



Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

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

Audit Date: August 06, 2024
Auditor: Michael Sanders

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-009057 |
| Audit Date: | August 06, 2024 |
| Audit Type: | Unannounced |
| Audit Result: | Passed |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Auditor Name: | Michael Sanders |
| Auditor Phone Number: | 214-972-7736 |
| Auditor Email Address: | mike.sanders@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 | 475 | 475 | 100.00 |
| Management Commitment | 50 | 50 | 100.00 |
| Employee Training | 75 | 75 | 100.00 |
| Overall Score | 1,225 | 1,225 | 100.00 |

** 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.

Beef Animal Welfare

** 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.

Score Summary

| | # Cattle in Question | Total Cattle Observed | Percent Acceptable |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Electric Prodding (prodded) - crowd pen to restrainer | 0 | 100 | 100% |
| Vocalization (vocalized) | 1 | 100 | 99% |
| Slips (slipped) - crowd pen to restrainer | 0 | 100 | 100% |
| Falls (fell) - Unloading | 0 | 166 | 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 of cattle daily on one shift of operations. Line speed was 156 head per hour.

1 Livestock Receiving

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| 1 | Livestock Receiving | |
| 1.1 | Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters. | 25 |
| Comment: | Transporter expectations were in the Animal Welfare Manual. Expectations were based on the National Beef Quality Assurance Master Cattle Transporter Guide. | |
| 1.2 | Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level. | 25 |
| Comment: | Trailers observed carried between 30-36 head of fed market cattle. 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 daily. Floors were stamped steel. Excessive manure accumulation or damage 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 ramp was level and was covered with weaved rubber matting. Manure, damage, 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. 100
- Excellent: No falls = 100 pts
 Acceptable: < or = 1% falls = 90 pts
 Unacceptable: > 1% falls = 0 pts

Comment: Falls or slips were not observed out of the 166 head evaluated during unloading.

- 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: Electrical prods were not used during unloading.

2 Non-Ambulatory

2 Non-Ambulatory

- 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: Non-Ambulatory Animals on Truck policy addressed immobile and fatigued animals on trailers. Animals that could not walk off the trailer under their own power were euthanized with a hand held captive bolt gun, denatured, and sent to the landfill.

- 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 and animals that died in pens were staged near the unloading dock which was out of public view. Dead animals were denatured and disposed to the landfill.

3 Holding and Handling

3 Holding and Handling

- 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: Emergency Livestock Management Plan explained procedures for managing emergency situations like loss of power at the plant or other reasons for extended downtime. Animals could be returned to the company feedlot which was approximately a half hour drive from the site. Pens could hold approximately 700 head.

- 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: Ambient air temperature during the audit was 101°F. Pens were covered with shade cloth and equipped with sprinklers which were used when temperatures exceeded 85°F. Cold temperatures were not a concern due to the geographical location of the site.

- 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: Pen floors, the surge pen, and drive alley floors were grooved concrete. There was no damage, poor lighting, or animal distractions 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: Slips or falls were not observed out of the 100 head evaluated from the holding pens to the restrainer.

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 on the ends of sticks and rattle paddles were used to move animals. Tools were observed used correctly.

3.6 If mounting behaviors are observed the animals that chronically mount are removed from the pen. 25

Comment: Chronic mounting was not observed. Company policy was to segregate such animals.

3.7 Holding pens should not appear overcrowded. 25
 Crowd pen should be under ¾ full and crowd gate should not be used to forcibly push animals.

Comment: Holding pens were approximately half full. Surge pens were approximately half full. Gates were 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. 100
 Animals must have access to feed if held over 24 hours.

Comment: Water was available and accessible in each pen. Troughs appeared clean. Feed was available onsite in the event animals were held over 24 hours.

4 Lead-up and Stunning Area

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: Pen floors were grooved concrete and were clean. There was no observed manure accumulation, damage, or distractions.

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 had a center track restrainer and used Jarvis pneumatic captive bolt guns for primary euthanasia and Jarvis .25 Magnum hand held captive bolt guns for back up. Euthanasia equipment was cleaned, inspected, and velocity tested each day of use. Inspections were recorded on Pneumatic Stunner PM Log and Knocking Gun Test Log, respectively. Ammunition for hand held captive bolt guns were kept in a sealable plastic container with a desiccant pack.

4.3 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 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 prods were not used out of 100 animals observed from the pens to the restrainer. 0/100=100%

4.4 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

 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: A single animal vocalized in the restrainer area out of the 100 head evaluated. 1/100=1%

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 of the 100 head evaluated for stunning efficacy was rendered insensible with a single attempt. 0/100=100%



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 of the 100 animals evaluated for insensibility was observed insensible prior to shackling and hanging. 0/100=100%

5 Management Commitment

5 Management Commitment

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

Comment: The Animals Welfare Mission Statement explained the site's commitment to humane treatment of animals. The policy was communicated to staff during new hire and annual refresher training.

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 audits were conducted daily and weekly to evaluate core and secondary handling and transportation criteria. Audits were conducted on site and using video monitoring.

6 Employee Training

6 Employee Training

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: Animal welfare awareness training was conducted for all staff at hire and annually. Job specific animal welfare training was conducted for employees with handling duties. The most recent training was conducted 2/13/24. Training was conducted annually.

7 Acts of Abuse



7 Acts of Abuse

7.1 A willful act of abuse is automatic grounds for an audit failure. No
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.

Comment: Willful abusive acts were not observed.

8 Conflict of Interest Declaration

8 Conflict of Interest Declaration

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

Comment: Michael Sanders
