



Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

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

Audit Date: September 19, 2023
Auditor: Rudy Hernandez

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:	559.896.3081 x5473
Contact Email Address:	emily.krage@harrisranchbeef.com

Audit ID:	AO-007040
Audit Date:	September 19, 2023
Audit Type:	Annual audit
Audit Result:	Passed

Auditor Name:	Rudy Hernandez
Auditor Phone Number:	970-405-0369
Auditor Email Address:	rudy.hernandez@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:

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

**** 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	145	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 145 head per hour across one ten-hour shift, harvesting approximately 1,100 head per day, five to six days per week.

1 Livestock Receiving

Result

1.1	Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters.	25
Comment: Transportation humane handling requirements were detailed in the Cattle Transportation Guidelines. Transporters were required to be trained on the site's Animal Welfare Program and take an Animal Handling Verification Quiz. Training and assessments were reviewed and complied with site guidelines. Transporters were required to be TBQA certified.		
1.2	Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level.	25
Comment: Five commercial pot belly trailers were evaluated during unloading, all containing 29 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 required to be cleaned weekly at a minimum or between loads as needed. Trailers were constructed with slip-resistant floors, and injury points were not observed

1.4	Ramps, unloading area, and scales should be slip resistant, ≤ 20° 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 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. 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: < or = 1% falls = 90 pts Unacceptable: > 1% falls = 0 pts	100
------------	--	-----

Comment: Falls and slips were not identified on the 145 head observed during unloading.
0/145 = 0%

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

Comment: Electric prods were not permitted during unloading. Raddle paddles were observed to be used in a non-contact manner to encourage cattle movement

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. 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.	25

Comment: The Non-Ambulatory Disabled Cattle SOP outlined immobile and fatigued animals. Trained employees used Jarvis, hand-held stunner for the euthanasia of non-ambulatory animals on trailers and in unloading areas.

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: Staging of dead carcasses was out of public view; such animals were tracked on the Non-Ambulatory Disabled Cattle Log that was presented as verification.

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. 25
 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

Comment: The Emergency Livestock Plan was in place for long and short-term and long-term breakdowns, including weather events, scheduling errors, plant breakdowns, accidents, and natural disasters. The plan identified how feed and water were provided, the use of backup generators, housing in the event of uninhabitable situations, animal evacuations, and alternative offsite unloading locations.

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 64°F during the audit, with clear skies. Pens were equipped with shade covers and sprinklers, turned on at 80F or if animals showed signs of heat stress. If an animal was stressed or overheated, it was handled according to the BQA Master Transporter Guide and allowed a rest period.

3.3 Pens, drive alley, circle pens, and other areas where animals walk must have slip resistant floors to minimize the risk of falls. 25
 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.)

Comment: Pens and drive alleys comprised pipe fencing and grooved concrete flooring that was in good condition; pens were cleaned between groups of cattle. Manure buildup, standing water, injury points, or distractions were not observed.

3.4 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
 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

Comment: The 100 head observed moving from the crowd pen to the restrainer did not slip or fall.
 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. 25
 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.

Comment: Flags/bags on a stick and raddle paddles were used non-contact to move cattle. The site did not utilize vibrating prods.

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. 25
 Crowd pen should be under $\frac{3}{4}$ full and crowd gate should not be used to forcibly push animals.

Comment: Holding pens were not overcrowded, and the crowd pen was under $\frac{3}{4}$ full when observed. Gates were not used to push animals.

3.8 Animals must have unrestricted access to potable water in pens. Water cannot be frozen. 100
 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.

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

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: Grooved concrete and stepped flooring leading up to the restrainer were in good condition and were free of manure buildup, injury points, standing water, or distractions. Rearing or struggling 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: Jarvis pneumatic captive bolt stunners were used for primary stunning and security knocking. Hand-held Jarvis stunners were available for backup stunning and euthanasia in the barns and on trailers. Ammunition was stored in a sealed plastic bag. Stunning equipment was cleaned, inspected, and test-fired each day of use. Inspections were recorded on the maintenance forms. The site used a center track restrainer. Air-injected stunning was not utilized.

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: The 100 head of cattle observed were rendered insensible on the first stunning 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: The 100 head of cattle observed were properly rendered insensible prior to hanging on the bleed rail.

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: The Animal Welfare Mission Statement was communicated through postings in the barn and explained the humane handling of cattle throughout the entire process.

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: The Animal Welfare Program outlined the monitoring and measurement of animal handling, stunning practices, and outcomes. Each of the seven core criteria was in place and included effective receiving, stunning, bleed rail insensibility, slipping and falling, vocalization, electric prod use, willful acts of abuse, and access to water. Animal handling and stunning audits were completed daily. Completed documents from April to September 2023 were reviewed and evidenced compliance.

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 included a combination of training videos and plant policy training. Training topics included but were not limited to cattle handling, stunning, and euthanasia, including handling a sensible animal on the bleed rail, water requirements, cattle held over 24 hours, and non-ambulatory and fatigued cattle handling. The training was conducted during new hire orientation and annual refresher training. Records from YTD 2023 evidenced program compliance.

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, Rudy Hernandez, do not have a conflict of interest with this auditee.