

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
15	M889A	J.F. O'Neill Packing Co. Inc.	DSC541307 5531G	2017-07-31	On July 31, 2017 at approximately 1300, I (b)(6) discussed my humane handling concerns with (b)(6) regarding the use of the hydraulic push gate in the knock box. Throughout the day, I observed approximately 15 bovines slaughtered under the religious Kosher exemption. The animals entered the knock box and went directly into the head restrainer, while the hydraulic rear push gate was simultaneously brought down to crowd the animal into the head restrainer. Approximately six of the observed 15 animals ended up into a dog sitting position with their head caught in the head restrainer due to the hydraulic push gate overcrowding them. Two of the six animals vocalized when in this position. This issue of overcrowding appeared to occur most frequently on longer animals due to less available compression room. Also, the hydraulic push gate does not appear to have the ability to be manually stopped at the operator's discretion. The gate can be stopped at approximately half-way, but once it is past the half-way point it continues to depress.
25	M244	Tyson Fresh Meats, inc.	HKG13170 74411G	2017-07-11	On June 29, 2017 at approximately 2111, while walking towards pen 27 to check slow/downer hogs at establishment M244, I (b)(6) observed a squealing and flailing hog half out of the restrainer and the establishment employee trying to properly place the wands on the hog and failing. I immediately summoned the stopping of the line and had management properly stun the hog. I was unable to determine whether the hog was vocalizing due to a miss-stun attempt or because of the physical constraints. During the ten minutes of down time, I discussed my findings with barn management and (b)(6) and (b)(6). They commented that in the case of a "piggyback" hog, the hog underneath is stunned electrically and the one on top is immediately captive bolted, and that what I had observed was an improper execution of their past practices. I told management I would inform my proper superiors and document my findings on an MOI. Management informed me a meeting would be held after shift that night. I then allowed them to resume normal operations. The establishment is invited to add corrective actions/preventative measures: On June 30, 2017, at 2119 while performing HATS tasks VIII and IX, I was able to observe the establishment's change in stunning execution: they allowed more spacing between hogs, stunner operators appeared more alert and on task, and standby employees were stationed to observe the stunning process and prepared to administer a captive bolt stun in any circumstance if necessary.

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
25	M244W	Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc.	BTD400107 2421G	2017-07-21	<p>At approximately 22:15 on 7-19-17, while performing antemortem inspection (HATS category IV) on pen 20, I observed a hog with a 2-3cm piece of wire sticking straight out of its mouth. A team member isolated the hog, and I was able to grab and remove the item from its mouth. There was no bleeding, and the hog did not appear distressed. The wire was approximately 25cm long, 2mm diameter, and slightly bent. The end that had been swallowed was tipped with a 1-2mm, pink, fleshy piece of tissue. I showed it to (b)(6) and (b)(6). The hog, tattooed 832, was part of an (b) (4) Load (b)(6). Shortly thereafter, I observed another slightly longer piece of the same type of wire on the ground in the walkway between the large scale and a "shipper" pen (not in an area that hogs move through). I showed it to (b)(6), and she immediately picked it up. After checking with a (b)(6) told me that the wire was filling rod, used in welding repairs in this establishment. He said that maintenance team members would be retrained. I informed (b)(6) that the incident would be documented on an MOI: it is the responsibility of the establishment to maintain pens, driveways, and ramps in good repair, free from sharp or protruding objects which may cause injury or pain to the animals (9CFR 313.1 (a)). On 7-20-17, at the start of B Shift, I was in the barn to perform antemortem inspection when a team member picked up and discarded a longer piece (approximately 40cm) of filling rod from the walkway along the west drive alley. The team member pointed out another piece of the same material in the walkway. Both pieces were bent on one end into a hook shape. I gave the items to (b)(6).</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
