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Through our knowledge and experience, we have built valuable relationships that allow us to provide unique product solutions and services to the rendering industry.
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Our product program includes both Regenerative and Recuperative Thermal Oxidizers, today considered best available odor abatement technology.

Both systems offer total elimination of odors from rendering operation, greater than 99%, and elimination of waste water from the cooking process together with energy recovery.
Naples, Marco Island, and the western portion of the Everglades make up Southwest Florida’s Collier County — also known as The Paradise Coast. In terms of land area, Collier is the largest county in the state of Florida, yet more than 80 percent of its vast expanse is preserved as park and nature preserve land by federal, state, county, city, and private agencies.

The National Renderers Association will gather for its 77th annual convention at the memorable Ritz-Carlton Naples, which was named to the highly prestigious 2009 Condé Nast Traveler Gold List.

Located on Florida’s Paradise Coast, this award-winning beachfront resort features Gulf of Mexico views from every guest room, pristine white sand beaches, and glorious sunsets.

Mark your calendar and start making plans now to attend this highly successful annual convention.

For complete convention details, visit www.convention.nationalrenderers.org
Our Deodorising Oxidisers are well known all over the world as the best technology to eliminate the odours from the effluents of cookers, sterilizers, presses, decanters, material storage hoppers, etc...

Taking the vapours directly from the top of the cookers avoid the need for condensing with a significant saving in the cost for treating the wastewater.

The option to select a system with heat recovery or a ceramic regenerative oxidiser is determined by the specific requirements of each customer and according to the quantity of effluent to be treated. Recovery and Regenerative DEO Oxidisers are utilised to eliminate odours and vapour emissions generated by the production processes. They are specially designed plants tailored to meet the particular requirements of these industrial processes.

Babcock Wanson is the leading company in the world in this field having completed many successful installations operating in the following countries:

• U.S.A.
• United Kingdom and Ireland
• France, Italy, Spain
• Argentina
• Middle East

Babcock Wanson technicians are available to offer the most suitable solution for each specific case.
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Jumping Through Trade Barrier Hoops

Early this year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) very quietly created a new job within the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) Veterinary Services division, that of a “farm animal welfare coordinator.” It isn’t the creation of this job that’s necessarily interesting. On its face, much good could come from recognition by USDA of the superiority of U.S. animal handling and well-being.

However, the job is a whole horse of a different color.

The mere creation of this job implies much about this administration’s attitude about trade and non-tariff trade barrier (NTB) challenges. I say “implies” because this administration says all the right things about “healthy trade” and “strong global markets,” but has put very little action behind those words. It also illustrates yet again that this administration is out of touch with mainstream, conventional agriculture and agribusiness.

First, to put the new APHIS gig in context, understand USDA has no statutory authority to regulate or set standards for on-farm animal production or handling practices. The federal Animal Welfare Act (AWA), which APHIS administers, specifically exempts both the raising of animals for food and fiber as well as research to enhance those endeavors. APHIS’ Animal Care Program oversees animals used in biomedical research, teaching, education, and entertainment, and folks who buy and sell such animals. As close as APHIS gets to farm animals is the regulation of those animals when they’re used in medical research. Once an animal gets off the truck at the slaughter plant, Food Safety and Inspection Service inspectors take over.

So, what’s the job description for the new “farm animal welfare coordinator”? As explained to me by senior APHIS staff, President Barack Obama’s administration anticipates that over time, more global trading partners may decide to use NTBs to keep U.S. goods out of their respective markets. One favorite method of achieving this protectionism is to single out a production or processing practice, impugn the safety or humaneness thereof, and use that as the basis for the NTB. Think European hormones in beef, Asian markets refusing to take rendered fats and oils over bovine spongiform encephalopathy fears, or the more recent Russian refusal to take U.S. chicken because of chlorine use in processing by the U.S. industry. It’s important to note none of the examples just given have one shred of science or fact to substantiate the action taken. This is all about protecting domestic production, markets, and, oh yeah, politics.

This new slot at vet services is all about making our folks jump through the hoops set up by foreign governments. The new guy at APHIS is supposed to create a “voluntary certification service” of which farmers and ranchers can avail themselves to prove to a foreign government that whatever production practice makes said government nervous isn’t used on the U.S. farm. So, if Lichtenstein – and I’m making this up now – decides it won’t accept meat or rendered products from animals forced to face east and wear red blankets, then the new APHIS program will be available for farmers to get official proof their animals faced west wearing blue blankets. It’s kind of an extension of the Agricultural Marketing Service’s (AMS) process verified program – the department makes no “judgment” as to the requirements of the program; all USDA does is charge a fee to go out and determine if a farmer can do whatever it is your process demands, and is the whole thing auditable.

What’s troubling here is the disconnect between USDA’s science side – that would be APHIS – and the trade policy side of USDA and the U.S. Special Trade Representative. When I first heard the program described, my comment was I hope this “voluntary certification” won’t even be considered until the last U.S. trade negotiator has drawn his or her last breath, and I hope this is an option of last resort, not first choice. This is the kind of move by an administration that sends all the wrong signals to trading partners, and implies surrender before the first shot is fired in any trade battle.

When I asked if the United States would retaliate in kind – as in refuse to accept meat, dairy, or eggs from countries where animals are raised in “free-range” or “open systems” given we’ve got mountains of data to show such animals carry heavier loads of microbial contamination, and not to put too fine a point on it, who the heck knows what the beasts ate – I got a blank stare in return. When I asked if we’d retaliate against other products, as in refusing to take Asian electronics or European specialty foods, that stare turned into a glare.

Europe has pushed this kind of NTB authority for decades. Called “the fourth hurdle” or “fourth protocol,” the European Union (EU) has tried unsuccessfully through the last few rounds of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, negotiations to get the global trade community to allow World Trade Organization members to be able to set up NTBs based on “consumer concerns” or similar reasons. This translates to trade barriers based on pretty much whatever you want to put in place; you only need claim your prohibition is based on fretful consumers. The United States has consistently opposed this EU move – going back to before President Ronald Reagan’s administration.

For instance, given the prevalence of ill-aided and politically motivated animal rights directives across Europe when it comes to farm animal care, it’s conceivable the EU, or any one of its members, could prohibit any pork product from an animal born of a mother who was housed in a gestation stall, or
refuse to take any eggs or egg products from hens raised in cages. Heck, given the goofiness of the Europeans on genetically modified ingredients and foods, they could extend that paranoia to a prohibition on any processed food containing these same animal ingredients based on the fundamental “concern” over the original on-farm production practice.

So, as nuts as it may sound, what if that pig you just rendered or those processing leftovers you just cooked up came from animals wantonly abused on farm, as in they were not allowed to run free in an Eden-like organic world? How could the United States certify the commingled rendered products derived from animals from different farms and different packing plants? And what of that restaurant grease?

This is just one of a number of small things that when taken together begin to indicate a larger body of evidence. Recently, it was announced the United States would begin reviewing European food safety programs and regulations to see if there were actions that could translate to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration considering its “critical drug” list to match that of the World Health Organization, which is pretty much the EU list.

I can see where arbitrary difference for the sake of difference makes no sense, and that to the extent practical, consistency among nations on standards and such need not be the hobgoblin of little minds. However, to even consider placating protectionist actions such as NTBs based on an on-farm production practice is at best naïve, and at worst, surrender.

Administration policy on such things should stick to Obama’s promise that when it comes to such struggles, his White House will follow “the best available science and the rule of law.” Industry needs to be assured the government will do battle on trade issues that threaten to undermine domestic industry, not create programs that inadvertently or intentionally force our producers and processors to adopt practices that our scientists tells us are wrong, our experience tells us is not in the animal or the producer/processor’s best interest, and that we’ve successfully defended against in our own Congress.
A Gentle Giant is Remembered

People come and go in our lives, some leaving their imprint for just a fleeting moment, others for a lifetime. One person who left his mark on this earth in so many ways is Frank Burnham, Render’s first editor and publisher, who died April 21, 2010, at the age of 86. As the rendering family mourns his passing, we remember an individual who truly had an impact on the industry, the aerospace world, and his family.

Render is what it is today thanks to Frank. In 1972, the Pacific Coast Renderers Association (PCRA) took on the task of expanding its newsletter to an industry publication. Frank stepped up to the plate, creating Render – The Magazine of Rendering and becoming its editor. A few years later, he also assumed the duties as publisher, serving in both capacities for 26 years until his retirement due to health reasons in 1996.

“He did the rendering industry a great amount of good with the establishment of Render and the dedication that he had to the magazine,” recalled Ray Kelly, formerly with Baker Commodities, who was there when Frank took the helm at Render and worked closely with him throughout the years.

Not knowing anything about rendering but being an award winning journalist, Frank learned the industry quickly and delved into such topics that first year as the industry’s economic impact on the U.S. gross national product, the big business of beef, how renderers can be good environmental neighbors, and the wonderful world of tallow. Accolades of praise were bestowed on PCRA and Frank as Render reached out to the far corners of the rendering and affiliated industries. Comments such as “you’re doing the industry a great service” to “anyone who had a hand in putting it all together deserves a pat on the back” graced the pages of Render that first year.

The publishing world recognized Render’s accomplishments twice under Frank’s watch. In 1977 and 1978, the Western Publications Association awarded its “Maggie” to Render for best agriculture and farm magazine. The publication was becoming such an integral part of the U.S. rendering industry, it was decided in October 1977 to re-label it “the national magazine of rendering.”

Render saw another leap forward in July 1979 when sponsorship was assumed by the National Renderers Association (NRA), expanding the magazine’s scope of coverage and initiating the industry’s yearly market report and NRA membership directory in each April issue. Frank was instrumental in this expansion and remained Render’s top leader as well as its chief photographer, a hobby that proved reputable over and over again throughout the pages of the magazine.

Another accomplishment for Frank and the industry was the publishing of Rendering – The Invisible Industry in 1978. Never before had a book been written on “the invisible industry” and Frank had made up his mind that “such a book must be written.” So with the “support and confidence” of the PCRA and rendering leaders Dick Ellis, Louis Ottone, Bill O’Donnell, George Cator, and Ray Kelly, Frank published that first book with the hope that future scholars and writers “may be motivated to give this industry the editorial attention it deserves.” Since then, two more rendering books have emerged by other authors – The Original Recyclers in 1996 and Essential Rendering in 2006.

“Frank served NRA well,” said Dr. Don Franco, former vice president of the National Renderers Association (NRA) Scientific Services. “His sincerity and his sense of dedication I would always remember. I thought the world of him. During my first convention after joining NRA, he took the time to provide me with valuable background information. I appreciated that to the utmost.”

In 1994, NRA President Burton Levy, right, honored Frank Burnham for his years of dedication and service to the rendering industry.
While Render may have been Frank’s final hurrah before his retirement, it was by no means his first venture into the publishing world.

Frank was a veteran newspaperman, aerospace editor, book author, and accomplished pilot. He began his writing career editing a newspaper for his Army Air Force Unit, the 356th Bomb Group, on the island of Guam in the closing months of World War II. Upon returning to civilian life in his hometown of Jamestown, NY, he became a cub reporter on the Jamestown Post-Journal and later, aviation editor for the Buffalo Evening News.

It was in Buffalo, NY, he first became familiar with Civil Air Patrol (CAP), an auxiliary to the U.S. Air Force, and became an active member. He eventually returned to Jamestown to become Chautauqua County Bureau Chief for the news and formed that city’s first CAP squadron.

Recalled to active military duty during the Korean War, Frank edited several military publications and, at the conclusion of hostilities, remained with the Air Force, becoming one of a handful of military information officers who pioneered in editorial coverage of the beginning space age. He served 14 years with the Department of Defense working in the missile program, concluding his government career at the Los Angeles Air Force Base.

In 1967, Frank returned to civilian life and over the next five years served as an editor on several national magazines published by American Aviation – Space Technology, Armed Forces Management, American Aviation, Airline Marketing, and Aerospace Daily. He received a national space writing award given by the Aviation/Space Writers Association, and authored three other books, Hero Next Door, about the CAP, Cleared to Land, the story of the Federal Aviation Administration, and Aerial Search, the CAP Story.

Frank was a pilot and airplane owner with over 4,000 hours in some 34 military and civilian aircraft types ranging from Piper Cubs to single-engine jets. He remained involved in CAP throughout his life, eventually becoming a commander, leading search and rescue missions for downed civilian aircraft either from the skies or at the command center on the ground. Frank also was a talented master of ceremonies for civilian air shows across the West coast.

Frank was preceded in death by his wife, Hazel, and is survived by four daughters, nine grandchildren, and eight great-grandchildren.

In his final days on this earth, Frank reminisced with his oldest daughter about his life. Favorite places he lived, the pets he adored, and the people he cherished were all remembered with fondness. When asked what his favorite job had been, he did not hesitate to announce it was working on Render and with the rendering industry.

It makes me proud to share that feeling with Frank, as my career with Render – which began as billing advertisers in the late 1970s, to associate editor in 1990, to editor in 1996 – has been my favorite as well. It also makes me proud to call Frank my grandfather, a man I am grateful to for leaving his mark on my life and the lives of so many others.

Rest in peace, Grandpa. You will forever remain in our hearts. R
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Treating Gaseous Effluents

By Josep Closa Ferrer
Haarslev Industries, Spain

The rendering industry is forced to continuously adapt to new challenges and meet the demands of new requirements in a constantly changing and evermore controlled sector. In Europe, as in the United States, there has been a period of consolidation of rendering activity to achieve an optimization of operational costs.

At the onset of any project to modernize or build a new greenfield rendering plant, the same fundamental question has to be asked: What is the best available technology to achieve the required process and environmental requirements?

For each project the answer can be different and contain many subtle differences due to the various project-specific factors and considerations that must be satisfied. In terms of the process requirements, today there is a wide variety of rendering systems that in turn influence the solutions governing the environmental requirements.

