



Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

Harris Ranch Beef Company
16277 South McCall Avenue
Selma, California 93662

Audit Date: September 30, 2022
Auditor: Scott Devitt

Audit criteria are based on the January 2021, NAMI Recommended Animal Handling Guidelines - Please refer to Guidelines for further explanation of criteria requirements



Audit Summary

Company Name:	Harris Ranch Beef Company	Company ID:	AUHARRIS
Address:	16277 South McCall Avenue Selma, California 93662		

Contact Name:	Emily Krage
Contact Phone Number:	
Contact Email Address:	emily.krage@harrisranchbeef.com

Audit ID:	AO-004479
Audit Date:	September 30, 2022
Audit Type:	Annual audit
Audit Result:	Passed

Auditor Name:	Scott Devitt
Auditor Phone Number:	712-662-1324
Auditor Email Address:	Scott.Devitt@FSNS.com



Beef Animal Welfare

Category	# Points Received	# Possible Points	Percentage (%)
Livestock Receiving	225	225	100.00
Non-Ambulatory	50	50	100.00
Holding and Handling	350	350	100.00
Lead-up and Stunning Area	455	475	95.79
Management Commitment	50	50	100.00
Employee Training	75	75	100.00
Overall Score	1,205	1,225	98.37

** Denotes a Core Criteria.

A failure of a Core Criteria or a cumulative score below 90% results in an Automatic Audit Failure.

An Audit Failure requires a re-audit in 60 days.



Findings Summary

4 Lead-up and Stunning Area

Beef Animal Welfare

**** Use of electric prods from crowd pen to restrainer / knock box** Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production Record percentage of animals electrically prodded. Electric prods should only be used when necessary and not on the facial, anal, or genital regions. Other primary handling tools should be in use. Excellent = $\leq 5\%$ prodded 100 pts Acceptable = $\leq 25\%$ prodded 90 pts Not acceptable = $> 25\%$ prodded 0 pts Knock box with head restrainer:

Prod use was observed on 6 out of 100 cattle observed.
 $6/100 = 6\%$

**** Vocalization from crowd pen to restrainer / knock box** Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production Record percentage of animals that vocalized from the crowd pen to and including the restrainer Excellent $\leq 1\%$ vocalize 100 pts Acceptable $\leq 3\%$ vocalize 90 pts Unacceptable $> 3\%$ vocalize 0 pts Knock boxes with head restraint: Excellent $< \text{or} = 1\%$ vocalize 100 pts Head Restrainer $< \text{or} = 5\%$ vocalize 90 pts Unacceptable $> 5\%$ vocalize 0 pts

Vocalization was detected on 2 out of the 100 head evaluated. $2/100 = 2\%$

Beef Animal Welfare

Score Summary

Result

Score Summary

	# Cattle in Question	Total Cattle Observed	Percent Acceptable
Electric Prodding (prodded) - crowd pen to restrainer	6	100	94%
Vocalization (vocalized)	2	100	98%
Slips (slipped) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	100	100%
Falls (fell) - Unloading	0	161	100%
Falls (fell) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	100	100%
Stunning Accuracy (double stun)	0	100	100%
Insensibility (sensible)	0	100	100%

Audit Outcome

Pass

Comments

The site harvested approximately 1,000 head daily on a single shift of operations. Line speed was approximately 155 head per hour.

1 Livestock Receiving

Result

1.1	Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters.	25
Comment:	Cattle transportation was provided by company trucks. Transportation Practices section of the Animal Handling Manual was where procedures were located. Transportation practices were based on National BQA Master Transporter Guide.	
1.2	Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level.	25
Comment:	There were a total of five commercial pot belly trailers evaluated during unloading containing 38, 29, 34, 30, and 30 head. Signs of overcrowding were not observed.	
1.3	Trailers must be cleaned at least once each week to prevent heavy accumulation of feces. Trailers must have slip resistant floors, and no potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, etc.).	25
Comment:	Trailers were cleaned between each delivery. Floors were stamped steel. Potential injury points and manure buildup were not observed	

1.4 Ramps, unloading area, and scales should be slip resistant, $\leq 20^\circ$ slope, with no significant accumulated manure. Record all potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, etc.) in unloading area. 25

Comment: The unloading dock was level, grooved concrete covered with a tire mat. Manure build up, standing water, or potential injury points were not observed.

