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 1962–June 1964

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Arizona

Mississippi-Continued

North Carolina-Continued

Maricopa County_____ 2-27-64

Fort a	Smith	7-26-62
Little	Rock	11- 5-63

Colorado

Boulder County 11-	13-62
Colorado Springs 10-	5-62
Denver 1-	25-63
Mesa County 4-	- 8-63
San Juan Basin 9-	20-63
Archuleta County	
Dolores County	
La Plata County	
Weld County 12-	- 5-62

Georgia

Alberry 1 10 04
Albany 1-10-64
Athens 5-24-63
Atlanta-Fulton County 11-12-63
Augusta 3-13-64
Cairo 6-11-63
Calhoun 10- 5-62
Cartersville 12- 5-62
Columbus 12-20-63
Dalton-Whitfield County 12- 2-63
Douglas 10-29-63
Fitzgerald 3-27-64
Macon 10-11-63
Quitman 10-18-63
Rome-Floyd County 7- 8-63
Savannah 12-13-63
Statesboro 10-14-63
Thomasville 7- 9-63
Valdosta 2-12-64
Washington 2-28-64
Waycross 11- 1-63

Kentucky

Bowling Green-Warren	
County	10- 9-62
Covington-Kenton County	8-26-63
Fulton County	11 - 14 - 62
Glasgow	11 - 26 - 62
Harlan	8 - 10 - 62
Hopkinsville-Christian County_	9-30-63
Louisville-Jefferson County	6 - 12 - 63
Mayfield-Graves County	9-18-62
Maysville-Mason County	12- 3-62
Monticello-Wayne County	10- 7-63
Morehead-Rowan County	7-10-63
Murray-Calloway County	10 - 15 - 62
Newport-Campbell County	1- 7-63
Owensboro-Daviess County	10 - 22 - 63
Paducah-McCracken County	9 - 22 - 62

Mississippi

Amory	5- 1-63
Biloxi	8-27-63
Brookhaven	11- 5-63
Cleveland	1- 9-63
Columbia	12 - 18 - 62
Columbus	4- 9-64
Greenwood	2 - 26 - 64
Grenada	9-20-63
Gulfport	1 - 16 - 64
Hattiesburg	1 - 22 - 64

5- 7-64 Iuka _____ Jackson _____ 1-24-63 Kosciusko 4- 8-64 Laurel _____ 3-14-63 McComb _____ 5-14-63 Meadville _____ 12-18-63 Meridian _____ 7-24-63 Natchez _____ 9-26-62 Oxford _____ 1 - 29 - 64Picayune _____ 2-21-63 Starkville 1-27-64 Tupelo 7-25-62 Vicksburg _____ 3-31-64 West Point_____ 4- 7-64

Missouri

Cape Girardeau	4-21-64
Kansas City	11 - 14 - 62
Poplar Bluff	12 - 18 - 62
St. Joseph	7-16-63
St. Louis	7-19-62
St. Louis County	3-17-64
Sikeston	8-21-63

Nevada

Clark Cou	nty	10	-62
Yerington		1–2	8-63

New Mexico

Albuquerque	5–29–6 3
Artesia	7 - 17 - 62
Carlsbad	7 - 17 - 62
Clovis	6-27-63
Farmington	6 - 27 - 63

North Carolina

1.0.000 0.000000
Alamance County 12- 6-63
Alexander County 1- 3-64
Alleghany County 5- 1-63
Anson County 5-14-63
Ashe County 5- 1-63
Avery County 3-21-63
Beaufort County 1-31-63
Bertie County 10-22-63
Brunswick County 7-17-63
Buncombe County 3-14-63
Burke County 1-21-63
Cabarrus County 2-27-64
Caldwell County 11-19-63
Camden County 12- 4-63
Carteret County 12- 6-63
Catawba County 1- 3-64
Chowan County 12- 4-63
Cleveland County 10- 9-62
Craven County 10-22-62
Cumberland County 6- 7-63
Davidson County 3- 8-63
Durham County 1-25-63
Edgecombe County 10-30-62
Forsyth County 8- 2-63
Gates County 12- 3-63
Guilford County 4-10-64
Henderson County 2-11-64
Hertford County 12- 3-63
Iredell County 10-29-63
Jackson County 7-31-62
Johnston County 12-12-63
Lenoir County 3-26-64

	Lincoln County	1- 3-64
	Macon County	7-31-62
	Madison County	6 - 25 - 63
	Martin County	10 - 22 - 63
	Mecklenburg County	12 - 7 - 62
	Montgomery County	8-29-63
	Moore County	12- 6-63
	New Hanover County	5 - 20 - 63
	Northampton County	10-31-63
	Onslow County	3- 8-63
	Pamlico County	3- 7-63
	Pasquotank County	12- 4-63
	Pender County	12- 2-63
	Perquimans County	12- 4-63
	Pitt County	10 - 21 - 63
	Randolph County	10-10-63
	Richmond County	9-12-63
	Rockingham County	4-10-63
	Rowan County	3-16-64
	Sampson County	2 - 11 - 64
	Scotland County	8-13-63
	Stokes County	10- 1-63
	Swain County	7 - 31 - 62
1	Tyrrell County	7-24-63
1	Union County	12 - 19 - 62
	Vance County	12-11-63
	Wake County	12 - 6 - 62
	Warren County	10 - 31 - 62
	Washington County	7 - 24 - 63
	Watauga County	5- 1-63
	Wayne County	7-11-63
	Wilkes County	10- 1-63
	Wilson County	1 - 24 - 63