Specifically, when referring to process systems, they are batch systems, continuous dry systems, wet rendering systems, and slurry evaporator systems. In the same manner, various environmental systems for treatment of gaseous effluents (vapors and process air) are available, such as:

- direct contact (water) systems;
- indirect contact (water) systems;
- condensation systems using air cooled condensers;
- air treatment systems using biofilters;
- air treatment systems using chemical washers/scrubbers; and
- thermal oxidation systems (recuperative or regenerative).

Nowadays, the thermal oxidation of gases produced in rendering plants has been accepted as an effective solution for the elimination of odors coming from rendering processes for meat and fish rendering plants. It is no coincidence that the European Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Bureau responsible for defining European law and best practices to minimize pollution has produced clear directives for the purpose of reducing or eliminating odors and reducing wastewater from rendering plants.

By law in Europe, all new greenfield proposals or major changes to rendering plants must accurately respond to and follow the recommended best available technologies as defined by IPPC. Compliance to the IPPC regulations must be demonstrated by the operator of the plant via a comprehensive written submittal to the local authority in question. The local authorities in each case must assemble a team of experts who will study the submitted information, including detailed calculations, and ask for clarifications and any other necessary additional information before granting, deferring, or refusing the relevant environmental license.

Having defined that thermal oxidation is the best method to treat process effluents from European rendering plants, it is necessary to focus on a number of key elements in order to develop a fully integrated thermal oxidizing solution that perfectly matches and responds to the process system or systems being proposed. In each case, it is necessary to apply an evaluation protocol in order to specify the best thermal oxidizing solution. There are a number of key points that must be addressed in order to define the best solution.

First, it is important to establish the exact flows of process vapor and air needing treatment. In the case of a recuperative thermal oxidizer, consideration must be taken for the amount of steam production from the thermal oxidizer compared to the process system steam demand (calculating for and adjusting the designed steam producing capacity in terms of maximum steam demand, minimum steam generated, and average steam demand). Perhaps even just this simple quantification of the necessary flows to be treated and steam produced will show if the most efficient system in terms of energy balance is being chosen.

It is obvious that one must look for the perfect balance between the production of steam from the thermal oxidizer and the overall process system steam demand. In the case that this balance cannot be achieved, or that a cost-effective source for steam production already exists, then the regenerative thermal oxidizer may be considered as a suitable alternative due to the fact the advantages of the regenerative thermal oxidizer are still available, but the inherent production of steam is not.

There is an ongoing debate by business leaders and experts as to the suitability of installing either recuperative or regenerative oxidation systems. However, in each case it is fundamental to understand that the two systems are technically different in terms of energy usage, but achieve the same environmental goals.

A recuperative thermal oxidizer consists of a system for feeding cooking vapors and process air into a combustion chamber where the temperature is raised to 850 degrees Celsius (1,562 degrees Fahrenheit) and gases are oxidized into odor-free components. The hot oxidized reaction gases then pass through a boiler/heat exchange unit to recover energy and produce steam.

A regenerative thermal oxidizer consists of three chambers filled with a ceramic material. A specially designed burner heats one chamber to 950 degrees Celsius (1,742 degrees Fahrenheit). Cooking vapors and process air are fed into this chamber where they are oxidized into odor-free components. The hot oxidized reaction gases are then led into and preheat the second chamber. When this chamber has reached the reaction temperature, the gas flow is automatically changed so that cooking vapors and process air are oxidized in this chamber...
while the third chamber is preheated. This cycle continues thus ensuring low energy consumption and efficient oxidation.

Both systems are perfectly suited for use in the elimination of odors coming from rendering plants. However, the selection of one or other technology depends on a number of different reasons including energy efficiency, fuel type(s) available, cost of fuel, total flow of vapor and process air, and space available at site for installation of equipment.

Ultimately, each project must be judged on its own individual merits from which a decision on which technology option (recuperative or regenerative) can be clearly and decisively made. In fact, in Europe the two options have often demonstrated themselves to be complimentary technologies or alternative technologies leading to both types being installed at the same site.

Whatever type of oxidation technology is chosen, it is essential from the onset to put the project exclusively in the hands of experts with a proven track record in thermal oxidation technology applied in rendering processes. This will ensure the correct specification and application of proven solutions that encompass the entire interconnection of the equipment to be installed at the plant in terms of processes, pipe work, process regulation, and securities between the various systems.

The only way to guarantee total system functionality is by delivering a totally integrated productive unit thereby ensuring both production and legal environmental objectives are fulfilled.
Feed Rule Compliance Excellent

A report released in April shows compliance with the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA’s) ruminant feed ban to be “excellent,” as FDA puts it.

As of March 6, 2010, FDA had received over 76,000 inspection reports since 1997, with about 72 percent conducted by state feed control officials and the remainder by FDA officials. Of the over 8,000 firms handling prohibited mammalian protein products, only one firm, a licensed feed mill, failed a recent inspection. None of the 153 renderers handling prohibited materials failed recent inspections. FDA’s Center for Veterinary Medicine has summarized the results of ruminant feed rule inspections as of March 6, 2010, and is available at www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/NewsEvents/CVMUpdates/ucm207367.htm.

To help prevent the establishment and amplification of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) through feed in the United States, FDA implemented a final rule that prohibits the use of most mammalian protein in feeds for ruminant animals. This rule, Title 21, Part 589.2000 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), referred to as the ruminant feed ban, became effective on August 4, 1997.

A second rule, Title 21, Part 589.2001 of the CFR, called the enhanced feed ban, became effective on April 27, 2009. This rule prohibits the use of certain cattle-derived materials in all animal feed. The BSE inspection report form has been revised and is being used for determining compliance with both the ruminant feed ban and the enhanced feed ban.

EPA Finalizes Thresholds for Greenhouse Gas Permitting Requirements

On May 13, 2010, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the largest stationary sources while shielding millions of small sources of GHGs from Clean Air Act permitting requirements. The final rule, “Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule,” defines when permits under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V operating permit programs are required for new and existing industrial facilities.

“After extensive study, debate, and hundreds of thousands of public comments, EPA has set common-sense thresholds for greenhouse gases that will spark clean technology innovation and protect small businesses and farms,” said EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson. The agency received about 450,000 comments during a 60-day comment period after it issued a proposed rule in October 2009.

The National Renderers Association (NRA) joined a coalition of food, feed, ingredient, beverage, and consumer product processors to comment on the proposed rule. The consensus of the coalition was the rule was unneeded and unjustified, and that it would have significant impact on industry, jobs, and ultimately food prices.

“While the group’s concerns did not stop the final rule, it was successful in getting some significant changes that will mitigate some of the impact,” said Dr. David Meeker, NRA Scientific Services.

Beginning in January 2011, the threshold level will be 100,000 tons per year (tpy) of GHG emissions rather than the 25,000 tpy originally proposed (until June 2013, then EPA proposes to lower it to 50,000 tpy through new rulemaking). For plants already subject to the PSD permitting program, the threshold level will be 75,000 tpy until 2013, then it too will be triggered at 50,000 tpy. EPA will not require permits for smaller sources until at least April 30, 2016.

In July 2011, Clean Air Act permitting requirements will expand to cover all new facilities with GHG emissions of at least 100,000 tpy and modifications at existing facilities that would increase GHG emissions by at least 75,000 tpy. These permits must demonstrate the use of best available control technologies to minimize GHG emission increases when facilities are constructed or significantly modified.

Under the new emissions thresholds for GHGs that begin in July 2011, EPA estimates approximately 900 additional permitting actions covering new sources and modifications to existing sources would be subject to review each year. In addition, 550 sources will need to obtain operating permits for the first time because of their GHG emissions. The final rule addresses a group of six GHGs: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.

The industry coalition believes that this somewhat scaled back action by EPA lessens the probability that court challenges to the agency on GHG regulation will be successful and that proposed legislation by Senator Lisa Murkowski to curb EPA is also less likely to succeed. The coalition will continue to analyze EPA actions.

The EPA announcement containing more details, including the final rule and fact sheet, is available at www.epa.gov/nsr/actions.html.
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The rendering industry continues to face many challenges, especially when it comes to government regulations. The best forum to develop strategies to confront these matters head-on is industry meetings, so National Renderers Association (NRA) members met at the end of April in Cincinnati, OH, to attack the tough issues.

NRA business meetings began with the Environmental Committee dishing out bad news about the multitude of regulations coming out of Washington, DC. First up was a report on the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) greenhouse gas (GHG) reporting rule, which requires facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year of GHG emissions to submit annual reports to EPA. Dr. David Meeker, NRA Scientific Services, stated that the association has signed on with other industry groups in a letter to EPA expressing concern over the implementation of the rule. The coalition has requested the agency “allow the use of best available monitoring methods through and beyond December 31, 2010.” The groups believe the existing deadline of March 31, 2010, does not provide adequate lead time to ensure compliance.

Also of concern is EPA’s controversial finding in late 2009 that GHGs endanger public health, a move that could result in additional regulations of GHG emissions under the Clean Air Act. Committee Chairman Bob Vogler said the finding means that emission sources will be subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V operating permit requirements as a result of GHG emissions. He pointed out that a pending “tailoring rule” may increase the threshold limits for Title V permitting in an effort to carve out smaller emitters from the act (see “EPA Finalizes Thresholds for Greenhouse Gas Permitting Requirements” on page 12). Meanwhile, multiple lawsuits by industry groups and states have been filed challenging the validity of EPA’s endangerment finding, and Congress is examining options to block EPA’s actions.

“For all practical purposes, the regulation of GHGs takes effect January 1, 2011, and will apply to many permitting processes, even pending permits, under PSD and Title V,” Vogler warned. “It’s a mess. We’ll have to stay tuned to see how it all works out.”

Vogler also updated the committee on EPA’s pressure on states to impose corrective actions when stormwater discharges exceed benchmarks. He said the trend is to reduce pollution from stormwater by eliminating stormwater runoff completely.

Meeker then briefed members on NRA’s comments to EPA on other final or proposed rules, such as the agency’s new national ambient air quality standard for ozone, which will greatly increase the number of nonattainment areas with tighter restrictions on sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, and particulate matter. The association also sent comments to EPA on its proposed ammonia standards for water that are based on the presence of certain freshwater mussels. The standards as proposed will likely apply to numerous waterways across the United States. Meeker thanked renderers for providing input on these comments, and stressed the importance of NRA’s alignment with certain coalitions in order to better respond to the many environmental issues facing the industry.

Another challenging area is the biofuels industry, where the lack of an extension of a tax credit that expired December 31, 2009, has caused many biodiesel plants to cease operation. However, a bright light emerged for the rendering industry with the February 2010 release of EPA’s National Renewable Fuel Standard. Biofuels Committee Chairman Chuck Neece pointed out that work done years ago by Dr. Gary Pearl and Fred Wellons on the life cycle analysis of animal fats and recycled cooking oils has emerged in the new standard, with fats, oils, and greases (FOG) being one of only three biomass-based liquids to have the data available to determine they significantly reduce GHG emissions.

While the amount of biodiesel produced currently is far below the 545 gallons produced last year and significantly less than the 690 gallons in 2008, the use of rendered fats and oils as a feedstock has increased, from five percent usage a few years ago, to 25 percent last year. Current FOG use estimates are about 75 to 80 percent, primarily because of their lower cost and the lack of the tax credit.

Neece explained that renderers’ obligations under the new renewable fuel standard, which goes into effect July 1, 2010, is to provide the biodiesel producer a statement on the contract or a letter on company letterhead that includes a license number that the fat or oil purchased is a recycled product. This is to prevent the possibility of blending canola and palm oils and calling it yellow grease.

Steve Kopperud, Policy Directions, updated members on Congress’ actions to renew any of the 1,100 tax credits that
expired at the end of 2009, of which two are the biodiesel and alternative fuel mixture tax credits. Currently the House and Senate have different versions of bills to extend these expired credits, but one hurdle is the $27 million saved by removing a tax credit for the paper industry that was used by Senator Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) for health care reform. Kopperud says a concern in Congress is the lack of infrastructure to move biodiesel around the country. He informed renderers that both bills need to be identical and need to pass prior to the end of May, which is when Congress will turn its attention to other issues, including mid-year elections this November.

The Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy Committee meeting was brief, with NRA President Tom Cook revealing that the Food and Drug Administration held a webinar for the public in mid-April that reported the industry’s outstanding compliance with the feed rule. Renderers had no serious violations in the last report released in early April, with only a few violations among feed manufacturers (see “Feed Rule Compliance Excellent” on page 12).

The committee was asked and agreed to spearhead a new third-party rendering industry economic analysis in collaboration with the Fats and Proteins Research Foundation (FPRF) and Animal Protein Producers Industry (APPI) Committee. A similar study was done nearly 10 years ago and much has happened within the industry that could have changed the demographics. The industry believes having an updated analysis would assist its organizations in future program planning and to reevaluate priorities.

NRA’s Legislative Committee had a full agenda, with Kopperud commenting that polls show 51 percent of voters voting this fall will vote against the incumbent. He noted that although the farm bill doesn’t expire until 2012, the House Agriculture Committee is already holding hearings because funds currently available will not be there in 2012 so those who benefit will need to evaluate changes now.

Cook reminded members that the NRA Congressional Fly-in is June 14-16, and emphasized that attending every year becomes more and more important.

Michael Koebler, Sacramento Rendering Company, informed the committee on issues facing the industry in California that could have an affect on the rest of the country. One matter is the desire to compost unprocessed meat material that is being pushed by the “green” community and waste haulers in an effort to gain state biomass diversion credits. But perhaps a bigger concern among renderers is the impending retirement of California’s state veterinarian, Dr. Richard Breitmeyer, a long-time proponent of rendering.

“Dr. Breitmeyer’s retirement will be a big blow to the industry,” commented Ross Hamilton, Darling International. “A real scary thought is who is going to replace him.”