1.5 Determine number of falls for all animals on trailers observed at unloading. 100
Evaluate at the most probable area and observe multiple unloading chutes if possible.
Fall is determined if brisket, belly, rump or other part of torso touches floor. Note number of slips, limb other than hoof touches floor, but do not score.
Excellent: No falls = 100 pts
Acceptable: $< \text{or } = 1\%$ falls = 90 pts
Unacceptable: $> 1\%$ falls = 0 pts

Comment: In the 161 head sample, slips and falls were not observed.
0/161=0%

1.6 Use of electric prods at unloading should be discouraged by plant. $< \text{or } = 5\%$ of animals should be electrically prodded. Record what other handling tools are in use. 25

Comment: Electrical prod use was not permitted during unloading. Rattle paddles were utilized if needed.

2 Non-Ambulatory

Result

2.1 A written policy for immobile and fatigued animals must be in place. The facility must also have the tools available for handling immobile and/or fatigued animals on trailers and in unloading area; unless the animal is euthanized prior to movement. 25
Canadian plants are not allowed to move non-ambulatory animals that arrive at the plant or become non-ambulatory during unloading. The animal must be euthanized where it is found.

Comment: Non-Ambulatory Disabled Cattle policy explained procedures for handling non-ambulatory animals. Animals that could not walk to the restrainer were euthanized and sent to the company owned feedlot for disposition. If an animal was stressed or overheated it was handled according to BQA Master Transporter Guide and allowed a rest period. Records reviewed demonstrated compliance with the facility's procedure.

2.2 Staging of dead carcasses should be out of public view. DOAs, animals euthanized in pens, and animals that died after arrival must be tracked. 25

Comment: DOAs or euthanized cattle were staged out of public view or returned to the company owned feedlot as appropriate for the situation. DOAs were tracked on delivery tickets for company owned and third party suppliers. DOAs were not observed during the audit. Records reviewed demonstrated compliance.

3 Holding and Handling

Result

- 3.1** An emergency livestock management plan must be in place for short term and long term breakdowns. Short term disruptions may include minor plant breakdowns, minor weather events, or scheduling errors. Long term disruptions may include extended plant downtime, snow storm, motor vehicle accident, natural disaster, building damage, fire, tornado, etc. Procedures should include:
- How feed and water will be provided during long term shutdowns
 - How electricity can be provided through back up generators in the event power is lost
 - How housing will be provided to animals should housing become uninhabitable due to fire or weather conditions such as snow or flood
 - How animals will be evacuated in an emergency such as fire or flood
 - For animals that cannot be returned to the farm of origin, there should be a designated place where animals can be unloaded and provided adequate facilities
- 25

Comment: The Animal Handling Manual included provisions for emergency management. There was a company owned feedlot within 50 miles of the site, as well as pasture land. In the event the site was no longer suitable for the temporary housing of livestock or harvest of livestock, animals would be transferred to company owned feedlots or pastures. Provisions were also made for the communication of transporter accidents where animal euthanasia may be required. Transporters could be contacted in route in the event animals needed to return to the farm of origin. The site was equipped with feed if animals needed to be held for a short period of time. Pens had hard piped sources of water, which flowed continually. Backup power generators were present to critical systems of the facility.

- 3.2** Note air temperature, and heat stress index or wind chill index. Observe animals for comfort. Temperature mitigation strategies at the plant should be established when needed for hot and cold conditions. 25

Comment: The air temperature was approximately 62°F during the audit with clear skies. Pens were equipped with shade covers and sprinklers which were turned on at 80F or if animals were showing signs of heat stress.

- 3.3** Pens, drive alley, circle pens, and other areas where animals walk must have slip resistant floors to minimize the risk of falls. Record potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, broken concrete, etc.) and potential animal distractions in alleys and pens (poor design, poor lighting / shadows, out of place objects, noises, debris, etc.) 25

Comment: Pen floors were grooved concrete and were cleaned throughout the day to prevent manure accumulation. Damage, distractions, manure accumulation, or potential injury points were not observed.