25	M410	Green Bay Dressed Beef, LLC	IIF3510070 325G	2017-07-25	<p>On Saturday, July 15, 2007 at approximately 1508 hours while performing the HATS activity to verify stunning effectiveness, (b)(6) observed an establishment employee apply a stunning blow to a Holstein steer with a pneumatic stunning gun. Following the blow, (b)(6) saw the steer blink. The establishment employee immediately applied another stunning blow. (b)(6) saw the steer blink again. Without direction from (b)(6), the establishment employee then promptly delivered a third stunning blow, and the steer did not blink again. All blows were delivered with the same pneumatic stunning gun. (b)(6) verbally instructed establishment employees to suspend stunning so the situation could be investigated and did not apply a Retain/Reject tag to the entrance of the knock box. (b)(6) called for (b)(6) and (b)(6) to come to the stunning area. (b)(6), and (b)(6) also arrived at the stunning area. Because of the design of the knocking box and head restrainer, (b)(6) could not adequately assess other signs of consciousness (e.g., floppiness of the head and ears, collapse of the body, menace response, tracking of the eye) when the blows were being delivered. The animal did not vocalize during this process. Upon consultation with (b)(6) it was decided this was not a regulatory non-compliance. The establishment replaced the pneumatic stunning gun with a back-up pneumatic stunning gun, and stunning was allowed to resume. The steer's head was identified and examined after the hide was removed. A single large knock hole was present and appeared to be appropriately placed within the 'kill zone' on the skull. It was unclear, though, if all blows reached the brain, since establishment employees had not split the skull to view the brain at that time. On Monday, July 17, 2007, (b)(6) informed (b)(6) and (b)(6) that a Maintenance Department employee had disassembled the pneumatic stunning gun used on Saturday and had discovered a broken piece within the gun. (b)(6) met with the Maintenance employee who explained that a broken bolt likely allowed air to escape from the gun, possibly reducing the pressure that drives the stunning rod into the skull. The stunning gun was to be rebuilt that day and fully tested before being returned to service. On Tuesday, July 18, 2007, (b)(6) met again with (b)(6) and (b)(6) to discuss the stunning event that occurred on Saturday. While the initial stun resulted in unconsciousness, the employee continued to stun until all signs of consciousness were absent. (b)(6) noted that the establishment does have a hand-held captive bolt gun available as a back-up device immediately available in the knocking box, but it was not used in this case. This situation reveals a potential vulnerability in the implementation of the humane handling program. (b)(6) stated that establishment management would discuss and consider this point in the stunning process. (b)(6) informed (b)(6) and (b)(6) that all discussions pertaining to Saturday's event would be documented in a Memorandum of Interview.</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
35	M31965	Triumph Foods	NM05721 070821G	2017-07-21	<p>At approximately 2000 hours, (b)(6) and (b)(6) met briefly to discuss the following incident: At 1938 hours on Friday July 21, 2017 (b)(6) was performing HATS Category II: Truck Unloading and observed the following concern. A truck driver unloading the nose on the bottom tier of a cattle pot trailer became increasingly aggressive with the hogs that were balking and refusing to exit via the unimpeded ramp. At first the driver used a rattle paddle to make repeated but appropriate contact with the rear and flanks of the hogs, but then proceeded to lean into the compartment and make contact with the heads and faces of the animals in sharp motions. (b)(6) informed establishment (b)(6) who was present next to him that he was not comfortable with the behavior and it should cease. (b)(6) told the truck driver to stop, and he complied and ceased interacting with the animals in the nose and began to drive the remaining animals in the belly of the trailer out in an appropriate manner. (b)(6) examined the hogs and there were no signs of injury or excessive excitement from the incident. (b)(6) instructed the driver to exit the trailer and unloaded the hogs in the nose and the upper level of the trailer without incident. (b)(6) conferred with (b)(6) about the incident. (b)(6) discussed the incident and concerns with (b)(6) that the concern would be documented as MOI.</p>
50	M51187	Pataskala Meats	000291207 3306G	2017-07-06	<p>Establishment Personnel: Mr. Kirk Hall, owner USDA: (b)(6), (b)(6) I reviewed the follow observations and incidents with (b)(6): On 6/29/17 at an estimated time of 1045 hours, a pig was left in the knock box unattended for a few minutes to finish the last goat on the kill floor. The pig knocked one of the two barrels over and was attempting to climb over the barrel. The pig was attended to immediately and showed no signs of injury. (b)(6) said he would not leave a pig in the knock box again with the barrels. I want to emphasize that a pig should not be left alone in the knock box again with the barrels to prevent potential injury to the pig. On 7/6/17 at approximately 0616 hours, a goat was tied to a bar in the knock box and left unattended. (b)(6) and (b)(6) discussed with (b)(6), at the time, that a goat cannot be left in the knock