Grease theft was then addressed by the committee, where it was agreed upon that although most states have some type of law in place to protect grease collection, the problem is the lack of manpower to enforce those laws and prosecutors who have bigger issues to deal with than grease theft. Bob Griffin, Griffin Industries, recommended every theft be documented and a police report filed so law enforcement and legislators can comprehend the magnitude of the problem. After discussing various avenues to help deter thefts, committee members agreed to approach the National Restaurant Association on providing education to their members.

Meeker disclosed during the APPI Committee meeting that over 100 rendering plants are certified in the industry’s Code of Practice, representing over 90 percent of U.S. production. He informed members that rendering plants that test negative for...
Kentucky Hospitality

During the National Renderers Association spring meeting in Cincinnati, OH, Griffin Industries, Inc., treated attendees to a tour of its new headquarters offices located across the river in Cold Spring, KY, followed by a dinner reception. Two bus loads of renderers savored in the Southern hospitality and the scrumptious riverside dining experience.

Griffin Industries emerged in 1943 as a one-man dead stock collection operation in Falmouth, KY. Throughout the 1940s, John L. Griffin worked day and night to build-up his rendering business, eventually constructing his first plant in 1947 in Butler, KY. Over 25 years later, with the company now boasting six major plants, it was decided to move the corporate headquarters from the Butler facility to Cold Spring, KY. John purchased five-and-a-half acres that included a 104-year old vacant house that had formerly been called the Eight Mile House because it was located eight miles from the Ohio River. It had been used as part of the Underground Railroad for slaves as they were making their way north to freedom. Because of its history, it was decided to restore the old house to its stately southern style instead of building a new structure. The corporate offices officially relocated on April 1, 1974.

In 1986, a 10,000-square-foot addition was built and in 1991 a separate building was constructed to house the company’s engineering and environmental departments. Late in 2007, the Griffin brothers decided additional office space would be needed to accommodate the future growth of the company. Dennis Griffin, oldest son of John, was selected to design the building while Robert Griffin, Dennis’ brother, oversaw construction. In January 2009, Griffin employees officially moved in.

The 45,000-square-foot, three level building has received the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, or LEED, Green Building certification. The walls are unique in design – they are insulated permanent panels filled with concrete to provide energy and sound efficiency. The building features a cafeteria that provides the nearly 85 employees a hot meal three days a week for the low price of $5 a person, which the company elects to pay.

One feature on the property is a clock tower built to memorialize deceased family members and employees.

NRA Meeting Continued from page 15

Salmonella at load-out attribute the result to plant cleanliness, while Fred Cespedes, American Proteins, noted that research within the company showed combustible dust is not as big an issue in rendering plants as previously thought.

The NRA Board of Directors wrapped up the business meetings with Chairman Kevin Golding, Rothsay, thanking the Griffin family for their hospitality in Cincinnati (see “Kentucky Hospitality” on this page). Cook informed the board that membership is stable and encouraged renderers to support the International Market Development Committee (IMDC) either as a member or through monetary donations because exports affect everyone as it removes product from the domestic market.

With that said, Koehler presented a check for $21,000 to IMDC Chairman Mike Gilbert from the Pacific Coast Renderers Association (PCRA), while Robert Vogler, Valley Proteins, handed over a $7,500 donation from the Eastern Region Renderers Association. Both groups also donated to FPRF, with PCRA providing $22,000 and the Eastern Region pledging $7,500.

International Challenges

The vast scope of issues being faced in the international markets called for meetings spread over two days. Dr. Albert Tacon, newly hired IMDC Latin America aquaculture consultant, presented total global aquaculture production numbers, which was 68.3 million metric tons in 2008, with 91 percent of that production in Asia. Total compound feed (pig, poultry, ruminant) production worldwide in 2009 was 708 million metric tons, up 20 percent since 1995, while estimated global production of commercial aquaculture feeds in 2008 was 29.3 million metric tons. He explained the major dietary nutrient sources used in aquafeeds, including land animal protein meals and fats, and pointed out that while fish meal prices remain at record levels, fish oil prices are down from their highest point in early 2008.

Tacon disclosed that global production of rendered animal protein in 2008 was 12.9 million tons, with the top producers being the United States at 31.5 percent, South America at 30.6 percent, and the 18 countries that made up the European Union (EU-18) in 2008 at 29.8 percent. Total global production of rendered fats and greases that year was 10.2 million metric tons, with the United States producing 44.7 percent of that amount, the EU-18 at 26.2 percent, and South America at 22.2 percent.

Kent Swisher, NRA International Programs, explained the complexities of how NRA petitions for government funding through the United Export Strategy program, which is highly competitive with other agriculture groups. While funds NRA has received under the Foreign Market Development program have dropped off slightly over the past 10 years, monies awarded under the Market Access Program have increased. The funds are provided as a match to industry contribution. NRA’s budget allocates 44 percent of the monies to Asia, 39 percent to Latin America, nine percent worldwide, and eight percent to Europe, the Middle East, and Africa.
ANCO-EAGLIN, Inc.  A World Leader in Batch and Continuous Rendering Systems Since 1902.

**Crushers**
- Pre-Breakers
- Fine Grinders
- Carcass Crushers

**Pumping**
- Lamella Pumps
- Piston Pumps, Diaphragm
- Lobe
- Centrifugal

**Cookers**
- Continuous Cookers
- Batch Cookers
- Hydrolyzers (Batch and Continuous)

**Fat Presses**
- 1-4 Tons Per Hour Inlet Capacities
- Low Fat Residuals of Finished Meal

**Process Systems**
- Pet Food Systems
- Edible Fat Systems
- Plant Automation

**Wastewater Treatment Systems**
- Chemical
- Non-Chemical
- Biological (Biogas Systems)
- Sludge Dewatering and Fat Recovery

ANCO-EAGLIN, Inc.
120 N. Chimney Rock Road
Greensboro, NC 27409
www.ancoeaglin.com

Phone: 336-855-7800
Fax: 336-855-7831
Email: info@ancoeaglin.com
The Fats and Proteins Research Foundation (FPRF), the research arm of the rendering industry, held its Emerging Issues Seminar in conjunction with the National Renderers Association spring meeting in Cincinnati, OH. The only topic of discussion: animal nutrition.

Dr. Jeff Firman, University of Missouri, emphasized that quality and price are the two most important issues to feed formulators. He said nutritionists need to be trained in computer formulations for proper feed ingredient use, and that increasing the number of ingredients increases the number of possible solutions thus reducing cost. Firman noted that animal fats are generally well thought of among nutritionists in the United States and internationally, with overseas markets increasing their usage of fat. He encouraged renderers to emphasize replacement of fish meal in international markets.

Dr. Eric van Heugten, North Carolina State University, presented the pork industry’s perspective on the use of rendered products in swine diets. Swine producers said cost is the number one driver why a commodity is used in diets, followed by the consistency of the ingredient supply. Many swine producers are using poultry meal in swine diets but worry about contamination, specifically Salmonella, once the meal leaves the plant. Heugten said animal proteins are a good source of phosphorous but have competition from distillers dried grains with solubles (DDGS) and phytase. He urged the industry to ensure rendered products are included in nutrition guides such as the newly released National Swine Nutrition Guide, available at www.usporkcenter.org, or the National Research Council’s (NRC’s) Nutrient Requirements of Swine, which is currently going through an update.

Dr. Layi Adeola, Purdue University, focused on using meat and bone meal in swine and poultry diets, reiterating that pricing drives the use of a commodity. He commented that the U.S. Pork Center of Excellence used metabolizable energy information from studies funded by FPRF for the National Swine Nutrition Guide and he believes those same studies will be used by the NRC for its updated swine nutrient requirements. Adeola advised foundation members to revisit the value of meat and bone meal in broiler chicken diets since the current information is outdated.

Dr. Brian Kerr, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, restated meat and bone meal’s competitiveness with DDGS and phytase, and told renderers to examine how good their lab is as results can vary.

Dr. Hans Stein, University of Illinois, wrapped up the nutrition seminar with ways to increase the use of animal proteins and fats in swine diets. He highlighted the data needed for feed formulators, which includes a clear definition of the ingredient, the concentration and digestibility of the nutrients and energy, and the limitations to inclusion rates for performance.

Stein said an excellent way of making this data available is through publications such as the NRC’s swine nutrient requirement guide. To be included in NRC’s updated guide, data must be available by February 1, 2011, with the new guide being published by the end of 2011.

Stein encouraged the foundation and rendering industry to create a “buzz” about using rendered proteins in animal diets by issuing press releases when new research data is available.
IMDC’s objective is to reestablish export markets for rendered products subject to proposed rules and regulations. Swisher then underlined some possible global constraints to that objective as being product perception, European Union regulations and influence, global standard-setting organizations such as the World Organization for Animal Health, or OIE, and global certification programs.

NRA’s global activities over the next year aim to help educate others and change perceptions. That includes further promoting and developing the World Renderers Organization (WRO), co-sponsoring global feed conferences, funding and promoting international research using rendered products, and sponsoring researchers to speak at global meetings. Swisher said being involved with the WRO is important because world organizations like OIE require input from global industries, not individual country organizations.

German Davalos, NRA regional director for Latin America, reported that Mexico is the largest market for U.S. animal protein meals, importing 115,000 metric tons in 2009. Mexican government officials planned to visit the United States in May to examine how the country is implementing its feed rule in an effort to possibly allow imports of beef from animals over 30 months of age and pet food produced with ruminant meat and bone meal. Davalos informed the IMDC that Chile is interested in using U.S. yellow grease for biodiesel so NRA is sponsoring a team visit in June to meet with suppliers of rendered fats and greases.

Dr. Peng Li, NRA regional director for Asia, showed how China’s feed industry continues to grow and discussed the complexities of reopening the market to U.S. and Canadian tallow. The China Association of Surfactant, Soap, and Detergent Industry has submitted a petition to release the bans for industrial use, but multiple government agencies must establish procedures and requirements making it a long and arduous process.

Li then highlighted the various seminars and meetings throughout Asia he and researchers attended to promote rendered products, with others planned for this year, including a special session titled, “Rendered Animal Protein Meals in Aquafeeds, Science, and Technology” at the 14th International Symposium of Fish Nutrition and Feeding in Qingdao, China, in early June. NRA also sponsored several visitors from Asia to the United States to tour rendering plants, meat processors, research facilities, and government agencies to educate them on the safety and value of animal protein and fat products.

Li said the targeted strategies in Asia for this year include the tallow ban in mainland China, the meat and bone meal ban in Vietnam, a non-ruminant meat and bone meal and porcine meal ban in Korea and Taiwan, the promotion of animal fat in biodiesel, and maintaining undisrupted ruminant meat and bone meal exports to Indonesia and the Philippines and possible expansion.

Gilbert thanked the NRA international team for their hard work at promoting rendered products overseas. He reiterated that exports help all renderers by removing product from the domestic market.
APPI Testing Program Continues to Ensure Safe Product

The Animal Protein Producers Industry (APPI) is the rendering industry program responsible for the weekly Salmonella testing in North America. APPI also develops educational programs to control biological, chemical, and physical hazards, and will be considering other biosecurity program needs in the future. APPI became a committee within the National Renderers Association on January 1, 2006. The Salmonella testing program and the Rendering Industry Code of Practice are open to all renderers in the United States and Canada.

APPI’s objectives are focused to assist member companies in manufacturing safe products. The Rendering Industry Code of Practice corresponds very closely to the initiatives taking place throughout the entire food chain and furthers the concept of safe feed – healthy livestock – safe food – healthy people. With continued intense scrutiny on all feed ingredients, the development of the Code of Practice by renderers shows great foresight.

The leading edge of the rendering industry is those renderers who participate in the Salmonella program and the participants in the Code of Practice, a list of which can be found at http://nationalrenderers.org/biosecurity.

APPI will continue to develop innovative programs to promote the safety of animal proteins and feed fats through testing, continuing education and training, and collaborative research. The following plants have made a significant commitment and will be the foundation for safe rendered feed products in the future.

The following rendering plants have completed the required testing for the 2009 Salmonella testing program.

| AB Foods, LLC | Toppenish, WA |
| Alberta Processing Co. | Calgary, AB, Canada |
| Allied Premium Protein | Gaffney, SC |
| American Food Group (Gibbon Packing, LLC) | Gibbon, NE |
| American Proteins, Inc. | Cumming, GA |
| | Cuthbert, GA |
| | Hanceville, AL |
| | Hanceville, AL (Pet Food Div.) |
| Ampro Products, Inc. | Concordia, MO |
| | Cumming, GA |
| | Cuthbert, GA |
| | Gainesville, GA |
| | Pickensville, AL |
| Baker Commodities, Inc. | Kerman, CA |
| | North Billerica, MA |
| | Phoenix, AZ |
| | Rochester, NY |
| | Seattle, WA |
| | Spokane, WA |
| | Vernon, CA |
| Birmingham Hide and Tallow | Birmingham, AL |
| Boyer Valley Co. | Arion, IA |
| | Harlan, IA |
| Cargill Meat Solutions | Beardstown, IL |
| | Dodge City, KS |
| | Friona, TX |
| | Ft. Morgan, CO |
| | Highriver, AB, Canada |
| | Ottumwa, IA |
| | Plainview, TX |
| | Schuyler, NE |
| | Wyalusing, PA |
| Carolina By-Products, Div. of Valley Proteins | Fayetteville, NC |
| | Fayetteville, NC (Pet Food Div.) |
| | Gastonia, NC |
| | Rose Hill, NC |
| | Wadesboro, NC |
| | Ward, SC |
| Custom Protein Corp. (formerly Southwest By-Products) | Springfield, MO |
| Darling International, Inc. | Bellvue, NE |
| | Berlin, WI |
| | Boise, ID |
| | Blue Earth, MN |
| | Clinton, IA |
| | Coldwater, MI |
| | Collinsville, OK |
| | Dallas, TX |
| | Denver, CO |
| | Des Moines, IA |
| | Fairfax, MO |
| | Fresno, CA |
| Darling International (continued) | Houston, TX |
| | Kansas City, KS |
| | Kansas City, KS (blending) |
| | Los Angeles, CA |
| | Lynn Center, IL |
| | Mason City, IL |
| | National Stock Yards, IL |
| | Newark, NJ |
| | Omaha, NE |
| | Omaha, NE (blending) |
| | San Francisco, CA |
| | Sioux City, IA |
| | Tacoma, WA |
| | Turlock, CA |
| | Wahoo, NE |
| | Wichita, KS |
| Farmers Union Industries, LLC (Central Bi-Products) | Redwood Falls, MN |
| | Long Prairie, MN |
| Fieldale Farms Corp. | Cornelia, GA |
| | Eastanollee, GA |
| Foster Farms | Farmerville, LA (formerly Pilgrim’s Pride Corp.) |
| | Livingston, CA |
| F.W. Renner and Son, Inc. | Canton, OH |
| G.A. Wintzer and Son Co. | Wapakoneta, OH |
Salmonellae are a resourceful and defiant group of microorganisms that parasitize a broad range of hosts and remain a challenge to the rendering industry. As an important link in the food chain, the rendering industry is conscious of its role in the prevention and control of this group of organisms to assure safe feed supplements for livestock, poultry, and pet foods.

