Milk Sanitation Honor Roll for 1962-63

Thirty-one communities have been added to the Public Health Service milk sanitation "honor roll" and 51 communities on the previous list have been dropped. This revision covers the period from January 1, 1962, to December 31, 1963, and includes a total of 199 cities and 104 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 This compilation is from the Milk and Food Branch, Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection, Public Health Service. The previous listing, with a summary of rules under which a community is included, was published in Public Health Reports, September 1963, pp 823–825. The rating method is described in PHS Publication No. 678 (Methods of Making Sanitation Ratings of Milksheds).

voluntary adoption in 517 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 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.

Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more, and date of rating for 1962-63

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED

Arizona	Georgia	Georgia—Continued
Maricopa County 3-6-62	Albany 12-14-62	Rome-Floyd County 7- 8-63
Automone	Athens 5-24-63	Savannah 12- 7-62
Arkansas	Atlanta 11- 9-62	Statesboro 10-14-63
Fort Smith 7-26-62	Augusta 1-11-63	Thomasville 7- 9-63
Little Rock 11- 5-63	Bainbridge 2-19-63	Valdosta 3- 1-63
Colorado	Cairo 6-11-63	Washington 2- 8-63
	Calhoun 10- 5-62	Waycross 11- 1-63
Boulder County 11-13-62	Canton 8-17-62	Iowa
Colorado Springs 10- 5-62	Carrollton-Carroll County 3- 3-62	Ames 1-16-62
Denver 1-25-63	Cartersville 12- 5-62	Burlington 1-10-62
Mesa County 4- 8-63	Columbus 12-21-62	Cedar Rapids 6-28-62
San Juan Basin 9-20-63	Dalton 12-13-62	Clinton 4-19-62
Archuleta County		Davenport 5-16-62
Dolores County	Douglas 10-29-63	Des Moines6-15-62
LaPlata County	Macon 10-11-63	Dubuque 5- 2-62
Weld County 12- 5-62	Quitman 10-18-63	Estherville 4-10-62

Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more, and date of rating for 1962–63—Continued