Oklahoma

	Ardmore	5 - 21 - 63
	Atoka	5 - 23 - 63
	Elk City	4- 9-64
	Enid	5- 6-64
	Henryetta	6 - 26 - 63
	Lawton	11 - 29 - 63
	Mangum	10-30-63
	Oklahoma City	4-19-63
	Okmulgee	1 - 18 - 63
	Ponca City	9- 5-63
	Shawnee	2-12-64
1	Stillwater	3-19-64
1	Tahlequah	1-11-64
Ì	Tulsa	11- 8-63

Tennessee

Athens-McMinn County 11-19-63
Bradley County 11-19-63
Chattanooga-Hamilton
County 11-20-63
Clarksville 2-17-64
Coffee County 12- 9-63
Columbia-Maury County 10-24-62
Covington 9-12-62
Erin 3-21-63
Fayetteville-Lincoln County 10-31-62
Franklin County 2-11-63
Gallatin 5- 1-63
Giles County 7-16-63
Huntingdon 11-30-62
Jackson-Madison County 5- 2-63
Kingston 11-13-62

Communities Awarded Milk Sanitation Ratings of 90 Percent or More, July 1962–June 1964– Continued

Tennessee—Continued	Texes—Continued	Virginia
Knoxville-Knox County 6-14-63	College Station 3-12-6	4 Colonial Heights 4- 1-63
Lebanon 5-27-63	Corpus Christi	
Lewisburg 4- 8-63	Dallas 9-18-6	
Lexington 11-29-62	El Paso 3-25-6	
Livingston 4-29-63	Falfurrias 1-17-6	
McMinnville 6- 6-63	Galveston 7-31-6	3 Washington
Marion County 3- 8-63	Gonzales 7- 5-6	3 Spokane 5-15-64
Meigs County 11-19-63	Grand Prairie 3- 6-6	3 Tacoma 7- 3-63
Memphis 5-22-63	Harlingen 1-17-6	4 Walla Walla 8-23-62
Monroe County 11-19-63	Jacksonville 2-12-6	3
Murfreesboro 6-18-63	Kerrville 5-13-6	4 Wisconsin
Nashville-Davidson County 10-21-63	Kingsville 11-11-6	3 Beaver Dam 3-21-63
Paris 11-27-62	Lubbock 7-26-6	2 Beloit 9-11-63
Polk County 11-19-63	Midland 2-13-6	4 Clintonville 12-19-63
Rogersville 6- 3-63	New Braunfels 3- 6-6	4 Green Bay 10-10-63
Sevier County 3-25-63	Paris 3-30-6	4 Kenosha 6-12-63
Sparta 12-12-62	Plainview 7-23-6	3 La Crosse 4-16-64
Springfield 2- 3-64	Port Arthur 7-30-6	2 Little Chute-Kimberly 12-18-63
Sullivan County (Bristol and	San Antonio 10-11-6	3 Madison 3-29-63
Kingsport) 10-15-63	San Benito 1-17-6	4 Milwaukee 4-26-63
Waverly 4-11-63	Texarkana 4-26-6	3 Neenah-Menasha 8- 9-62
_	Tyler 2- 6-6	3 Oshkosh 3-18-63
Texas	Victoria 9- 4-6	
Abilene6-11-63	Wichita Falls 10-10-6	3 Ripon 3-21-63
Amarillo 5- 3-63	~~	Sheboygan 5-16-63
Beaumont 5-24-63	Utah	Stevens Point 12-10-63
Brady 12- 6-64	Logan 11-27-6	3 Two Rivers 3-13-63
Brenham 3- 6-64	Ogden 11-27-0	
Burkburnett 10-11-63	Salt Lake City 11-27-6	

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED-Continued

BOTH RAW AND PASTEURIZED MARKET MILK¹

Georgia	Oregon	Texas—Continued
Moultrie (92.4) 7-12-63 Newnan (99) 11- 6-63		Marshall (98.6) 5-15-63 Waco (99.09) 4-20-64
	Tennessee	Virginia
New Mexico	Harriman (99.67) 11-13-62	Danville (99.6) 12-11-62
Roswell (98) 6-27-6		Washington
	Texas	Benton-Franklin Counties
Oklahoma	Austin (98.4)	(98.3) 10- 3-62
	Fort Worth (99.97) 4- 5-63	Seattle-King County (99.6) 5-22-63
Norman (99.66) 6-20-63	Laredo (98.3) 12- 6-63	Yakima (99.1) 11-29-62

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

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 recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service.

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.