**WE MUST WORK TOGETHER AND BE PROACTIVE TO ACHIEVE THAT GOAL!**

Since 1985, the Animal Protein Producers Industry (APPI) has coordinated a progressive program of education and laboratory sampling for its membership to control Salmonella. This program serves as the industry’s official response to reduce the incidence of the organism in rendered protein meals. The diversity of the entire salmonella complex serves as a reminder that we have to combine our resources to insure that a workable initiative is in place to counter the different avenues of transmission and contamination.

The benefits of an organized system for surveillance, testing, education, and prevention are obvious. APPI is also interactive with national livestock/poultry associations, regulatory agencies, academic and industrial sectors, research institutions, and disease control officials in its quest for an active Salmonella control program.

All renderers who are not currently involved with this government endorsed program are encouraged to support the effort. Active participation shows your commitment to Salmonella control. Membership permits your display of the SALMONELLA SECURITY SEAL on your finished products.

Ask your animal protein suppliers to be a part of an active control program by joining today!

**For information call:**
Ms. Dara John (660) 277-3469

www.animalprotein.org • e-mail: appi@animalprotein.org
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Griffin Industries, Inc.
  Bastrop, TX
  Butler, KY
  Ellenwood, GA
  East Dublin, GA
  Jackson, MS
  Newberry, IN
  Russellville, KY
  Starke, FL
  Tampa, FL
  Union City, TN

Hahn and Phillips Grease
  Marshall, MO

H.J. Baker and Brothers, Inc.
  Albertville, AL
  Forest, MS
  Ft. Smith, AR
  Nacogdoches, TX
  Sanford, NC
  Westville, OK

Holmes By-Products
  Millersburg, OH

Hormel Food Corp.
  Los Angeles, CA
  Austin, MN
  Fremont, NE

HTC Industries
  San Angelo, TX

Indiana Packers Corp.
  Delphi, IN

Island Commodities
  Kapolei, HI

JBS Swift and Company
  Green Bay, WI
  Greeley, CO
  Grand Island, NE
  Hyrum, UT
  Louisville, KY
  Marshalltown, IA
  Tolleson, AZ
  Worthington, MN

JCR Enterprises, Inc.
  Linkwood, MD

John Kuhni Sons, Inc.
  Nephi, UT

Kaluzny Bros., Inc.
  Joliet, IL

Keystone Protein Company
  Frederickburg, PA

Kruger Commodities
  Hamilton, MI

Lewiston Fats and Proteins
  (Perdue Farms)

  Lewiston, NC

Maple Lodge Farms
  Norval, ON, Canada

Mason City By-Products
  Mason City, IA

Merrick Animal Nutrition, Inc.
  Oxford, NE

Mid-South Milling Co., Inc.
  Kansas City, KS
  Memphis, TN

Mountain View Rendering
  Edinburg, VA

National Beef California
  Brawley, CA

National Beef, LLC
  Dodge City, KS
  Liberal, KS

Nebraska By-Products
  Lexington, NE

North Alabama Blend Mill
  (Tyson Foods)
  Cullman, AL

Northern Alberta Processing
  Sherwood Park, AB, Canada

Nutra-Flo Co.
  Sioux City, IA

Nutrimax, Inc.
  Greensboro, NC

Oklahoma By-Products
  Durant, OK

Pacific Rendering Co., Inc.
  Seattle, WA

Perdue Farms, Inc.
  Accomac, VA

Pilgrim’s Pride Corp.
  Ball Ground, GA
  Eldorado, AR
  Live Oak, FL
  Mt. Pleasant, TX
  Moorefield, WV
  Russellville, AR
  Sumter, SC
  Timberville, VA

Pine Bluff Blending Mill
  (Tyson Foods)
  Pine Bluff, AR

Protein Products
  Sunflower, MS

River Valley Animal Foods
  (Tyson Foods)
  Clarksville, AR
  Forest, MS (formerly Central Industries, Inc.)
  Harmony, NC
  Robards, KY
  Scranton, AR
  Sedalia, MO
  Sequin, TX
  Temperanceville, VA
  Texarkana, AR

Rothsay
  Dundas, ON, Canada
  Moosefield, ON, Canada
  Truro, NS, Canada
  Winnipeg, MB, Canada

S.F. Rendering, Ltd.
  Port Williams, NS, Canada

Sacramento Rendering Co.
  Sacramento, CA

Sanimax
  Green Bay, WI
  So. St. Paul, MN
  Charney, QB, Canada
  Montreal, QB, Canada

Salinas Tallow Co.
  Salinas, CA

Saskatoon Processing Co.
  Saskatoon, SK, Canada

Simmons Foods, Inc.
  Southwest City, MO

Smithfield Foods, Inc.
  (Farmland Foods)
  Crete, NE
  Denison, IA
  Milan, MO
  Monmouth, IL

Smithfield Foods, Inc. (John Morrell and Co.)
  Sioux City, IA
  Sioux Falls, SD

Smithfield Foods, Inc.
  (Smithfield Packing Co.)
  Clinton, NC
  Smithfield, VA
  Tar Heel, NC

Standard Fertilizer Co.
  Greensburg, IN

Tallowmasters, LLC
  Miami, FL

Tyson Fresh Meats
  Amarillo, TX
  Columbus Junction, IA
  Dakota City, NE
  Denison, IA
  Hillsdale, IL
  Holcomb, KS
  Lexington, NE
  Logansport, IN
  Madison, NE
  Pasco, WA
  Perry, IA
  Storm Lake, IA
  Waterloo, IA

Valley Proteins, Inc.
  Amarillo, TX
  East Earl, PA
  Emporia, VA
  Linville, VA
  Strawberry Plains, TN
  Winchester, VA

Venture Milling Co.
  Annsonville, NC
  Binghamton, NY
  Seaford, DE

West Coast Rendering
  Vernon, CA

West Coast Reduction, Ltd.
  Vancouver, BC, Canada

Western Mass. Rendering
  Southwick, MA

Worthington Rendering Co.
  Worthington, MN

XL Four Star Beef
  Nampa, ID*

*New participant
Total: 200 Plants
Australia’s livestock industries and the Australian government are investing in a new five-year, $5 million research program to address vulnerabilities in Australia’s readiness to control foot and mouth disease (FMD).

The beef and dairy cattle, sheep, goat, and pig industries and Meat and Livestock Australia’s (MLA’s) donor company are investing $2 million in funding over the first two years of the program that will be managed by Animal Health Australia. The research will be carried out by Australian Commonwealth Scientific and Research Organization scientists from the Australian Animal Health Laboratory (AAHL). The new program will better prepare the Australian industry to respond effectively to an outbreak of FMD and thereby minimize disruptions to trade and impacts on the community.

“Markets around the world have stringent and unwavering laws on their food imports and in the event of Australia contracting FMD, we would be locked out of all trade with our customers,” said MLA’s Managing Director David Palmer. “Economic losses would be devastating – in the order of $4 million a day according to estimates by the Australian Productivity Commission.

“In addition, community concerns will demand better use of technology to minimize any livestock destruction as the main source of control in such an event,” Palmer continued. “Vaccines, animal traceability, improved modeling, and the use of sophisticated diagnostics underpin an effective and efficient response to FMD. This project will deliver the necessary science on vaccination as a preferable FMD control strategy, and develop the necessary protocols.”

Australia’s government and livestock industries made a significant investment in an FMD vaccine bank five years ago, which provides Australia with guaranteed access to vaccine. This has been recently renewed for another five years. Although this provides Australia with assurance of accessibility, there are many unknowns in the application of vaccine to Australian livestock in Australian conditions.

During the five-year program, AAHL will conduct research into the application of FMD vaccines in Australian livestock. Much of the work will be carried out collaboratively with overseas countries including South Africa, Argentina, Vietnam, and South East Asia as the live FMD virus that is required for this work will not be imported into Australia.
Sorting Out the Babble

When I get out of the Washington, DC, area, I am always asked, “What’s going on in Washington?” My answer is basically, “It is what you see in the papers and on television.”

With all the various means of communication like television, smart phones, blogs, cable, radio, and newspapers, we all have access to more news and opinions than we actually care about. It is sometimes difficult to sort out all of the babble.

I must say, though, in my opinion, there is a different atmosphere in Washington these days than in recent years. The Obama administration has caused many changes. Some are to be expected whenever you have a turnover, particularly when there is a political party change.

Most noticeable is the emphasis on new regulations and enforcement. The Environmental Protection Agency is leading the way with its new rule on reporting greenhouse gas emissions, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has a newly created deputy commissioner for food safety, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is looking to change current policy regarding E. coli follow-up sampling and inspection methods that industry believes is unnecessary and unsubstantiated. The current mindset in Washington is to solve all problems through regulation. The media is regularly reporting on new laws coming forth from an alphabet of agencies and commissions, like the FCC, SEC, CFTC, FEC, FDA, and so on.

It’s troubling that the current administration is not showing the commitment to trade as previous administrations. Yes, there are delegations going to various countries attempting to expand exports and open new markets. For example, USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack recently went to Japan. High on his list was to further open that market for beef, especially from animals over 20 months of age, yet he was met with a cold rejection. And on another trade matter, we are getting nowhere on the trucking dispute with Mexico.

In his State of the Union speech earlier this year, President Barack Obama set a goal of doubling exports over the next five years, a very laudable goal we can all support. But so far, we’ve not seen a plan to accomplish this. There are three major free trade agreements with Columbia, Panama, and South Korea that were negotiated by the previous administration, yet they have not been ratified by Congress. This administration has had 15 months to tweak them to their liking, but has not sent them to Congress for review and ratification. The truth of the matter is that the current Congress will likely never approve any free trade agreement because the mood and politics are against it. The administration knows this, but that shouldn’t stop them from taking a position on free trade agreements.

The administration has been very helpful in trying to solve current trade disagreements. The USDA is working with the National Renderers Association (NRA) on a number of health-related issues with various trading partners. NRA has very good relations with the USDA and U.S. Special Trade Representative offices with our day-to-day issues. However, I believe we need greater expression from the president on a commitment for trade.

Industry Lobbyists

One of my biggest gripes from this administration is their demagoguery about lobbyists. It appears to make good political fodder to denigrate and accuse lobbyists for just about everything that is wrong with government.

The truth of the matter is that, in some form or another, we all are represented by lobbyists. I can’t think of a single profession or industry that isn’t represented by lobbyists. If you belong to a trade association, professional society, union, school board, church, county commission, or whatever, you are likely being represented in Washington or your state capitol by someone lobbying on your behalf.

Yes, there are some bad apples in the lobbying profession that can spoil and harm everyone’s reputation. This is not unique to just this profession. But, I contend the bad apples are few. Most lobbyists work hard to make an honest representation to government officials on behalf of the clients they represent. They know that the only thing they have to sell is their honesty and integrity. If
they are found to be lying or misleading to those they are trying to influence, their credibility is destroyed.

The truth is many government officials and politicians look to industry lobbyists for information to help them make their decisions. There are already significant laws and regulations overseeing lobbying practices and the industry is very transparent. There are Web sites where one can find out who lobbies for whom and how much they make.

Whether a lobbyist is good or bad is in the eye of the beholder. If the lobbyist makes a lot of money, or opposes your point of view, they are bad. If they are lobbying on behalf of your interests, they must be good.

Candidate and President-elect Obama declared often that no lobbyist would serve in his administration. Once he started making his appointments, he learned that the most qualified candidates might have been lobbyists. What did he do? He made exceptions for those he wanted in his administration.

But if this is political fodder to stir up the electorate, so be it. R
Tallow and waste cooking oils continue to be feedstocks of choice for a number of biodiesel projects, whether producing or using it in locomotives.

AB Bioenergy, LLC, was one of 13 recipients selected for more than $16.5 million in grants and loans from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act awarded by the Washington State Department of Commerce. The company received a $1.4 million loan and a $600,000 grant toward its biodiesel facility that will use as feedstock tallow and waste cooking grease from its Toppenish, WA, plant and from other local livestock processors throughout Washington and Idaho. The company received the funding in the “waste-to-energy” category.

Amtrak to Test Tallow-based Biodiesel in Train

Amtrak and the Oklahoma and Texas state transportation departments have launched the nation’s first-ever test of a biodiesel blend to power a daily interstate passenger train between Oklahoma City, OK, and Fort Worth, TX, with the aim of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and the use of foreign oil.

