

Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

Caviness Packing Company - Hereford 3255 U.S. 60 Hereford, Texas 79045

> Audit Date: September 07, 2022 Auditor: Dennis Willson

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:	Caviness Packing Company - Hereford	Company ID:	AUCAVHER
Address:	3255 U.S. 60 Hereford, Texas 79045		

Contact Name:	Jorge Aleman
Contact Phone Number:	806-357-2443
Contact Email Address:	jorge.aleman@cavinessbeef.com

Audit ID:	AO-004342
Audit Date:	September 07, 2022
Audit Type:	Unannounced
Audit Result:	Passed

Auditor Name:	Dennis Willson
Auditor Phone Number:	
Auditor Email Address:	Dennis.Willson@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

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.

^{**} Denotes a Core Criteria.



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)	1	100	99%
Slips (slipped) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	100	100%
Falls (fell) - Unloading	0	196	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 facility harvested approximately 2,800 cattle per day on two shifts, six days per week. The line speed during observations was approximately 195 cattle per hour.

1 Livestock Receiving

		Result
1.1	Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters.	25
Comment:	The facility's Animal Welfare SOP 5 Cattle Unloading and Program for Transporters defined transporter requirements, including prohibition of electric prod use by drivers and procedures for handling DOAs. Drivers received a copy of the requirements upon arrival.	
1.2	Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level.	25
Comment:	Five commercial potbelly trailers with 40, 43, 40, 38 and 35 cattle were observed. The trailers were not overcrowded.	
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	25



Comment:	Weekly internal trailers audits included assessing trailers for cleanliness, non-slip flooring and potential injury points. Manure could not be above the level of the hoof line. The five trailers observed had stamped metal tread flooring and did not have excessive manure or potential injury points.	
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 facility had two commercial unloading docks. The unloading docks had diamond grooved concrete flooring and sand for traction. Two rows of rebar were on the dock flooring where cattle stepped off trailers. The facility did not have ramps in the unloading area. Excessive manure 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:	100
Comment:	Falls were not observed during unloading of 196 cattle. Two animals from trailer four slipped on the unloading dock immediately after stepping off the trailer. Facility personnel added sand to the area and additional cattle did not slip. 0/196 = 0% (100 points)	
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 used during unloading. Plant personnel were responsible for unloading cattle and used plastic flags on sticks or rattle paddles properly to encourage cattle movement.	
	0/196 = 0%	

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 facility's Animal Welfare SOP 3 Non-Ambulatory and Ante-Mortem Condemned Cattle protocol outlined actions for handling non-ambulatory and fatigued cattle. Non-ambulatory cattle on trailers and in the facility were euthanized where they were found using a penetrating captive bolt gun. Fatigued cattle were segregated into a USDA suspect pen, provided water and allowed to rest until USDA ante mortem inspection occurred. A Bobcat was available onsite for moving fatigued cattle.	
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: Carcasses were staged in a covered pen that was out of public view and picked up several times a week by a rendering truck. An accumulation of carcasses was not observed in the carcass staging area. DOAs, cattle euthanized in pens, and cattle that died at the facility were tracked on the the Outside Livestock Condemned Log. Records dated 8.1.22 to 9.5.22 were reviewed and evidenced compliance with carcass tracking and handling.

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 facility's Animal Welfare SOP 4 Inclement Weather and Emergency protocol outlined actions during events that could cause short or long term production breakdowns. Generators were located onsite to supply power to the stockyards and production floor during a power outage. Water was supplied by the city and was not affected by a power outage. Hay was available onsite for cattle held over 24 hours. Offsite pens owned by the facility were available across the street to hold cattle in the event of an extended breakdown. During short term breakdowns in hot weather, drivers were instructed to keep driving a designated route to maintain trailer airflow. Cattle could be temporarily held at a sheltered location during cold weather.	
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 weather was 80 degrees F and sunny during observations. Cattle in pens appeared comfortable and did not show signs of heat stress. Pens were open to maximize airflow during extreme heat. Sand was used to prevent ice formation in the unloading area, stockyards, and handling facility during freezing temperatures.	
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:	The handling facility had diamond grooved concrete flooring for traction. Pens and the handling facility were cleaned daily and were well maintained during observations. Potential injury points or potential cattle distractions 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 or falls were not observed during handling of 100 cattle from pens, up the drive alley, through the crowd pen, into the single file alley and into the center track conveyor restrainer.	
	0/100 = 0% (100 points)	
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:	Rattle paddles and orange plastic streamers on sticks were used in a low stress manner to encourage cattle to move forward in the handling facility. Vibrating prods were not used.	
3.6	If mounting behaviors are observed the animals that chronically mount are removed from the pen.	25
Comment:	Cattle did not show mounting behaviors during observations. Plant personnel segregated aggressive cattle when problems were observed.	
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:	The facility maintained holding pens at 75% capacity. Pens were not overcrowded during observations. Cattle had room to move around freely and access water. Groups of approximately 10 head were moved through the crowd pen. The crowd pen was under 75% full and the crowd gates were not used to forcibly push cattle.	
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:	Overflow troughs were rinsed daily and deep cleaned weekly. Emergency protocols explained when a breakdown of thirty minutes or more occurred, cattle were backed out of the single file alley area and returned to pens to access water. Cattle held over 24 hours were provided feed.	