- 3.4** Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals
Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production
Evaluate at the most probable area.
Fall is determined if brisket, belly, rump or other part of torso touches floor.
Note number of slips, limb other than hoof touches floor, but do not score.
Excellent: No falls = 100 pts
Acceptable: < or = 1% falls = 90 pts
Unacceptable: >1% falls = 0 pts 100

Comment: Slips and falls were not observed in the 100 head assessed from the holding pen to the restrainer. 0/100 = 0%

3.5	Driving tools used to move animals must be used in a manner that allows sound or visual cues for movement. Tools should not be used to strike or jab an animal. Vibrating prods, if used, must have the pointed end worn down and smoothed prior to use on animals. Vibrating prods should be used on the back, rump, or shoulders of the animal and should not be applied to sensitive parts of the animal or used to jab the animal.	25
Comment:	Driving tools were limited to rattle paddles and sticks with bags on the end. The handle of the rattle paddle and stick were not permitted to be used on animals. The paddle end of the rattle paddle, and the bag end of the back and stick device were permitted to be used on the animal. Tool usage observed was appropriate with minimal physical contact with the animal.	
3.6	If mounting behaviors are observed the animals that chronically mount are removed from the pen.	25
Comment:	Mounting behaviors were not observed. Procedure required chronic mounters be removed from the pen.	
3.7	Holding pens should not appear overcrowded. Crowd pen should be under $\frac{3}{4}$ full and crowd gate should not be used to forcibly push animals.	25
Comment:	Animals in each pen could move about and access water. Holding pens were approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of capacity. The crowd pen was filled to approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ capacity. The crowd gate was not used to push animals.	
3.8	Animals must have unrestricted access to potable water in pens. Water cannot be frozen. Establishments should include provisions for providing water to animals waiting in drive alleys in their emergency management plan. Animals must have access to feed if held over 24 hours.	100
Comment:	Animals were observed with unrestricted access to water present in pens. For downtime longer than 30 minutes, animals were backed out of the serpentine. Portable troughs could be placed into the crowd pen for access to water. Feed was provided to animals held overnight.	

4 Lead-up and Stunning Area

		Result
4.1	Floors must be slip resistant and cleaned to minimize the risk of falls. Manure should not be excessive. Record potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, etc.) and potential animal distractions (poor design, poor lighting / shadows, out of place objects, noises, debris, etc.) in crowd pen, chute, restrainer, knock box area. Rearing or struggling should be minimal.	25
Comment:	Pen floors were grooved concrete and were cleaned daily. Excessive manure, animal distractions, or potential injury points were not observed.	

- 4.2** Documented records are available for the maintenance and cleaning of euthanasia tools. 50
 Captive bolt guns must be cleaned each day of use and documented.
 Cleaning and preventative maintenance must be performed in accordance with manufacturer recommendations and documented.
 Equipment and ammunition must be stored in a dry place when not in use. Plant must have a back-up stunner. Record type and brand of stunner and type of restrainer or knock box. Air injected stunners are prohibited.

Comment: The site utilized three Jarvis brand pneumatic captive bolt guns for primary stunning, and 8 hand held Jarvis captive bolt guns for back up stunning, and stunning in pens and the yard as needed. Euthanasia equipment was cleaned, inspected, and test fired each day of use. Inspections were recorded on the Pneumatic Stunner PM Log or Knocking Gun Test Log respectively. Air injection stunning was not performed. Ammunition for hand held guns were stored in water tight plastic containers or plastic bags. The facility utilized a center track restrainer. Records reviewed from June 2022 demonstrated compliance with plant procedure.