Amtrak received a $274,000 grant from the Federal Railroad Administration to carry out the research project in partnership with the Oklahoma Department of Transportation on the daily Heartland Flyer train operated by Amtrak with state support from both Oklahoma and Texas. The biodiesel supplier is Direct Fuels of Euless, TX, which uses tallow from Texas beef processors as its feedstock.

The Heartland Flyer will operate exclusively on a 20 percent biodiesel blend (B20) for approximately 12 months. Amtrak will take detailed measurements on the P32-8 locomotive at the end of the year-long project to determine biodiesel’s impact on valves and gaskets. The company will also collect locomotive exhaust emissions data for analysis in accordance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency test protocols. Previously conducted stationary locomotive engine testing showed a B20 blend reduced hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide each by 10 percent, reduced particulates by 15 percent, and sulfates by 20 percent.

“Amtrak travel is already more energy efficient than most other forms of intercity transportation,” said Roy Deitchman, Amtrak vice president, Environmental, Health, and Safety. “If the test shows this use of a renewable fuel in our locomotive is successful, it’s a home run for our passengers, for our partners, and for the planet.” The Heartland Flyer uses about 100,000 gallons of diesel per year.

Alberta Invests Heavily In Bioenergy

To promote more clean energy production, the Alberta government in Canada is expanding and extending an incentive program for producers of bioenergy products. Funding under the Bioenergy Producer Credit Program is extended until 2016. The program will help Alberta meet its climate change targets by reducing emissions while also providing value-added opportunities and long-term stability to Alberta’s agriculture and forestry industries.

The program provides incentives to develop a wide variety of bioenergy products including fuels, power, and heat that will support the Renewable Fuels Standard to be implemented in April 2011. Specifically, the program will encourage development of new technologies and facilities that use non-food crops, waste biomass, or wood.

The Renewable Fuels Standard establishes benchmarks for five percent renewable fuel in gasoline and two percent renewable fuel in diesel fuel. As a result of this standard, production and consumption of renewable fuels in Alberta is expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by about one million tons annually, equivalent to removing 200,000 cars from Alberta roads.

DOE Invests Millions for Biofuels User Facility

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory will build an advanced biofuels process development facility aimed at speeding the commercialization of advanced biofuels by allowing researchers and the private sector to test and integrate innovative technologies.

The Advanced Biofuels Process Development Unit (PDU), funded with nearly $18 million from the Recovery Act, will be a publicly available facility where researchers can integrate process steps and test technology pathways.
Planned capabilities include unique pretreatment of biomass, enzyme production, fermentation for the production of multiple biofuels, and product purification in quantities sufficient for engine testing at partner institutions.

The PDU is scheduled to be fully operational by early 2011, and multiple possible sites for the facility are now being considered in the San Francisco, CA, East Bay region.

The DOE’s Biomass Program has awarded nearly $718 million in Recovery Act funds to accelerate the commercialization of advanced biofuels and foster the growth of a sustainable U.S. bio-industry. These investments will facilitate the bio-industry’s ability to meet mandated production requirements for advanced biofuels, which increase from 950 million gallons per year in 2010 to 21 billion gallons per year in 2022.

**Springboard Biodiesel CEO Wins Award**

Mark Roberts, chief executive officer (CEO), Springboard Biodiesel, was honored with the Innovator of the Year Award by the Chico Chamber of Commerce, Chico, CA. He received the recognition for his work in promoting small- to mid-scale biodiesel production both locally and nationally.

Springboard Biodiesel manufactures and sells small-scale, fully-automated biodiesel processors. The company is preparing to release a fully integrated, multi-feedstock processing system this summer that will allow operators to make ASTM International-grade biodiesel from the lowest-cost feedstocks.

**University Biodiesel Testing Lab Opens**

The University of Connecticut Biodiesel Testing Laboratory, housed within the school’s Center for Environmental Science and Engineering (CESE), opened in April to provide biodiesel producers another testing option to ensuring their fuel meets ASTM International specifications.

In 2009, the university received a $600,000 grant from the state of Connecticut to help establish the testing laboratory. Anthony Provatas, a research scientist at CESE who does the testing, receives two to three samples per week of biodiesel from around the state and the country. He performs 14 different tests to examine physical and chemical properties and ensure the fuel meets national standards. If a sample fails a test, university scientists provide extra in-house service to help troubleshoot the fuel suppliers’ process.

A benefit for those clients who use the university’s new lab is price – Connecticut companies can get the same testing they get at a commercial lab for a discount of 75 to 80 percent, creating an incentive for individuals to set up their biofuels companies in the state. CESA Director Mike Willig says the university’s lab doesn’t intend to supplant the more expensive testing companies, but rather help to jump-start the biofuels business and aim to create a culture of trust for the new alternative fuel.

“We’re assuring the public that there are high standards associated with the production of biodiesel, and that it is as reliable and as useful as any fuel,” he commented. “This is a quality fuel that the public can use in their homes or cars without worries.”

*Continued on page 43*
The final rulemaking for the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS2) was signed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administrator on February 3, 2010 (see “Biofuels Bulletin” in the April 2010 issue of Render). There has been a lot of confusion about the new standard, including how it will affect rendered products.

To assist regulated parties, the EPA has collected questions pertaining to a variety of implementation issues and generated responses to those questions. A list of frequently asked questions prepared by the agency’s Office of Transportation and Air Quality has been posted at www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/renewablefuels/compliancehelp/rfs2-aq.htm and will continue to be updated periodically as new questions arise.

To help the rendering industry in understanding what renewable fuel producers will require of them and how these producers generate renewable identification numbers (RINs), below are some questions and answers posted on EPA’s Web site that pertain to rendered products used in renewable fuels produced to meet the standard.

Q. What are the recordkeeping requirements for a renewable fuel producer that uses used cooking oils and fats as feedstocks for renewable fuel?

A. Renewable fuel producers using used cooking oils or animal wastes as feedstocks are required under 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 80.1454(d)(3) to obtain from their feedstock supplier, and maintain in their records, documents that certify that the feedstock meets the definition of renewable biomass, describe the feedstock, and identify the process that was used to generate the feedstock.

For example, a renewable fuel producer could maintain as a record a contract with a feedstock supplier that states that the supplier will provide the producer with a certain volume of chicken fat that meets the definition of renewable biomass because it is an animal waste or by-product, and that it was produced as a by-product of the chicken rendering process.

Q. The preamble states that “fuel from the existing capacity of current facilities and the capacity of all new facilities that commenced construction prior to December 19, 2007, (and in some cases prior to December 31, 2009) are exempt, or grandfathered, from the 20 percent life cycle requirement for the renewable fuel category.” Does this mean that a biodiesel plant built prior to December 19, 2007, could use palm oil, or any other feedstock, to generate RINs applicable to the renewable fuel category, but not applicable to the biomass-based diesel category?

A. Renewable fuel produced at grandfathered facilities (as defined in CFR 80.1403(d)) is only exempt from the 20 percent greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction requirement. Biodiesel producers who wish to generate biomass-based diesel RINs for biodiesel starting July 1, 2010, must meet a 50 percent GHG reduction requirement regardless of when commencement of construction occurred. Plants that are exempted only qualify for a D code of 6 per CFR 80.1426(f)(6)(ii).

Q. If a facility is grandfathered, is it also exempt from the requirement that feedstocks must be renewable biomass?

A. Even if a facility is exempt from the 20 percent GHG reduction requirement, in order to generate RINs, the facility is still required to use feedstocks that meet the definition of renewable biomass. The definition of renewable fuel in CFR 80.1401 specifies that renewable fuel be made from renewable biomass, which is also defined in that section.

Registration

The following questions and answers pertain to those renderers who are also biodiesel producers.

Q. What is the due date for the initial engineering review and the subsequent updated engineering reviews? Is there a deadline for EPA to approve the engineering review after it has been accepted?

A. The initial engineering review must be submitted and accepted by EPA as part of a renewable fuel producer’s initial registration by July 1, 2010, or 60 days prior to the generation of RINs, whichever date comes later.

Every three calendar years from the initial date of registration, an updated engineering review must be submitted to and accepted by EPA. In addition, if a renewable fuel producer makes changes to their facility that will qualify their renewable fuel for a renewable fuel category or D code that is not reflected in their registration information submitted to EPA, then pursuant to CFR 80.1450(d)(1), an updated engineering review must be submitted to EPA at least 60 days prior to producing a new type of renewable fuel.

There is no deadline for EPA to approve an engineering review after it has been accepted. EPA will provide approval when staff deems the engineering review to be complete and to have met all the requirements stipulated in CFR 80.1450.

Q. What types of engineers are qualified to conduct the third party engineering review of a domestic renewable fuel production facility, as required in CFR 80.1450(b)(2)?

A. The final regulations in CFR 80.1450(b)(2)(i)(A) state that domestic renewable fuel production facilities must have an engineering review conducted by a “professional chemical engineer.” For foreign facilities, CFR 80.1450(b)(2)(i)(B) provides that the review should be conducted by “a licensed professional engineer or foreign equivalent who works in the chemical engineering field.”

EPA interprets these provisions similarly. For both domestic and foreign facilities the third party engineering review should be conducted by a professional engineer (or foreign equivalent) who works in the chemical engineering field.

EPA views renewable fuel production to fall generally within the chemical engineering field, so that professional engineers with experience engineering such facilities would qualify to conduct the third party engineering reviews. As required in CFR 80.1450(b)(2) (ii)(E), the engineer must provide...
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The World Renderers Organization (WRO) was founded in 1999 to represent renderers around the globe. Its vision is “to be known as the principal organization representing the interests of the rendering industry on a global level, serving as a vehicle for exchanging points of view and on rendering issues and where appropriate, to express positions to governments and world organizations."

The WRO has a unique and essential role when addressing problems faced by the global rendering industry and in turning these problems into opportunities for practical resolution. The WRO has an important role to play in how decisions are made in the global debate in food and agriculture. The ethical role of WRO is not just to be the “voice and ears” of the global rendering industry but to promote global feed and food security, management and utilization of natural resources, and sustainable rural development.

The WRO gathers and shares information on the rendering industry, acting as an interactive forum and providing expert guidance on policy options and choices based on practical research and analysis. One of the WRO’s objectives is to achieve consensus on the science of regulations and legislation that affect the rendering industry in order to ensure the global availability of safe and wholesome rendered by-products for the feed industry. The WRO facilitates global discussion on the scientific issues that support decisions made by national governments and international regulatory bodies by providing the foundation for sound, sensible, science-based regulations.

Likewise, harmonizing global regulations aid in the uptake and application of new technologies as well as encourage the rendering industry to invest in technologies to ensure the safety and quality of the feed/food supply for consumers worldwide. For public health agencies responsible for overseeing the safety of the international food supply, harmonization of the rendering industry’s safety and quality standards and regulations will bring a higher level of confidence that risk-reduction strategies and food safety measures are effective, that decisions taken are based on science and not on underlying political agendas that may be in conflict with public health goals, and that available resources are allocated where they have the highest impact on the most pressing foodborne disease-related problems.

The strengthening process of the rendering industry worldwide is to share the responsibility of the WRO and its member countries. The WRO’s role in the process is that of a facilitator and catalyst. The countries are responsible for taking and implementing decisions of a legal, statutory, institutional, capacity building, administrative, and procedural nature to ensure that the WRO is an efficient and effective worldwide body. In lieu of this, the WRO facilitates the exchange of information with the World Organization of Animal Health, or OIE, and its Codex Alimentarius Commission. In response to the demand from consumers worldwide for safe food, efforts are under way within the WRO to present a broader view of the biosecurity of animal by-products in order to enable the consideration of other important factors, such as sustainability and environmental competence.

More recently, the creation of new WRO committees has been informally discussed including having an advisory committee of individuals whose expertise is in global regulatory issues and agricultural policies, especially in the realm of biosecurity and feed/food safety epidemiology. In order to build consensus among the rendering industry on global harmonization of feed/food safety regulations, the WRO organizes member meetings, workshops, and symposia to further its collaborative work and to provide educational outreach to key stakeholders. While the WRO has published a very limited number of papers on the subject of regulations in the rendering industry, the formation of a new communications committee has also been discussed as part of the future WRO structure to provide further outreach.

A recent and good example of the organization’s role was the attendance of several members at a special session in conjunction with the International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF) and the United Nation’s Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which hosted the feed industry’s most significant event for 2010 in Cancun, Mexico, in late April. Over 200 people attended the IFIF meeting from most Latin America countries as well as the United States, Mexico, Canada, and the European Union. The program included presentations by industry and government officials. Participants at the regulators meeting were invited by FAO and Feed Latina, the new regional federation that represents about 120 million tons of animal feed production in Latin American and Caribbean countries. A number of important regulatory issues were discussed involving the entire Latin American and Caribbean region as an economic bloc. These included registration of feed additives, labeling and inspection, residues and contaminants, biotechnology, and good manufacturing practices for both commercial feed manufacturers and on-farm mixers.

Financial support for the WRO is provided from member dues. Currently, 23 countries are represented in the WRO membership, which is open to national rendering organizations or companies in those countries that do not have an established rendering organization. Countries currently represented are Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Italy, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the Netherlands, United States, United Kingdom, and Venezuela. More information on the WRO is at www.worldrenderers.org.
(RIA) as having no land use impacts similar to waste oils (page 311). EPA’s proposed rule had referred to tallow and chicken fat. In response to comments that animal fats should be included as biomass-based diesel, EPA states, “We agree and have included animal fats as meeting the life cycle threshold of 50 percent for biomass-based diesel,” and “We have continued to assume that animal fats and waste greases will meet the lifecycle threshold for biomass-based diesel for the final rule” (RTC 7-384 and 7-385).