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:	The drive alley and single file alley leading into the center track conveyor restrainer had diamond grooved concrete flooring. Excessive manure, potential injury points or potential cattle distractions were not observed. Rearing or struggling in the handling facility and restrainer were minimal.	
4.2	Documented records are available for the maintenance and cleaning of euthanasia tools. 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.	50
Comment:	The facility used Jarvis pneumatic penetrating captive bolt guns for primary stunning and Jarvis .25 caliber handheld cylinder style penetrating captive bolt guns for back up stunning and euthanasia. Guns were disassembled, inspected, cleaned and test fired daily during preventive maintenance tasks. Preventive maintenance records dated July 2022, August 2022 and September 2022 were reviewed and evidenced compliance with the preventive maintenance program. Handheld guns were stored in the Cattle Personnel office and pneumatic guns were stored in a cage near the restrainer and bleed area. Ammunition was stored in airtight containers when not in use. The facility used a center track conveyor restrainer with adjustable side restraints. The facility did not use air injected stunners.	
4.3	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 = $\le 5\%$ prodded 100 pts Acceptable = $\le 25\%$ prodded 90 pts Not acceptable = $> 25\%$ prodded 0 pts Knock box with head restrainer:	100
Comment:	An electric prod was not used during handling of 100 cattle from pens, up the drive alley, through the crowd pen, into the single file alley and into the center track conveyor restrainer.	
	0/100 = 0% (100 points)	



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 \leq 1% vocalize 100 pts Acceptable \leq 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: One animal out of 100 vocalized in the restrainer.

1/100 = 1% (100 points)

4.5 Chain speed > or =100/hr., evaluate 100 animals

100

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 \leq 1% double stunned 100 pts

Acceptable \leq 4% double stunned 90 pts

Unacceptable > 4% double stunned 0 pts

Comment: The 100 cattle observed were instantly rendered insensible by a single shot with a Jarvis

pneumatic penetrating captive bolt gun. The cattle showed instant collapse and no signs of

sensibility.

0/100 = 0% (100 points)

4.6 Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals

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 cattle observed were insensible. The cattle had floppy heads, flaccid tongues and

no natural eye movements.

100/100 = 100% (100 points)



5 Management Commitment

		Result
5.1	An animal welfare mission statement is in place and posted or circulated within the facility.	25
Comment:	The facility's Animal Welfare Mission Statement was posted in employee common areas and was covered in training. The statement explained the facility took great pride in being stewards of live cattle and strived to competently and consistently produce quality beef products derived from humanely handled livestock.	
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:	Transportation and animal welfare audits were conducted weekly and were based on NAMI core and secondary criteria. Daily monitoring was conducted to verify water availability in pens and that maintenance was performed on both pneumatic and handheld captive bolt guns. Drive alleys and pens were inspected weekly to verify cleanliness and conditions of flooring, gates, water troughs and pens. Audits were conducted on 100 cattle weekly for stunning effectiveness, insensibility, falls during unloading, falls in the handling facility, vocalizations in the restrainer and electric prod use. Trailer audits were conducted weekly for 100 cattle minimum on NAMI criteria. Audits reviewed for August 2022 and September 2022 evidenced compliance with program requirements.	

6 Employee Training

Result 75 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.

Comment: Training was conducted at hire, annually and as needed using the Alchemy software program. Training included plant policies and watching animal handling videos by Dr. Temple Grandin. Training included handling a sensible animal on the bleed rail. Employees responsible for euthanasia were trained annually. The most recent annual training occurred on 6.03.22. Training records were current for 2022.

7 Acts of Abuse

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 eves. 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.

Result

No



Comment: Willful acts of abuse 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, Dennis Willson, do not have a conflict of interest with this auditee.