



Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

Missouri Prime Beef Packers
5305 Highway H
Pleasant Hope, Missouri 65725

Audit Date: March 21, 2023
Auditor: Tamara DeFord

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:	Missouri Prime Beef Packers	Company ID:	AUMISPRI
Address:	5305 Highway H Pleasant Hope, Missouri 65725		

Contact Name:	Megan McLaughlin
Contact Phone Number:	970-443-7282
Contact Email Address:	mmclaughlin@mpbeef.com

Audit ID:	AO-005823
Audit Date:	March 21, 2023
Audit Type:	Unannounced
Audit Result:	Passed

Auditor Name:	Tamara DeFord
Auditor Phone Number:	(210) 606-8735
Auditor Email Address:	tamara.deford@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	340	350	97.14
Lead-up and Stunning Area	475	475	100.00
Management Commitment	50	50	100.00
Employee Training	75	75	100.00
Overall Score	1,215	1,225	99.18

** 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

3 Holding and Handling

Beef Animal Welfare

**** Falls - Holding pen to restrainer** 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

One fall and two slips were observed on the 100 head assessed at lead up to the restrainer.

$1/100 = 1\%$

Beef Animal Welfare

Score Summary

Result

Score Summary

	# Cattle in Question	Total Cattle Observed	Percent Acceptable
Electric Prodding (prodded) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	100	100
Vocalization (vocalized)	0	100	100
Slips (slipped) - crowd pen to restrainer	2	100	98
Falls (fell) - Unloading	0	209	100
Falls (fell) - crowd pen to restrainer	1	100	99
Stunning Accuracy (double stun)	0	100	100
Insensibility (sensible)	0	100	100

Audit Outcome

Pass

Comments

The site harvested approximately 750 head per day of cull cows and bulls on a single production shift, five days per week at a chain speed of 130 head per hour.

1 Livestock Receiving

Result

1.1	Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters.	25
Comment: The Animal Welfare Policy for Transportation (4/18/2022) outlined transportation requirements for the site. Drivers were required to be BQA trained and adhere to governmental regulations.		
1.2	Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level.	25
Comment: Load density was referenced under IAW the FASS (Federation of Animal Sciences Societies) and AMI guidelines. The five trucks observed at unloading held 33 to 55 head, and were compliant with recommendations. 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 as needed, but no less than weekly. Excessive manure accumulation was not noted on the trailers watched at unloading. Trailers were constructed with slip resistant floors and injury points 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 area was even with trailer decks when backed in. Injury points, manure accumulation, and gaps were not observed. Flooring was slip resistant with corn stalks, saw dust, and wood shavings for additional traction.

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: Slips or falls were not observed on the 209 animals assessed 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: Use of electric prods was not permitted during the unloading process. Employees used flags during unloading to move animals.

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 Animal Welfare Procedure Non-Ambulatory Animal Knocking (4/18/2022) defined non ambulatory animals that could not rise on their own power were euthanized in place without moving the animal or attempting to drive it. This included animals down in the pens, drive alleys, chutes, or on trucks at delivery. Animals were stunned with a hand held captive bolt gun, and a safety knock applied. Zylazine could be used under veterinarian direction to ensure the safety of personnel and stock. Provisions were outlined for segregation of stressed or over heated animals to allow the potential for recovery by separation and observation.

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: Dead animals were staged adjacent to the pens in an area that was outside of public view. DOAs and animals that were euthanized or died on site were tracked on the Livestock Report which was reviewed from January 2023.

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 Plan for Animals were outlined in the Animal Welfare Policy (4/18/2022) and included specified actions taken in event of adverse weather conditions, diversion of cattle in transit, evacuation of cattle onsite that could not be slaughtered, emergency overnight plans for animals that could not be removed in a timely manner, and handling of animals loaded on inoperable trucks. Provisions included how animals could be diverted if in transit, removed from the site if necessary, and cared for if at the plant. The plan included access to feed, water, and shelter. In lieu of a generator the site would transport cattle offsite to a nearby feedlot.

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: Conditions at the time of the audit were 52°F with light wind and drizzle. Animals were observed calm, laying down or standing, in an unstressed manner. Pens were covered and had curtain drop sides, stir fans, and misters for ventilation and temperature control.

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 were grooved concrete that was bedded with wood shavings, corn stalks, and saw dust. Pens were cleaned minimally every two weeks with a loader and re-bedded as needed. Pen condition was acceptable without excess manure, and standing water was not present at the time of the assessment. Potential injury points were not identified in pens or alleys, and distractions such as shadows or noises were not noted.

3.4 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
 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: One fall and two slips were observed on the 100 head assessed at lead up to the restrainer.

1/100 = 1%

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 included flags on sticks, and rattle paddles. Tools were used in an appropriate manner. Vibrating prods were not utilized at the site.		
3.6	If mounting behaviors are observed the animals that chronically mount are removed from the pen.	25
Comment: Excessive mounting behaviors were not observed. The site's animal welfare policy stated that such animals would be segregated.		
3.7	Holding pens should not appear overcrowded. Crowd pen should be under ¾ full and crowd gate should not be used to forcibly push animals.	25
Comment: Holding pens were not overcrowded and animals had access to water. Animals were not pushed with gates. The crowd pen was under 3/4 full.		
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 in holding pens. Troughs were cleaned weekly and were heated to prevent freezing in winter. If held in the drive alley more than 30 minutes, animals were provided water through hose filled troughs. Feed was provided if animals were held over 24 hours.		

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: Floors were with grooved concrete with rebar mesh reinforcement and were cleaned daily. Manure accumulation, injury points, and standing water was not observed. Rearing and struggling was minimal.		

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: Air injected stunning was not utilized. Box restrainer with head restraint was used for the knocking of cattle. Jarvis pneumatic captive bolt guns were used for primary euthanasia and Jarvis hand held pneumatic captive bolt guns were used for back up. A shotgun was utilized for euthanasia when needed in the pens. Euthanasia equipment was cleaned, disassembled, inspected, and test fired each day of operations. Inspections for the pneumatic captive bolt guns were recorded on the Pneumatic Knocking Gun Test Log. Hand held captive bolt gun inspections were recorded on the Gun Maintenance record. Completed records reviewed for November and December 2022 indicated compliance.

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: Animals were not prodded during observation of 100 animals evaluated during one hour of production.

0/100 = 0% prodded.

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 total of 100 animals were evaluated during one hour of production. Vocalization was not detected.

0/100 = 0% vocalized

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: A total of 100 animals were evaluated during one hour of production. Animals were rendered insensible with the initial shot. After verification of insensibility, a security knock was administered.

0/100 = 0% double knock

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: A total of 100 animals were evaluated during one hour of production. Each of the animals were insensible on the rail.

0/100 = 0% sensible

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 (1/01/2021) outlined the company commitment to ensuring the humane treatment, handling, and harvest of animals at all times. The policy was communicated during animal welfare training and was posted in several locations in the facility.

		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: The individual components of animal handling from receiving through insensibility were monitored by FSQA and operations daily and weekly. The assessment was outlined from Appendix IV. Documents from the most recent 3 months were available for review and observed completed per outlined 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: The training manuals separated training procedures into each component of animal handling from receiving, through movement, assessment of condition, holding, moving, lead up, stunning, and insensibility. A hand stunner was positioned by the sticker and employees in that area were trained to identify a sensible animal and promptly stun it. Training was performed at employment and retraining was conducted annually. Records from quarterly trainings completed in January 2023 were reviewed and observed current.

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, Tamara Deford, do not have a conflict of interest with this auditee and the audit has been carried out independently and impartially.