In the preamble to the final rule, EPA states as follows (page 267-268): “The look-up table identifies a number of individual fuel ‘pathways’ that allow for the use of waste feedstocks. These feedstocks include: (1) waste ethanol from beverage production; (2) waste starches from food production and agricultural residues; (3) waste oils/fats/greases; (4) waste sugar from food and beverage production; and (5) food and beverage production wastes. For the purpose of this rule only, EPA will consider these feedstocks to be ‘wastes’ if they are used as feedstock to produce fuel, but would otherwise normally be discarded or used for another secondary purpose because they are no longer suitable for their original intended use. They may be unsuitable for their original intended use either because they are themselves waste from that original use (e.g., table scraps) or because of contamination, spoilage, or other unintentional acts. EPA will not consider any material that has been intentionally rendered unsuitable for its original use to be a waste.”

EPA’s RIA states: “For waste oils, we note that no land use changes are included in the FASOM [Forest and Agricultural Sector Optimization Model] assessment because any land use impacts are attributed to the original purpose of the feedstock (e.g., the use of the vegetable oil for cooking or the production of animals for their meat), rather than the biofuel produced from the recovered waste material” (page 311). NBB reads this to mean that because the animal is being used for meat and the by-products/wastes go to producing tallow, tallow would qualify as biomass-based diesel.

Q. Where does waste vegetable oil fall under the RFS2?
A. This falls under the biogenic waste oils/greases as well.

Q. If you intend to prove a fuel pathway, what will it take to get a D code of 4?
A. You must prove that your feedstock meets the GHG profile for that category.

Q. What D codes are available for biodiesel production?
A. If you are producing biodiesel from a qualified renewable biomass identified in Table 80.1426, then your RIN will qualify for biomass-based diesel, advanced biofuel, and total renewable fuel. A biodiesel producer will generate RINs with a D code of 4 and obligated parties will determine how to apply those RINs in the above three categories.

---

**FACT:**
Thieves will steal someone’s grease...
Make sure it’s not yours!

Onken’s “thief deterrent lid” keeps the thieves out of your bins and away from your grease.
Our embossing option also makes it easy to identify who’s bin it is...........YOURS!

www.onkens.net 309.562.7271
Grease theft. Those two words make any renderer or used kitchen grease collector shutter.

As the demand for biodiesel has grown over the years and yellow grease prices have surged, grease theft has been on the rise. The purity of used kitchen grease and its relative low viscosity have made it a prime and easy target for thieves. Some larger holding tanks can be vacuumed empty in just minutes.

With a typical fast food restaurant producing 200 to 300 pounds of used kitchen grease per week, and a large rendering company servicing hundreds of these locations regionally, the value of this at-risk commodity can range into the tens of thousands of dollars each week. When larger facilities are serviced and a national outlook is taken, used kitchen grease theft potential to a renderer can be astronomical.

Although many states have laws in place to try and prevent grease theft, with state and local government budgets being slashed, any laws in place are very seldom enforced. Combine that with prosecutors and law enforcement having bigger criminal issues to deal with and it appears the industry has its work cut out for it as it tries to prevent thieves from taking what has become a hot commodity.

Shielding oil from theft while allowing it to be accessed by those authorized can be a challenge. But those who collect used cooking oil from restaurants with internal tanks now have a new tool that so far is preventing thefts.

Several years ago, Bruce DeMent of Kastalon, Inc., was talking with long-time friend Dave Dykstra, Mahoney Environmental, and a few other renderer colleagues about the grease theft problem. Having previously been involved with fats, oils, and grease projects, DeMent decided to come up with a solution, trying different designs “until something worked.”

What emerged was the Kastalon Sekure Kap.

The pound-and-a-half device is made of iron and is comprised of three pieces: a fitting that permanently attaches to the wall/pipe of the tank, a removable cap, and a lock either supplied by Kastalon or the end user. The compact cam-lock cap is designed to fit a two-inch hose but can be built to fit other sizes, is very durable, and is easy for grease collectors to remove with the turn of a key.

Although DeMent admits nothing is totally theft proof, the Sekure Kap is extremely tamper resistant. A few attacks have left some locks damaged and needing replacing, but to date, no grease has been stolen.

Dykstra backs up that claim, saying that because the design prohibits access to the lock; bolt cutters are useless.

“People don’t have the time to get this thing off,” he stated.

Mahoney Environmental has installed dozens of Sekure Kaps throughout its Midwest region. The company has used many types of locks or security tags to deter would-be thieves, only to find them cut or broken off. In addition, one of the problems created by theft of used cooking oil is spillage on the customer’s property, creating a liability. According to Brad Baird, vice president of Restaurant Services at Mahoney Environmental, the company is pleased with the performance of the theft prevention caps.

“So far, I can say that there has been no reported successful attempts to remove the cap and material, though there have been attempts,” said Baird. “The amount of time and effort it would take to get past a well-designed Sekure Kap would surely bring attention to any thief.”

Dave Olson, procurement manager for Baker Commodities’ Phoenix, AZ, division, also noted that the cap acts as a deterrent and secures the grease. At this time, the company only has a handful of caps installed in California and Phoenix with about four months of experience and is taking a wait and see approach.

But Olson said the cap is easy to install; the drivers have no difficulty removing the cap and accessing the grease, and no thefts have occurred on those tanks using the Sekure Kaps.

While both renderers are pleased with the new theft prevention device, they are continuously looking at various approaches to securing raw materials and are always open to new, innovative ideas, such as the one Kastalon has brought to the industry.

Kastalon, Inc., based in Alsip, IL, has applied for a patent on its Sekure Kap and all indications are it will go through. The cap has a simple and straightforward design, is manufactured onsite, and is zinc plated to ensure weather and environment resistance.
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**National Renderers Association Central Region Convention**, June 9-11, Green Lake, WI. Contact George Kaluzny at (815) 744-1453, or e-mail goynzulak@aol.com.


**American Feed Industry Association Feed Industry Institute**, June 14-17, St. Louis, MO. Visit www.afia.org.

**WATT Online Feed Forum**, June 24. This is a “virtual forum” available only online. Visit www.wattevents.com.

August


September


October

**U.S. Poultry and Egg Association’s Poultry Protein and Fat Seminar**, October 7-8, Nashville, TN. Log on to www.poultryeggstinstitute.org.


November

**U.S. Animal Health Association Annual Meeting**, November 11-17, Minneapolis, MN. Log on to www.usaha.org.

**Have an upcoming event or meeting?** Send event date, name, location, and registration contact information to Render, 2820 Birch Avenue, Camino, CA 95709, fax (530) 644-8429, or e-mail editors@rendermagazine.com.
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**Have an article idea, or interested in writing an article to be included in a future issue of Render? Then e-mail editors@rendermagazine.com.**

---

**Keep up-to-date on the latest industry meetings by logging on to www.rendermagazine.com.**

---

**For more information call:**

**REDWOOD METAL WORKS**
36419 US Hwy 71 • Redwood Falls, MN 56283
PH: 507-644-2893 • Fax: 507-644-7000
www.redwoodmetalworks.com
Carnosine Concentration and Antioxidant Activity in Animal Protein Meals

Dr. Paul L. Dawson, professor of Food Science and Human Nutrition and a member of the Clemson University Animal Co-Products Research and Education Center (ACREC), is conducting a research project to determine the carnosine content of animal protein meals. Carnosine is a water-soluble dipeptide that has been proven to be a powerful antioxidant. Composed of the amino acids beta-alanine and histidine, carnosine is naturally present in skeletal muscles as well as in organs such as the brain and skin. Research has indicated that carnosine may be used for a variety of antioxidant activities. Medically, it has been correlated with anti-aging and disease prevention as well as tissue regeneration after injury, radiation, or other damage to cellular membranes.

The objective of Dawson’s exploratory research is to determine the content and biological activity of carnosine extracted from rendered poultry products. Because carnosine is a water-soluble peptide, extraction procedures are easily accomplished. The overall goals of the project are to derive carnosine from animal protein meals for use as an antioxidant in rendered products and to catalog the concentrations of carnosine in poultry meals so the products can be so labeled. It is believed that high levels of carnosine could become a significant value-added selling point for animal protein meals over vegetable proteins.

In preliminary studies, Dawson and graduate student Paljinder Manhiani determined the levels of carnosine in raw poultry tissues using two methods to quantitate carnosine. The first is a rapid screening method that is less expensive to perform but is less sensitive. The second method involves use of liquid chromatography and is more expensive and time-consuming, but yields more sensitive results. Dawson also measured antioxidant capacity using three different assays that are standard tests used in determining antioxidant properties in foods and feeds. The first assay measures true antioxidant activity by measuring the free radical scavenging ability. The second assay involves metal binding or chelating ability, while the third method measures the active oxygen scavenging capacity.

The researchers determined that chicken brain was the richest source (6.1 milligrams [mg]/gram [gm]) of carnosine followed by breast (5.4 mg/gm) and gizzard (5.4 mg/gm). The chicken tail section contained the least available amount of carnosine (1.5 mg/gm) and the heart contained no carnosine. Upon measuring the metal chelating activity, the extracts from the head had 32.29 percent metal chelating activity and the extracts from the tail section were the second highest with 28.77 percent metal chelating activity. Higher metal chelating activity results indicate a better antioxidant capacity of the product.

Earlier studies on muscle extracts had indicated that the metal chelating activity for breast was 32.24 percent and for thigh was 14.95 percent. In measuring total antioxidant activity, water extracts from chicken breast muscle were 50.4 percent and from thigh muscle were 33.1 percent. In comparison, pure carnosine has a total antioxidant activity of 76 percent. Recommended human doses are in the range of 50 to 100 mg. Veterinary uses can be readily envisioned and, thus, the potential yield from animal co-products could supply a large market.

Dawson and his graduate student are continuing their work using animal protein meals as a source of carnosine. The significance to the industry could be the extraction of antioxidants from animal protein meals for use back into rendered animal co-products. In addition, with wide antioxidant properties, the application of carnosine as a nutraceutical could increase value in the pet food and
animal feed industries. Carnosine also has been suggested for use in eye drops, cosmetics, and skin lotions. An acetyl derivative of carnosine even has been studied for non-surgical treatments of cataracts. Recovering a high value product such as carnosine from animal protein meals could generate additional revenue for the rendering industry. Although this research is targeted toward poultry products, further research could be suggested for studying carnosine content from other rendered products as well. ACREC is very proud to have Dawson and his team working on finding value-added products from rendered animal meals.

Dawson obtained his doctorate from North Carolina State University and has become a leading expert in food quality and safety. He is a member of the Poultry Science Association, Institute of Food Technologists, American Chemical Society, International Association of Food Protection, and American Society of Agricultural Engineers. Dawson is an associate editor of *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, and was honored in 2006 by the Clemson University College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences with the Graduate Teaching Award and in 2009 with the Godley-Snell Agricultural Research Award. His work has been featured in newspaper articles and on various radio programs.

**Dear Editor,**

We are a collector in the Boston area. It is critical for us to be up to date on the latest news, reports, market conditions, and government regulations. *Render* magazine provides us with all of that and more. Thanks for publishing a great magazine and tremendous resource.

Gus Martucci
Mutual Beef Co.
Boston, MA

**Dear Editor,**

Excellent magazine. Really enjoyed April 2010 issue with the NRA (National Renderers Association) members. I have learned a lot from the national magazine of rendering. Keep ‘em coming!

Christopher J. Miller
Warren, OH

**Dear Editor,**

Very good on most features and departments. Requesting more on Washington and international, and more nutrition info and review of old and new uses of your by-products.

Dr. Marcus A. Hoelscher
Hereford, TX

Render welcomes your opinions. Send to 2820 Birch Avenue, Camino, CA 95709, e-mail to editors@rendermagazine.com, or fax to (530) 644-8429.
OSHA Ups the Enforcement Ante on Employers

Changes to OSHA’s Penalty Policy

On April 22, 2010, OSHA head Dr. David Michaels issued a memorandum on enhancements to OSHA’s penalty policy. The memorandum was the result of a working group study, which generally concluded that OSHA’s current penalties were too low to have any deterrent effect against violations of safety and health regulations. Thus, the revisions to the penalty policy (which will be captured in OSHA’s Field Operations Manual) will have the primary effect of increasing penalties for citations classified as serious.

While the statutory maximum penalty for serious citations is $7,000, OSHA’s penalty policy directs inspectors to determine what specific dollar amount, at or below $7,000, is appropriate considering the seriousness of the violation, the size of the employer, and the employer’s good faith and history of compliance. In addition, the area directors, who meet with employers to discuss citations during an informal conference, had fairly wide latitude in reducing penalty amounts in an effort to resolve employer contests outside of litigation.

The April 22 memorandum made several key changes to these policies. First, OSHA can now increase a base penalty by 10 percent if an employer has received any high-gravity serious, willful, repeat, or failure-to-abate violations over the last five years. Second, area directors now have the authority to reduce penalties in an informal conference only by 30 percent. Reductions greater than 30 percent will require approval from the OSHA regional administrator.

Perhaps the most striking change in the April 22 memorandum relates to repeat violations. Because the OSHA Act authorizes a penalty of up to $70,000 for a repeat violation, employers with multiple locations around the country are always concerned about avoiding repeat violations. Under OSHA’s previous policy, it can issue a repeat citation to an employer who has a substantially similar violative condition due to a condition cited within the previous three years from the previous citation becoming final. Now, OSHA can look back five years to issue repeat citations. For employers who thought they had seen the three years as a light at the end of the tunnel for purposes of avoiding a repeat citation, the look-back timeframe has now almost doubled.

OSHA projects that these changes to its penalty policy will result in an overall increase in penalties for serious violations from an average of $1,000 to a new average of $3,000 to $4,000.

