

Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

CS Beef Packers, LLC 17365 South Cole Road Kuna, Idaho 83634

Audit Date: July 19, 2022 Auditor: Enma Marroquin

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:	CS Beef Packers, LLC	Company ID:	AUCAVKUN
Address:	17365 South Cole Road Kuna, Idaho 83634		

Contact Name:	Kyle Hand
Contact Phone Number:	208-810-7510, x 7533
Contact Email Address:	kyle.hand@csbeef.com

Audit ID:	AO-003982
Audit Date:	July 19, 2022
Audit Type:	Annual audit
Audit Result:	Passed

Auditor Name:	Enma Marroquin
Auditor Phone Number:	559-212-8550
Auditor Email Address:	enma.marroquin@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	465	475	97.89
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

4 Lead-up and Stunning Area

Beef Animal Welfare

** 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 < or = 1% vocalize 100 pts Head Restrainer < or = 5% vocalize 90 pts Unacceptable > 5% vocalize 0 pts

Of the 100 animals evaluated from the pens to the restrainer, vocalization was observed with two animals.



Beef Animal Welfare

Score Summary

Result

Score Summary

	# Cattle in Question	Total Cattle Observed	Percent Acceptable
Electric Prodding (prodded) - crowd pen to restrainer	3	100	97%
Vocalization (vocalized)	2	100	98%
Slips (slipped) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	100	100%
Falls (fell) - Unloading	0	100	100%
Falls (fell) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	100	100%
Stunning Accuracy (double stun)	1	100	99%
Insensibility (sensible)	0	100	100%

Audit Outcome

Pass

Comments

The site chain speed was approximately 180 head per hour on one eight hour shift, five days per week.

1 Livestock Receiving

		Result
1.1	Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters.	25
Comment:	Cattle Unloading Procedure stated transportation requirements for haulers. Requirements were posted on signs in the unloading area for drivers.	
1.2	Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level.	25
Comment:	Potbelly style trailers were observed loaded with 30 to 48 animals. Three farm trailers were loaded with 4-17 animals. Trailers had adequate spacing for animals to freely move.	
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



Commont	Transporter requirements indicated that trailers were to be cleaned at least once per week	
Comment.	Transporter requirements indicated that trailers were to be cleaned at least once per week. Signage was posted at entrances directing transporters to nearby trailer wash out facilities. Flooring of all trailers were stamped metal without holes, injury points, and accumulated manure.	
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:	Unloading areas were observed in adequate condition. Ramps were less than or equal to a twenty degree slope. Flooring in the unloading area was comprised of heavily textured concrete with weaved rubber tire mats without injury points or manure. Side walls were comprised of metal gates and sealed concrete observed in adequate condition and without injury points. Ice melt was available for use in winter months to prevent ice build up.	
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	100
Comment:	Of the 94 animals evaluated during unloading, slips or falls were not observed. $0/94 = 0\%$	
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 and were not observed in use. Rattle paddles or a flexible snub ended rods were used in a non contact manner for the unloading of animals. Signs were posted throughout the unloading areas indicating a "No Prod" usage policy was in place.	
2 Non-Ar	nbulatory	
		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:	Non ambulatory and Antemortem Condemned Cattle Procedure defined non ambulatory animals were animals that were not able to rise from a recumbent position. USDA FSIS personnel were notified for antemortem inspection and disposition of the animal. Animals were timely euthanized, verified for insensibility, pithed, denatured, and transported to a secured pen near the unloading area out of public sight. Fatigued animals were segregated and allowed to recover and subjected to antemortem inspection and disposition of the animal.	
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: Animals euthanized on trailers, DOAs, non-ambulatory, and animals euthanized in pens were documented on the Condemned Log including back tag number and reason. Records for April through July 2022 were reviewed and demonstrated compliance. The document included the date, time, animals information, hand stunners that were present and used at euthanizing, and employee euthanizing. Area manager verified the process. Records were provided for review from April through July 2022. Dead animals were taken to a secured pen near the unloading area out of public sight.