100 PERCENT OF MARKET MILK PASTEURIZED—Continued

Iowa—Continued	New Mexico—Continued	North Carolina—Continued
Keokuk 3-21-62	Carlsbad 7-17-62	Wilkes County 10- 1-63
Laurens 3-14-62	Clovis 6-27-63	Wilson County 1-24-63
Mount Pleasant 3- 9-62	Farmington 4-25-62	•
Ottumwa 5-11-62	Portales 6-14-62	Oklahoma
Sioux City 2-15-62		
Kentucky	North Carolina	Ardmore 5-21-63 Atoka 5-23-63
	Alamance County 5- 4-62	Elk City 4-30-63
Bowling Green-Warren County 10- 9-62	Alamance County 5- 4-62 Alexander County 5-30-62	Enid 5- 7-63
Covington-Kenton County 8-26-63	Alleghany County 5-1-63	Henryetta 6-26-63
Fulton County 11-14-62	Anson County 5-14-63	Lawton 12- 7-62
Glasgow 11-26-62	Ashe County 5- 1-63	Mangum 10-30-63
Harlan 8-10-62	Avery County 3-21-63	Oklahoma City 4-19-63
Henderson-Henderson County_ 6-7-62	Beaufort County 1-31-63	Okmulgee 1-18-63
Hopkinsville-Christian	Bertie County 10-22-63	Ponca City 9- 5-63
County9-30-63	Bladen County 6-11-62	Shawnee 2-26-63 Stillwater 3-27-63
Louisville-Jefferson County 6-12-63	Brunswick County 7–17–63	Tulsa 11-29-62
Mayfield-Graves County 9-18-62	Burke County 3-14-63 Burke County 1-21-63	14154
Maysville-Mason County 12- 3-62 Monticello-Wayne County 10- 7-63	Burke County 1-21-63 Cabarrus County 6- 1-62	Потполого
Morehead-Rowan County 7-10-63	Camden County 5- 9-62	Tennessee
Murray-Calloway County 10-15-62	Carteret County 4-24-62	Athens-McMinn County 6-10-63
Newport-Campbell County 1- 7-63	Catawba County 5-30-62	Clinton 6-27-62
Owensboro-Daviess County 10-22-63	Chowan County 5- 9-62	Columbia-Maury County 10-24-62
Paducah-McCracken County 9-22-62	Cleveland County 10- 9-62	Cookeville 5-24-62
Mississiani	Craven County 10-22-62	Covington 9-12-62
Mississippi	Cumberland County 6-7-63	Erin 3-21-63
Amory 5- 1-63	Davidson County 3- 8-63 Durham County 1-25-63	Erwin 4- 4-62 Fayetteville-Lincoln County_ 10-31-62
Biloxi 8-27-63	Edgecombe County 10-30-62	Franklin County 2-11-63
Brookhaven 11- 5-63 Canton 6-12-62	Forsyth County 8- 2-63	Gallatin 5- 1-63
Cleveland 1- 9-63	Gates County 5- 9-62	Giles County 7-16-63
Columbia 12-18-62	Guilford County 9- 7-62	Huntingdon 11-30-62
Corinth 5- 9-62	Harnett County 5- 2-62	Jackson-Madison County 5- 2-63
Greenwood 12- 4-62	Henderson County 6-15-62	Kingston 11-13-62
Grenada 9-20-63	Hertford County 5-9-62	Knoxville-Knox County 6-14-63
Hattiesburg 1-23-62	Iredell County 10-29-63 Jackson County 7-31-62	Lewisburg 4- 8-63 Lexington 11-29-62
Iuka 5- 8-62 Jackson 1-24-63	Lenoir County 9-21-62	Livingston 4-29-63
Jackson 1-24-63 Kosciusko 4-10-62	Lincoln County 5-30-62	Loudon 5-24-62
Laurel 3-14-63	Macon County 7-31-62	McMinnville 6- 6-63
McComb 5-14-63	Madison County 6-25-63	Marion County 3-8-63
Meadville 9-26-62	Martin County 4- 4-62	Memphis 5-22-63
Meridian 7-24-63	Mecklenburg County 12- 7-62	Murfreesboro6-18-63
Natchez 9-26-62	Montgomery County 8-29-63 Moore County 4-27-62	Nashville-Davidson County 10-21-63
New Albany 6-13-62	Moore County 4-27-62 New Hanover County 5-20-63	Paris 11-27-62 Rogersville 6- 3-63
Picayune 2-21-63	Northampton County 4-13-62	Sevier County 3-25-63
Starkville 10-19-62 Tupelo 7-25-62	Onslow County 3- 8-63	Sparta 12-12-62
Tupelo	Pamlico County 3- 7-63	Waverly 4-11-63
Missouri	Pasquotank County 5- 9-62	_
Cape Girardeau 5-17-62	Pender County 5-17-62	Texas
Kansas City 11-14-62	Perquimans County 5- 9-62	Abilene 6-11-63
Poplar Bluff 12-18-62	Pitt County 10-21-63 Randolph County 4- 5-62	Amarillo 5- 3-63
St. Joseph 7-16-63	Richmond County 9-12-63	Beaumont 5-24-63
St. Louis 7-19-62	Rockingham County 4-10-63	Brenham 2-15-62
St. Louis County 4-12-62 Sikeston 8-21-63	Sampson County 7- 6-62	Corpus Christi
Sikeston 8-21-63 Springfield 1-24-62	Scotland County 8-13-63	Dallas 9-18-62 Donna 4-27-62
NP-1161111 ======= 1-21-02	Stokes County 10- 1-63	Edinburg 4-27-62
Nevada	Swain County 7-31-62	Falfurrias 1- 9-62
Clark County 1062	Tyrrell County 7-24-63 Union County 12-19-62	Galveston 7-31-63
Yerington 1-28-63	Wake County 12-6-62	Gonzales 7- 5-63
77. 76 4	Warren County 10-31-62	Grand Prairie 3- 6-63
New Mexico	Washington County 7-24-63	Harlingen 1-23-62
Albuquerque 5-29-63	Watauga County 5- 1-63	Houston 5-21-62
Artesia 7-17-62	Wayne County 7-11-63	Jacksonville 2-12-63

274 Public Health Reports

Communities awarded milk sanitation ratings of 90 percent or more, and date of rating for 1962–63—Continued

100 PERCENT OF MILK MARKET PASTEURIZED—Continued

Texas—Continued	Virginia		Wisconsin	
Lubbock 7-26-62	Colonial Heights	4- 1-63	Ashland	5-10-62
McAllen 4-27-62	Lynchburg	6-28-63	Beaver Dam	3-21-63
Paris 3-21-63	Norfolk	5-25-62	Kenosha	6-12-63
Plainview 7-23-63	Petersburg	2-12-63	La Crosse	6-30-62
Port Arthur 7-30-62	Richmond	4- 6-62	Madison	3-29-63
San Antonio 3- 1-63	Roanoke	7-12-62	Milwaukee	4-26-63
San Benito 1-23-62	Staunton	4-19-62	Neenah-Menasha	8- 9-62
Texarkana 4-26-63	Waynesboro	5 - 25 - 62	Oshkosh	
Tyler 2- 6-63				
Wichita Falls 10-18-62	Washington		Racine	12- 5-62
	w asning ion		Ripon	3-21-63
Utah	Spokane	5-17-62	Sheboygan	5–16–63
Logan 11-27-63	Tacoma	7- 3-63	Two Rivers	3–13–63
Ogden 11-27-63	Walla Walla	8-23-62	Waupun	3-21-63
Salt Lake City 11-27-63	Whitman County	5- 3-62	Wausau	6-26-62