OSHA’s Severe Violator Enforcement Program

OSHA also announced on April 22 that its new Severe Violators Enforcement Program (SVEP) is expected to take effect within 45 days. The program is another step in OSHA’s plan to bolster the deterrent effect of citations and penalties. The SVEP concentrates OSHA’s resources on inspecting employers who have “demonstrated indifference” to their obligations under the act and regulations by committing willful, repeated, or failure-to-abate violations in one or more of the following circumstances: (1) a fatality or catastrophe situation; (2) in industrial operations or processes that expose employees to severe occupational hazards, such as those identified as “high-emphasis hazards”; (3) exposing employees to hazards related to the potential release of a highly hazardous chemical (i.e., process safety management); or (4) all prior egregious enforcement actions.

Any inspection that finds one or more of these four criteria at the time that the citations are issued will be considered a SVEP case. (OSHA has identified several “high-emphasis hazards,” such as fall protection, amputations, combustible dust, crystalline silica, excavation/trenching, lead, and ship breaking.)

Once a case meets the SVEP

Editor’s Note – Mark A. Lies II is a labor and employment law attorney and partner with the Chicago, IL, law firm of Seyfarth Shaw, LLP. He specializes in occupational safety and health and related employment law and personal injury litigation. Elizabeth Leifel Ash is an associate with Seyfarth Shaw, whose practice focuses on regulatory compliance and litigation, including occupational safety and health and environmental matters.

Legal topics provide general information, not specific legal advice. Individual circumstances may limit or modify this information.

Under President Barack Obama’s administration, employers have already seen the Occupational Safety and Health Administration’s (OSHA’s) enforcement budget increase. The democratically-controlled Congress has publicly announced its intention to amend the OSHA law to increase civil and criminal penalties. OSHA representatives have also identified new aggressive inspection strategies directed toward certain hazards or groups of employers. Already in 2010, employers have seen a dramatic increase in the number of OSHA inspections. Then, the early April tragedy at the Upper Big Branch Mine in West Virginia, in which 29 miners perished, redoubled the nation’s focus on workplace safety issues. The loss of 11 employees in the off-shore oil rig accident in the Gulf of Mexico in late April has also heightened this awareness.

During the later part of April, OSHA announced several changes to its enforcement policies. These changes mean that OSHA has now taken affirmative steps to implement what many have predicted: an enforcement climate that is much more rigorous for employers. This article addresses several recent developments and recommends actions employers can take to protect themselves against the expected increase in citations and penalties.
criteria, the employer will be subject to heightened scrutiny from OSHA. First, any workplace that is the subject of a SVEP inspection will be inspected again after the citations become final orders, even if the employer has submitted abatement verification of the cited violations.

Second, when an OSHA inspector identifies a SVEP case, the inspector is to evaluate whether compliance problems noted during the inspection are likely to exist at related facilities (i.e., those facilities that are within the same three-digit North American Industry Classification System, or NAICS, or two-digit Standard Industrial Classification, or SIC, codes) around the country. The OSHA regional administrator will then determine whether those related facilities should also be selected for an inspection.

Third, OSHA will mail copies of any SVEP citations to the employer’s national headquarters in an effort to increase company-wide awareness of the citations. OSHA may also issue a news release for any SVEP case upon issuance of the citations.

Fourth, for any SVEP case that is resolved through settlement, OSHA and the employer must consider several potential provisos to ensure future compliance both at the cited facility and company-wide. Those provisos include hiring a safety consultant, making the settlement agreement company-wide, requiring interim abatement controls if final abatement requires an extensive amount of time, and requiring accountability measures such as the submission of injury/illness logs and/or reporting of serious illnesses or injuries to OSHA.

Finally, SVEP cases are “strongly considered” for the entry of a federal court enforcement order under Section 11(b) of the act in order to assure compliance with the settlement agreement, which allows federal courts to utilize their considerable authority, including contempt and sanctions to enforce compliance, including plant closure.

**OSHA’s Native Language Training Policy**

Numerous OSHA standards, from lockout/tagout to forklift operation, and bloodborne pathogens to hazard communication, require employers to train or instruct employees in some way. OSHA generally treats its training requirements as “performance-based,” meaning that OSHA defers to each individual employer to fashion the most effective manner by which to accomplish the goal of the standard. For that reason, none of OSHA’s training standards require employers to use particular documents, teaching methods, or language to train employees. Instead, OSHA requires employers to present information in a manner that employees are capable of understanding.

On April 28, 2010, Michaels issued a memorandum reiterating its policy regarding the training of employees. Specifically, the memorandum affirms that if an employee does not speak, read, or understand English, training must be provided in a language the employee understands. OSHA has tasked each of its inspectors with the duty to determine whether the training provided by an employer satisfies the intent of the standard, i.e., whether employees receiving the training have actually understood that training.

One way OSHA inspectors will evaluate the employer’s compliance with safety training standards is by determining how the employer communicates other workplace rules and policies to employees, particularly job instructions, i.e., other non-safety policies or procedures. If these other job instructions are given in Spanish, for example, OSHA will likely view English-only safety training as insufficient.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

OSHA’s recent activity confirms its announced intent toward more aggressive enforcement and less leniency toward employers. This increased enforcement exposure reinforces the need for employers to develop systematic and thorough strategies for addressing OSHA citations and correcting health and safety violations promptly to avoid a similar fate.

- Develop company-wide written safety policies to ensure that all facilities are at the same level of compliance. Remember that even company-wide safety policies must often be tailored to address the hazards of each particular workplace.
- Develop a company-wide system of tracking citations that have become final within five years to avoid repeat liabilities.
- Develop written policies for ensuring that required training is conducted for every employee subject to the requirement. This should include a method for ensuring, for example, that employees who are absent from work on the date of their scheduled training are not overlooked or forgotten.
- Maintain documentation demonstrating the receipt of training for every employee required to receive the training.
- Hold individual employees, including managers and supervisors, accountable through appropriate disciplinary measures where a safety rule or practice is violated. Maintain documentation of any such disciplinary action.
- Consider engaging bilingual trainers to conduct training and document employees’ understanding of that training.
- Consider translating safety programs into Spanish or other languages where the employer has a large non-English speaking workforce.
- In the event a citation is issued, contact your legal counsel immediately to assess the potential risk of repeat exposure and to avoid waiving your right to contest that citation.
Ameri-Pac Receives AIB Superior Rating

Ameri-Pac has earned a superior rating from AIB International as a result of its recent good manufacturing practices facility audit. The award was for Ameri-Pac’s main production facility in St. Joseph, MO, where it manufactures animal nutrition and veterinary supply products.

AIB was established over 90 years ago to develop production and facility standards for the food industry. Their mission is to lower risks and to strengthen reputations of companies through rigorous inspections, audits, and training. This rating assures Ameri-Pac customers that their products are produced in facilities with the highest standards for cleanliness, food safety, pest management, ingredient storage, and manufacturing integrity. As part of the superior designation, Ameri-Pac and its employees have signed on to make a total commitment to product quality and safety.

Ag Transportation Report Released

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has released to Congress a comprehensive report on agricultural transportation in the United States, the first ever of this magnitude. The report, Study of Rural Transportation Issues, was mandated by the 2008 farm bill and covers the four major modes of transportation commonly used by agriculture in the United States – truck, rail, barge, and ocean vessel.

“Agriculture is the largest user of freight transportation in the United States, with 31 percent of all ton-miles recorded in 2007 being used in the movement of agricultural products,” said Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack. “This report provides policymakers the vital information needed to make strategic infrastructure and policy decisions to meet rural America’s transportation needs, now and in the future.”

The report examines some of the major issues facing agricultural transportation, including the dramatic effect of deregulation on the rail industry, a growing gap for funding the inland waterways and highway systems, availability of containers and ocean vessel capacity, and the infrastructure that may be needed to support a projected increase in biofuel transportation.

The report also discusses the current approach to transportation policy in the United States, in which each mode of transportation is often considered separately without an overarching view of the flow of freight through all the modes.

Study of Rural Transportation Issues may be found on the Agricultural Marketing Service Web site at www.ams.usda.gov/ruraltransportationstudy.

Animal Health Research Facility Dedicated

Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack and other U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) officials dedicated the final component of the National Centers for Animal Health (NCAH) in late April. The cutting-edge center provides laboratories, offices, animal space, and administrative space for some of the country’s top animal health scientists and researchers. The dedication marks the completion of a long-term project to consolidate three USDA units previously operated separately at Ames, IA, resulting in better cost savings for U.S. taxpayers and employing about 700 people.

“This new facility will not only save taxpayers money, but will help the men and women who work here in Ames to provide the critical advancements needed to maintain the success of the [livestock] industry,” said Vilsack.

The NCAH operates from a single campus with the facility including the National Animal Disease Center, operated by USDA’s Agricultural Research Service (ARS); the National Veterinary Services Laboratory; and the Center for Veterinary Biologics, operated by USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). All branches contribute to the nation’s livestock industry by conducting research, diagnostics, and training, as well as testing vaccines and evaluating veterinary biological products.

Last year, APHIS and ARS scientists and employees worked around the clock to test the first samples of the H1N1 virus, leading to the important discovery that infected pigs did not have any of the virus in their tissues and confirming the safety of the food supply. The work from ARS and APHIS staff protects food sources for consumers all over the world – and protects public health by minimizing human infectious diseases and food safety pathogens that might be transmitted from animals or their products.

ARS is the principal intramural scientific research agency of USDA. APHIS is responsible for protecting and promoting U.S. agricultural health, administering the Animal Welfare Act, and carrying out wildlife damage management activities.

Babcock Wanson Partners with Scan American

Babcock Wanson, LLC, has contracted with Scan American Corporation to represent all its interests in North America. Babcock Wanson, through Scan American, will market, sell, deliver, install, commission, and service deodorator thermal oxidizers and regenerative thermal oxidizers.

Besides deodorizing the airstream, including all foul air, room air, and non-condensables, Babcock Wanson systems eliminate all vapors from the rendering cooking process. Both companies are located in Kansas City, MO.

FSIS Administrator Appointed

Alfred V. Almanza was formally appointed as administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) in early
May, overseeing the regulation of meat, poultry, and processed egg products. He had been in a limited term appointment as administrator of FSIS since July 2007. Almanza will lead FSIS and its more than 9,500 employees in their mission of protecting public health through food safety.

Almanza’s FSIS career began in 1978 as a food inspector in a small slaughter plant in Dalhart, TX. Since then he has served in a variety of positions throughout the agency, including deputy district manager, labor management relations specialist, and processing inspector. Prior to accepting the administrator position, Almanza was the district manager for the Dallas District where he provided leadership and direction to more than 600 employees located in more than 350 federally inspected establishments.

Kemin China Celebrates Anniversary

Kemin Industries, Inc., celebrated its tenth year of manufacturing premium feed ingredients in China in April with customers and government officials during a technical seminar, tour of the company’s China facilities, and dinner reception.

Kemin’s commitment to the development of China’s feed industry began in 1982 when the company held its first technical seminar in China. The establishment of Kemin China and the Zhuhai manufacturing facility in 2000 has enabled Kemin to better meet the ever-increasing demands for its products and services in the local market.

“The establishment of Kemin China has brought us closer to our customers, increasing the quality of service and customer satisfaction,” says Zhilin Gan, president of Kemin China.

Kemin China recently completed the first phase of a seven-year long facility expansion. The expanded facility nearly doubled the production and storage space, adding 1,924 square meters to the existing facility. When the final expansion is complete in 2015, Kemin China will also have added food grade manufacturing capabilities.

In 2008, the Sanzao Government recognized Kemin China for its contributions to the community by honoring the company with the Prominent Contribution award.

JBS Investing in Odor Improvement

JBS Swift & Company is investing nearly $850,000 to upgrade odor equipment at its Grand Island, NE, rendering and blood-drying facility as part of a $46.4 million three-year improvement plan JBS launched in 2009.

According to reports, JBS will spend $550,000 for a 60,000-square-foot air scrubber, to raise the discharge stacks on all three discharge points to 65 feet above the ground from the current 30 feet, to plumb the non-condensable vapors in the boiler burners (running air back though the boilers), to add scrubbing to the wastewater grease room into the existing room air scrubber, to upgrade the vapor collection equipment to a high-intensity scrubber, and to run an air model to determine the most-effective stack height on all three scrubbers.

The company will spend $296,000 in the dryer room to include installing a wall and new exterior door to enclose the room. A 40,000 cubic feet per minute fan will be added to make up air in the room, which will then be used as combustion air in the bone and blood dryers.

Other capital projects to the Grand Island meatpacking and rendering facility include $1.7 million in wastewater

Continued on page 40

Baker Commodities Holds Open House

Baker Commodities, Inc., held an open house in April at its Los Angeles, CA, area facilities. More than 200 guests, including Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard, Vernon city officials, representatives from neighboring businesses, and other dignitaries, attended the event that was held at Baker’s Sierra Pine Avenue offices. The goals behind the open house were to introduce visitors to the company, to explain the role rendering plays in the environment, and to recognize the congresswoman for her consistent support.

Upon arrival, guests mingled and had their pictures taken with the Andreoli collection of rare vintage cars. They also had the opportunity to learn more about the rendering and cold storage industries by viewing various exhibits in the offices. Jim Andreoli Jr. addressed the crowd, sharing the company’s history and its future. He then presented Congresswoman Roybal-Allard with Baker Commodities’ first Excellence in Government Award. Upon her acceptance, she praised the company for its forward-thinking, and the vital role it plays in the community and environment.

Guests then boarded buses and took tours of the Bandini plant, including the laboratory, to see the actual process of manufacturing feeding fats, tallow, and yellow grease.

From left are Tony Andreoli, Jim Andreoli Jr., Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard, Jim Andreoli Sr., Andy Andreoli, Jason Andreoli, and Jim Andreoli II.
treatment centrifuges added last year, a $5 million wastewater treatment lagoon, an $11.5 million cooler, $6.5 million of upgrades to the fabrication floor, and $3.5 million in rendering cookers.