- 4.3** Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 90
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production Record percentage of animals electrically prodded. Electric prods should only be used when necessary and not on the facial, anal, or genital regions. Other primary handling tools should be in use.
 Excellent = ≤ 5% prodded 100 pts
 Acceptable = ≤ 25% prodded 90 pts
 Not acceptable = > 25% prodded 0 pts
 Knock box with head restrainer:

Comment: Electrical prod use was observed 6 out of the 100 head evaluated from the crowd pen to the restrainer. 6/100 = 6%

- 4.4** Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 90
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production
 Record percentage of animals that vocalized from the crowd pen to and including the restrainer
 Excellent ≤ 1% vocalize 100 pts
 Acceptable ≤ 3% vocalize 90 pts
 Unacceptable > 3% vocalize 0 pts
 Knock boxes with head restraint:
 Excellent < or = 1% vocalize 100 pts
 Head Restrainer < or = 5% vocalize 90 pts
 Unacceptable > 5% vocalize 0 pts

Comment: Vocalization was detected on 2 out of the 100 head evaluated. 2/100 = 2%



4.5 Chain speed > or =100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 100
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production

Record percentage of animals that were stunned more than once to render the animal insensible.
 If animals are to have a planned security knock, auditor must assess sensibility prior to the second knock.

Excellent ≤ 1% double stunned 100 pts
 Acceptable ≤ 4% double stunned 90 pts
 Unacceptable > 4% double stunned 0 pts

Comment: Each animal observed was stunned effectively on the first attempt. 0/100 = 0%

4.6 Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 100
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production

An animal exhibiting characteristics of sensibility on the rail (i.e., immediately after shackling or hanging) will be an automatic audit failure if observed during any part of the audit. Insensibility is characterized by floppy head, straight tongue hanging out, no righting reflex, eyes in blank stare (no eye tracking), no natural blinks. If an auditor sees an animal that has returned to full consciousness on the bleed rail or table at any time during the audit, it should be noted and the audit failed, even if the animal observed was not part of the 100 animals scored when auditing bleed rail insensibility.

Excellent 100% insensible 100 pts
 Unacceptable < 100% insensible 0 pts

Comment: Each animal observed was insensible prior to shackling and hanging. 0/100 = 0%

5 Management Commitment

		Result
5.1	An animal welfare mission statement is in place and posted or circulated within the facility.	25

Comment: Harris Ranch Beef Company Mission Statement explained the company commitment to humane treatment of animals. The policy was posted and communicated to persons involved with live animals at the time of hire and during annual refresher training.

		Result
5.2	A program of ongoing monitoring and measurement of animal handling, stunning practices, and outcomes is in place. Each of the seven core criteria should be included. Animal handling and stunning must be audited a (minimum weekly).	25

Comment: Animal welfare and transportation audits were completed on 100 head weekly to evaluate core and secondary handling criteria. Access to water and willful acts of abuse were audited daily. Bleed rail insensibility was evaluated twice weekly. Unbiased camera audits were conducted daily to evaluate cattle offloading, animal movement, effective stunning, and bleed rail insensibility. Each aspect of the camera audit was evaluated for 35 minutes. Records from June 2022 demonstrated compliance with the facility's program.

6 Employee Training

Result



- | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 6.1 | The company's training program must reflect company procedures and policies for livestock receiving, condition of livestock, holding and handling, lead-up and stunning area. Training for personnel performing euthanasia must be documented. A written procedure for handling a sensible animal on the bleed rail and is included in training provided. Retraining should be at least annual. | 75 |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

Comment: Training for persons involved with live animals were given at hire and refreshed annually. Records of the most recent refresher training dated 3/30/22 were available as well as training for new hires. Training topics were compliant with 6.1 requirements and included procedures for handling of a sensible animal on the bleed rail.

7 Acts of Abuse

- | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| | | Result |
| 7.1 | A willful act of abuse is automatic grounds for an audit failure. These offenses include, but are not limited to, dragging a conscious, non-ambulatory animal, intentionally applying prods to sensitive parts of the animal like the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, rectum, vulva, testicles, or belly; deliberate slamming of gates on livestock; intentionally driving livestock on top of one another or hitting or beating an animal, purposefully driving livestock off high ledges, platforms or off a truck without a ramp, or animals frozen to the floor or sides of trailer. | No |

Comment: Willful abusive acts were not observed.

8 Conflict of Interest Declaration

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| | | Result |
| | The below named auditor declares he/she does not have a conflict of interest with the client. | Yes |

Comment: I, Scott Devitt, do not have a conflict of interested with this auditee.