NEIL ABERCROMBIE





In reply, please refer to: File:

Committee on Health

HONOLULU, HAWAII 96801-3378

H.B.606, RELATING TO MILK LABELING

Testimony of Loretta Fuddy, ACSW, MPH Acting Director of Health January 27, 2011

- 1 Department's Position:
- Oppose
- 2 Fiscal Implications: The new regulatory function regarding labeling will require resources to
- administer, monitor, and enforce. The DOH already has present difficulties meeting it's core functions
- 4 due to a lack of resources.
- 5 Purpose and Justification: The bill requires milk that is sold or distributed in Hawaii to be labeled
- 6 with a date of pasteurization or packaging.
- 7 The DOH opposes the bill because it is confusing in its purpose and intent. The milk industry is
- 8 already the most regulated food product in the nation. The nation and Hawaii's milk industries adhere to
- a voluntary Federal, State, Industry agreement called the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO), which is
- created through the National Conference of Interstate Milk Shippers (NCIMS), of which the State of
- Hawaii is a long time participant and voting member. HAR, Chapter 15, Milk, is patterned after the
- 12 PMO and already has definitions for "milk and milk products" and "pasteurization" which would be
- changed by passage of this bill. The existing definitions are recognized nationally and would be in
- 14 conflict with this bill. The bill may also be mistakenly used to allow raw milk sales as Section 2. (a) (2)
- allows for the packaging of product in which no portion of the beverage has been pasteurized. This

LATE TESTANDAY

- would be in direct conflict with existing State law that prohibits the sale of raw, unpasteurized milk in
- 2 Hawaii