“We’re putting a lot of capital into this plant,” JBS spokesman Chandler Keys told The Grand Island Independent. “We don’t want this plant to stink.”

“This will more than double the available scrubbers for the rendering side,” commented Public Works Director Steve Riehle.

Keys said the changes are all about a new corporate culture that the JBS owners brought to the plant.

“It’s a commitment of JBS to put money in these plants and make them bigger and better and bring more value,” he stated. “Everybody realizes our responsibility.”

Pilgrim’s Pride to Close Corporate Offices

As part of its continued integration with JBS USA, Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation will close its corporate headquarters building in Pittsburg, TX, and a satellite corporate office in Atlanta, GA. Both offices were expected to close by mid-June as most corporate functions are consolidated at JBS USA’s headquarters in Greeley, CO.

Although many Pilgrim’s Pride employees at both corporate offices have been offered positions at other company facilities, the closure of the two offices will lead to the elimination of 158 positions at the Pilgrim’s Pride headquarters in Pittsburg and 55 jobs at the suburban Atlanta office. The company has said it will provide severance benefits, including outplacement assistance, to affected employees.

Nelson Named Chair of ASTM Committee

ASTM International Committee F10 on Livestock, Meat, and Poultry Evaluation Systems has named Mark Nelson, director of commodities at the Kansas Farm Bureau in Manhattan, KS, as its new chairman.

The work of Committee F10 is a high priority to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and is supported by a wide range of stakeholders to achieve fair and competitive markets for the livestock, meat, and poultry industry. A member of ASTM International since 2003, Nelson also serves on five of F10’s eight subcommittees, and he is vice chair of Subcommittee F10.50 on Terminology.

Upon his graduation from Kansas State University where he earned both a bachelor of science and master’s degree in agricultural economics, Nelson accepted the position of Northwest area economist at the university in 1986. He then spent time as a field representative and merchandiser at Northern Sun in Goodland, KS, before assuming his role at the Kansas Farm Bureau in 1997.

Publication Examines Water Availability for Agriculture

With a projected 25 percent and 50 percent increase in U.S. and world populations, respectively, by 2050, substantial increases in freshwater use for food, fiber, and fuel production, as well as municipal and residential consumption, are inevitable. This increased water use will not come without consequences, and as one of the largest users of water in the United States, agriculture will be impacted significantly by changes in water availability and cost.

To evaluate current trends, summarize key vulnerabilities, and identify possible solutions to current and future water challenges, the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) convened a task force of eight scientists, educators, and resource analysts who have prepared a new issue paper, Water, People, and the Future: Water Availability for Agriculture in the United States.

Through case studies, the new CAST publication discusses the diverse demands for water resources using the impacts, regulations, challenges, and policies of four specific areas of the United States – California, Arizona, Florida, and the High Plains – with particular focus on the implications for agriculture.

“It is critical that policymakers, water managers, and water users work collaboratively to achieve sustainable water resource management,” says Task Force Chair Sharon Megdal, Water Resources Research Center, University of Arizona, Tucson. “Multiple issues require attention – water quality, environmental water needs, municipal demands for water, water resource availability, agricultural water use – and no issue can be addressed individually. Supplying future water demand requires continued investments and efforts to enhance water use efficiency.”

The full text of Water, People, and the Future: Water Availability for Agriculture in the United States (Issue Paper 44) may be accessed free of charge on the CAST Web site at www.cast-science.org. The paper also is available in hard copy for a shipping/handling fee.

CAST is an international consortium of 32 scientific and professional societies.

Robertson Joins Farmers Union

Farmers Union Industries, LLC, Redwood Falls, MN, has hired James Robertson as environmental engineer. He will be responsible for air quality initiatives for all divisions and will assist in other governmental compliance matters. Robertson brings years of experience in air scrubbing and odor compliance issues.

Ranck Elected Chairman of Liquid Environmental

Bruce Ranck has been elected as non-executive chairman of Liquid Environmental Solutions’ Board of Directors. He has been a board member since 2003.

Ranck was chief executive officer (CEO) of Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI), the second largest solid waste company in North America, from 1995 through its sale in 1999. Prior to assuming the CEO position, he served in increasingly responsible roles at BFI, including president and chief operating officer. Ranck was elected to the board of BFI in 1990.

After the sale of BFI, Ranck served as chairman and CEO of Tartan Textile Services, a linen management company serving the healthcare and hospitality industries, from 2002 to 2006. He has also served on the board of Furon Company, Chase Bank of Texas, and SITA, a United Kingdom waste services company. Ranck currently serves as a director of Dynamex and Quanta Services.
Sundlof Leaving FDA for Academia

Dr. Stephen Sundlof has stepped down as director of the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA’s) Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN) to accept a two-year assignment with the Virginia-Maryland Regional College of Veterinary Medicine. He has been with FDA for 16 years, including 14 years as director of the Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM).

Sundlof began his career in 1980 on the faculty of the University of Florida’s College of Veterinary Medicine. His research interests in drug residues in livestock eventually led to interactions with the FDA, first as a member and later as the chair of the FDA’s Veterinary Medicine Advisory Committee. In 1994, he was named the CVM director.

With his return to academia, Sundlof will be starting a new training and development program in regulatory science in conjunction with the University of Minnesota and Ohio State University. He will be designing a curriculum for certification and master degrees drawing from key faculty across three large universities with strong public health programs, and from FDA subject matter experts. The programs will be designed especially for government employees.

Agreeing to serve as acting director of CFSAN is Michael Landa, who has served as deputy director for Regulatory Affairs at CFSAN since 2004 and began his FDA career in 1978 as assistant chief counsel for Enforcement, Medical Devices, and Veterinary Medicine. Roberta Wagner and Donald Kraemer, who have extensive experience at FDA both at headquarters and in the field, will serve as acting deputy directors.

Theobald Family Mourns Losses

George Francis Theobald Sr. and George Francis Theobald Jr., father and son, died within weeks of each other, leaving a long-time rendering family to mourn two losses. George Jr. died of cancer-related ailments on March 18, 2010, at the age of 66, and George Sr. died April 22, 2010, at the age of 91.

Both men spent much of their lives in the rendering industry.

After serving in the U.S. Army during World War II, including on Omaha Beach during the D-Day battle and later in the Battle of the Bulge, George Sr. returned to Kearney, NJ, and joined the family rendering business, Theobald Industries, started by his father, Harry Theobald. In 1959, George Sr. moved to Plantation, FL, to build the southern operations of the family business, Southeast Recycling Company (SERCO) and Florida Transport. He served as president of SERCO until his retirement in 1996.

George Sr. served as chairman of the Fats and Proteins Research Foundation, and was a longstanding board member of the National Renderers Association. He is survived by his second wife, Virginia, three children, a sister, eight grandchildren, seven great-grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews.

George Jr. worked as an executive in the family’s Florida businesses alongside his father. Both men created a working partnership with the government of Jamaica to provide tallow to the country in the late 1970s and 1980s. They also worked with scientist Ilonna Taussky, a member of the American Oil Chemists’ Society, on tallow filtering techniques, and the Florida government to establish environmental regulations for food establishments, wholesalers, and butcher-type markets to ensure animal by-products are collected and processed in industrial rendering plants.

George Jr. is survived by two children, a sister, two brothers, five grandchildren, and numerous other family and friends.

Washington Beef to Pay Penalty for Violations

In an agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington Beef, LLC, will pay a $750,000 civil penalty and install several pieces of new wastewater treatment equipment to resolve allegations that it violated its permit for discharge of treated water under the Clean Water Act. EPA estimates the new equipment cost to be approximately $3 million.

Continued on page 43

Texas Rendering Plant Emerges

It’s not every day a new rendering plant is built, but Caviness Packing Company has done just that to accommodate its beef processing plant.

Located in the panhandle community of Hereford, TX, the 45,000-square-foot rendering and hide operation features a Dupps continuous rendering system, at the heart of which is a 260U Supercookor, Duske Drying Systems blood drying equipment, and SCP Control air quality equipment, all of which are completely automated. Rendered products offered will be bleachable fancy tallow, meat and bone meal, blood meal, and cattle hides.

Caviness Packing, a family-owned company, has been processing cattle in Texas since 1962. A new beef harvest plant was built in 2005 followed by a boxed beef fabrication facility erected in 2008. Construction of the new rendering plant and equipment installation is being done by Schmeeckle Bros. of Fort Morgan, CO. The plant will employ 10 to 12 people and is scheduled to begin operations mid-June 2010.

Caviness Packing’s finished product storage and loadout.
Classifieds

EQUIPMENT/SERVICE

Used Boilers For Sale
700 HP 150# O2 trim Economizer
500 HP 200# Gas-#5 Oil
500 HP 150# Complete Boiler Room
Much more for your boiler room.
Sales@McCainEngineering.com
(205) 663-0123

3 used Anco cookers, 5’ x 12’, painted. Auger and elec. equipment.
Vertical centrifuge, polisher,
Westfalia SA-60-06-177 stainless
40 hp. Call Bud at (704) 485-4700

Polar Temp harsh environment
refrigeration for protein recovery.
Call Dea Knapp, (316) 683-5863

2002 IH rendering truck w/Serco
4500 loader and 16’ dump body.
Call Brian Stanley, (715) 340-1480

2005 FL rendering truck, no CDL,
w/Kesla 500Z loader and 15’ body.
Call Brian Stanley, (715) 340-1480

EMPLOYMENT

Mechanical Engineer/Technical Service/Sales located in western Missouri. Must have mechanical engineering degree and food manufacturing experience preferably in the meat/meal processing industry working with evaporators and drying/separating systems for stick water and other effluent. This position is required to perform and execute complicated analysis as well as structural and installation requirements and determine system requirements and specifications for equipment. Apply at integrityrecruiting@comcast.net and note “Tech-Engineer” in subject line. Word format only.

Reach 1,000s of potential customers
And hundreds more on the Internet
1st 3 lines only $28
editors@rendermagazine.com
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According to a complaint filed with the settlement agreement in federal court in Spokane, WA, Washington Beef violated the Clean Water Act on numerous occasions from 2003 to 2009. EPA alleges that the company discharged partially-treated slaughterhouse wastes into the Spencer Lateral and Wanity Slough, nearby waterways, without a permit for an extended period, and that it also exceeded the level of pollutants allowed by its permit on numerous occasions. EPA stated that the company has recently obtained a permit for all of its discharges, and is currently meeting its permit limits.

Washington Beef states the permit issues were reported to EPA when they occurred at its Toppenish, WA, facility. “The water was processed through the treatment facility and had no detrimental water quality impacts to either Wanity Slough or the irrigation system,” said Rick Stott, executive vice president, Washington Beef. “The water was for the beneficial use of the local farmers.”

According to Washington Beef, historically, this water was managed through an innovative constructed wetlands system in cooperation with the Yakama Nation and the Wapato Irrigation District. During the last 10 years, Washington Beef’s wastewater permit was administratively extended and the company actively petitioned EPA to establish new permit standards and incorporate the existing cooperative agreement.

Since the 2003 purchase of Washington Beef by AgriBeef Co., a privately held corporation based in Boise, ID, the company has actively pursued the discharge permit renewal, which would allow Washington Beef to significantly upgrade the water treatment system. Upon receiving the renewed permit in February 2010, the company began construction of the system.

“Now that the EPA has issued a permit renewal and this enforcement action has been settled, Washington Beef has moved forward with investments in the state-of-the-art water treatment system we envisioned several years ago,” Stott stated. “These investments are part of Washington Beef’s environmental initiatives as the company continues to be on the forefront of green technology.”

---

Wisconsin Renewable Fuels Bill Becomes Law

Wisconsin has a new law on the books that is designed to encourage the development, production, and use of renewable fuels in the state.

Senate Bill 279, signed by Governor Jim Doyle on May 18, 2010, organizes the way biofuels research and development is managed in the state, streamlines the regulatory burdens faced by manufacturers and retailers, and sets realistic benchmarks for the biofuels industry.

Specifically, the bill expands state programs to support the establishment, production, harvest, storage, and transport of bioenergy feedstocks. The measure also specifies that the state’s renewable energy grant and loan program applies to bio-refineries in general, rather than just cellulose ethanol plants. The legislation also calls for the creation of a bioenergy advisory council to study and report voluntary best management practices for sustainable biomass and biofuels production.
High Flight (aka The Pilot’s Prayer)
Oh! I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I’ve climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth
Of sun-split clouds — and done a hundred things
You have not dreamed of — wheeled and soared and swung
High in the sunlit silence. Hov’ring there,
I’ve chased the shouting wind along, and flung
My eager craft through footless halls of air.

Up, up the long, delirious burning blue
I’ve topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace
Where never lark, or ever eagle flew —
And, while with silent, lifting mind I’ve trod
The high untrespassed sanctity of space,
Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

— John Gillespie Magee Jr.

A gentle giant
The Render family bids a sorrowful farewell to its first editor and publisher, Frank Burnham, who passed away April 21, 2010.

Rest in peace, dear friend and grandfather... may we continue to make you as proud as we are of you.
A word from your friends at Dupps Field Service

“For us, the bottom line is to be there when our customers need us. They operate Dupps equipment because it offers top performance and reliability; and it’s our job to keep it that way . . . any time, day or night.

“For the Field Service team, the most important thing is to get the customer’s system up and running properly as quickly as possible. Every minute of downtime costs money, so it’s our policy to have a service representative ready to work at a customer’s plant in 24 hours or less. That’s why we maintain the largest service department in the business, with the right tools and parts to do the job.

“Another important advantage we offer is experience. Every representative knows Dupps equipment inside and out, so we do the job right as well as quickly. Experience pays off in other ways too — we can help make sure equipment is properly maintained so it operates at peak performance, and to avoid expensive repairs down the road.

“Our motto is ‘Dupps won’t let you down’; for our team that means we’re committed to the customer, every hour of every day.”