BOTH RAW AND PASTEURIZED MARKET MILK¹

Georgia	New Mexico	Texas
Moultrie (92.4) 7-12-63 Newnan (99) 11- 6-63	Roswell (98.2) 7-16-62	Austin (98.4) 7-19-62 Fort Worth (99.97) 4- 5-63
Newnan (66) 11- 0-05	Oklahoma	Marshall (98.6) 5-15-63
Kentucky	McAlester (45.6) 5- 3-62	Virginia
Lexington-Fayette County	Norman (99.66) 6-20-63	Danville (99.6) 12-11-62
(99.6) 5- 3-62 Madisonville (99.8) 6- 4-62	Oregon	, ,
Somerset-Pulaski County (97) _ 5-14-62	Portland (99.74) 4- 5-63	Washington
Missouri	Te nnessee	Benton-Franklin Counties (98.3) 10- 3-62 Seattle-King County (99.6) 5-22-63
Joplin (99) 1- 9-62	Harriman (99.67) 11-13-62	Yakima (99.1) 11-29-62

 $^{^{1}\,\}mathrm{Figures}$ 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.



Radionuclide Analysis of Gamma-Ray Spectra by Stepwise Multiple Regression. PHS Publication No. 999-R-5; 1963; by Robert H. Shumway; 19 pages. Describes a method for resolving gamma-ray spectra of unknown solutions containing a relatively large number of radionuclides. The procedure requires no a priori assumptions about the radionuclide content of the solution, and utilizes the information in all of the channels simultaneously. Illustrative examples are presented.

Serving Health Research. The mission of the Division of Research Facilities and Resources of the National Institutes of Health. Publication No. 1047; September 1963; 54 pages; 25 cents. Explains how the division provides a focal point for the administration of broad NIH programs supplying a wide institutional base of support for healthrelated research. The division's principal concerns are to aid institutions in construction of medical research facilities; help establish and operate general clinical research centers: supply highly specialized research services and equipment; increase the availability of laboratory animals; and stimulate well-balanced institutional research programs through grants for general medical research support.

Alcohol and Traffic Safety. PHS
Publication No. 1043; 1963; edited
by Bernard H. Fox and James H.
Fox; 258 pages; \$1.75. Major papers from the National Conference
on Alcohol and Traffic Safety have
been compiled and amended to present a multifaced view of the problem of drinking and driving. Facts
and professional opinions concerning behavioral and physiological effects of alcohol, chemical testing and
legal problems, statistics and ex-

perimental design, social and psychological factors, and emotional and educational aspects of drinking-driving are presented.

Conference on Research in Hospital Use. PHS Publication No. 930-E-2: 1963; 148 pages; 75 cents. Comprises report and full proceedings of a conference sponsored by the American Hospital Association and the Public Health Service, held in Chicago, Ill., January 22-23, 1963, Contains a short review of the conference and summarizes panel discussions on research projects carried out in this country, with emphasis on methodology, review of research in hospital use in the United Kingdom, and presentation of guidelines for future research.

Hill-Burton State Plan Data: A national summary as of January 1, 1963. PHS Publication No. 930-F-2; revised 1963; 89 pages; 50 cents. Summarizes data on general, mental, tuberculosis hospital and long-term care beds, public health and diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities for 1963. Includes current estimates of additional needs, as well as trend data since the enactment of the Hill-Burton Act in August 1946.

Selected References on Design of Facilities for Long-Term Patients. PHS Publication No. 930-G-9; October 1963; 13 pages; 15 cents. Lists sources of information on the design of long-term care facilities under such headings as chronic illness, child care, rehabilitation, and care of the aging.

Statistical Summary of Municipal Water Facilities in the United States. PHS Publication No. 1039; 1963; by Andrew C. Glass and Kenneth H. Jenkins; 54 pages; 25 cents. Covers facilities as of January 1, 1958. Contains a history of the statistical program, definitions and descriptions of methods, 13 tables of basic data, arranged by State, population groups, and drainage basins relating to methods and extent of treatment given to public water supplies. Remaining tables are devoted to comparisons and analyses.

Research and Training Programs of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. PHS Publication No. 1099; 1963; 10 pages; 10 cents. Describes the types of research and training programs supported by the Institute. Designed primarily for the information of scientific investigators, graduate students, and others interested in obtaining support from the Institute.

Cancer of the Bone. PHS Publication No. 1070 (Health Information Series No. 110); 1963; leaflet; 5 cents, \$2.75 per 100. Informational pamphlet designed to give the general public a clearer understanding of primary and secondary bone malignancies. Discusses primary bone malignancies originating in the skeletal tissues, and secondary bone malignancies arising from primary tumors elsewhere in the body. Also discusses benign bone tumors and describes symptoms for both conditions.

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, D.C., 20402. 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, Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., 20201.

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