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:	Inclement Weather and Emergency Procedure stated mitigation strategies for weather and actions taken in case of electrical power loss. Well water was used for water, and a backup generator were used for power. For fire, animals were loaded and taken to a secured and approved offsite area within 1/4 mile of the site. For short term breakdowns, animals were calmly backed out of the serpentine and crowd pen to the pens. Animals were provided water and if held over twenty-four hours were provided feed. The plant and livestock pens were located on an elevated area of the site. The area has a low historical occurrence of flooding and this combined with the elevated site greatly reduced the risk of potential flooding.	
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:	At the time of the audit, it was 90° F with sunny skies and a light breeze. Animals appeared comfortable with the temperature. Facility required trailers to keep moving for ventilation until scheduled arrival times. Pens were open air and allowed for ventilation in warmer months. Site maintained an alarm system in the livestock yard that signaled yard management when temperatures reached 95 F. At that time, sprinkler systems were started that provided sprinklered water throughout the yard for five minutes per hour to help with keeping livestock cool. Water was provided for animals upon arrival. In winter months, heaters were used in the crowd pen and serpentine areas. Water troughs were equipped with heaters for prevention of freezing.	
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:	Pens, drive alleys, crowd pen, and serpentine flooring was comprised of heavily textured concrete without injury points or accumulated manure. Side walls were comprised of sealed concrete or smooth metal gates without injury points. Lighting was adequate for prevention of distractions and shadows.	
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:	Of the 100 animals observed, no slips or falls were not observed. $0/100=0\%$	
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:	Rattle paddles, flags and tools made of recycled materials were used to drive animals in a non contact manner. Two different types of vibrating prods were observed in use in the serpentine area. Vibrating prods were not observed being used in a jabbing manner and the pointed ends were worn down. Electric prods were used as a last resort.	
3.6	If mounting behaviors are observed the animals that chronically mount are removed from the pen.	25
Comment:	Mounting behaviors were not 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:	Holding pens and crowd pen were observed less than three quarters full. Gates were not observed used to move 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 had unrestricted access to water troughs located in each pen. Troughs were equipped with heaters for prevention of ice formation in winter months. For extended downtimes, animals were calmly backed out of the serpentine and drive alleys to the pens for water access. Portable water troughs were available as needed. Animals held over twenty-four 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 25 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. Comment: Pens, drive alleys, crowd pen, and serpentine flooring was comprised of heavily textured, stamped concrete without injury points or accumulated manure. Side walls were comprised of sealed concrete or smooth metal gates without injury points. Lighting was adequate for prevention of distractions and shadows. Restrainer was center track in design without observed rearing or struggling. Side walls of the restrainer were hydraulic and were able to be adjusted as needed. 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: Three Jarvis pneumatic stunners were used as the primary stunning method. Pneumatic stunners were cleaned, inspected, and maintained on a daily basis. Inspections were documented on the Jarvis Pneumatic Stunning Device Daily Check. Records from May through July 2022 demonstrated compliance. Five individually numbered Jarvis TORO .25 caliber handheld captive bolt guns were used as back up in the knock box, pens, and on trailers. Five handheld stunners were disassembled, cleaned, maintained and test fired on a daily basis. Inspections were documented on the Daily Hand Stunner Cleaning/Maintenance

form. The Nightly Handheld Knocking Gun check was used to document test firing of each of the Jarvis hand held stunners. Guns were stored in a dry area and ammunition stored in a sealed container. Records from May 2022 through the date of the assessment demonstrated compliance. Air injection stunning was not performed.

4.3		nimals ur of production Record percentage of animals uld only be used when necessary and not on the	100
Comment:	Of the 100 animals evaluated from the prodded with an electric prod. $3/100 = 3\%$	pens to the restrainer, three animals were observed	



4.4	Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production		
	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% vocalize100 ptsHead Restrainer < or = 5% vocalize90 ptsUnacceptable > 5% vocalize0 pts		
Comment:	Of the 100 animals evaluated from the pens to the restrainer, vocalization was observed with two animals. Head restraint was not utilized. $2/100=2\%$		
4.5	Chain speed > or =100/hr., evaluate 100 animals Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production	100	
	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:	Security knocks were used for bulls. Stunning personnel communicated when a security knock was made and animals were assessed for insensibility after the initial knock. Out of 100 animals evaluated, one animal was stunned more than once after first stunning attempt. 1/100=1%		
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	100	
	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:	Of the 100 animals evaluated, animals were observed insensible. Animals exhibited a floppy head, flaccid tongue, and absence of rhythmic breathing or eye movement. $0/100 = 0\%$		

5 Management Commitment



		Result
5.1	An animal welfare mission statement is in place and posted or circulated within the facility.	25
Comment:	Humane Handling Mission Statement, dated January 4, 2022, was developed and communicated through posting in unloading and common areas. The Animal Welfare Mission Statement stated that CS Beef Packers took great pride in being stewards of live cattle and strives to competently and consistently produce quality beef products that are 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:	Humane handling audits based on NAMI core and secondary criteria were conducted on twenty head on a daily basis. Areas audited included slips and falls, vocalization, electric prod use, effective stunning, and insensibility. Transportation audits were conducted on a weekly basis based on NAMI core and secondary criteria. Records from July 2022 demonstrated compliance. Cattle Pens Structural Audit was conducted on a weekly basis with work orders generated for deficiencies. Records from July 2022 demonstrated compliance.	
6 Employ	vee 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 was conducted at new hire and on an annual basis at minimum. Topics were based on AMI Guidelines including animal movement, transportation, shackling, stunning, FSIS Directive 6900.2 and insensibility. Training records from all of 2022 through the date of the assessment demonstrated 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 acts of abuse were not observed.

8 Conflict of Interest Declaration



Result

Yes

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

Comment: I, Enma Marroquin, did not have a conflict of interest with this auditee.