box with the halter tied to the bars unattended due to potential for accidental injury. A goat can be left in the knock box unattended as long as it is not tied up and there are no objects for it to injury itself on in the knock box. On 7/6/17 at approximately 1029 hours, the last goat of the day was shot twice. After the first shot, no signs of consciousness were observed, but it was concerning that the eye was bleeding. The owner followed up with a second shot due to the concern. On evaluation of the skull, there was blood staining and damage to a 2cm section of skull behind the right horn and damage to the cornea of the right eye. There was blood staining in a second location behind the head in the center between the ears. I discussed with the owner that this does not represent a noncompliance. I emphasized that he needs to make sure animals are stunned with one shot. It is important to ensure and improve upon accuracy as the requirement is that an animal is stunned with a single shot prior to being shackled, hoisted, cut or bleed.</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
50	M31578	Trenton Processing Center, Inc.	LKK121307 5321G	2017-07-21	(b)(6) and (b)(6) discussed an issue that is of concern , This concerns proper handling of livestock, during the kill period on 7/21/17 , (b)(6) and (b)(6) noticed that the gatepole closest to the outside exit to the holding pens has a sharp edge on the bottom edge of it , in which can possibly create injury , in addition we also witnessed a trailer being off loaded and not square , leaving a gap that could have potentially harmed the animal or allowed for escape of the animal. This is a concern that needs attention in a timely manner. Both of these issues are explained in Regulation 313.1(a)
60	M9443	LaRue Meat Processing	GGE45090 75025G	2017-07-25	Memorandum of Interview July 25, 2017 Today, July 25, 2017, at approximately 0845 hours, I verbally notified Mr. Luke Sredy, the establishment manager, that I had taken a regulatory control action in the stunning area for improper stunning resulting in egregious inhumane treatment of a steer. I also informed Mr. Sredy that I was contacting the Philadelphia District Office to discuss the regulatory control action and further enforcement actions. At approximately 0830 hours today, (b)(6) and I were observing the stunning of a large steer. The establishment manager, Luke Sredy, loaded the captive bolt and applied a stun to the beef animal in the stun chute. The steer immediately dropped in the chute and quickly rolled into the cutting area. The beef was then shackled and hoisted. At this point, (b)(6) and I observed the steer begin to rhythmically breath and blink its eye. The establishment stuck the animal and it began to vocalize and attempt to right itself. The establishment manager immediately reloaded the captive bolt and applied two additional stuns which were ineffective at rendering the animal unconscious. At this point, the establishment retrieved a .22 caliber rifle and applied a final stun which rendered the animal unconscious. I instructed the establishment employees to halt slaughter operations immediately. (b)(6) and I tagged the entrance of the stun chute with U.S. Rejected tag #A6910155 to halt the slaughter process. The establishment does not currently have a Robust Systematic Approach to Humane Handling Program. (b)(6) (b)(6)
90	M7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK0915071 617G	2017-07-17	On July 17, 2017, at approximately 1:22 PM ET, while conducting HATS Category 8 (Stunning Effectiveness) verification, the Consumer Safety Inspector (CSI) observed the following: an establishment employee at M7356 stunned the 4th cow by captive bolt. The cow went down in the chute as if it was unconscious and employees raised the chute door and shackled the back legs and hoisted the cow into the air. The CSI observed that the cow began vocalizing and moving its head side to side. It tried to right itself. The CSI also observed natural blinking and coordinated eye movement. An establishment employee delivered a second stun attempt by captive bolt approximately 2 minutes following the first attempt. The second stun attempt rendered the animal unconscious and insensible. The CSI tagged the chute at 2:00 PM ET with USDA Retain/Reject Tag B19167822 and notified the owner Dave Harmon of the incident.

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
15	M969	Swift Beef Company	UOA1709094809G	09SEP2017	<p>On Wednesday, September 6, 2017, the FSIS Public Health Veterinarian (PHV) documented in a Memorandum of Information the following event at establishment M 969 JBS Swift Beef: At approximately 0828 hours while performing a routine humane handling assessment at M 969, JBS Swift Beef the PHV observed the knocker attempt to stun a beef animal with a pneumatic captive bolt. The PHV observed that it appeared to glance off of its head but was unsure if it made contact. The same employee attempted two more stunning attempts with the a pneumatic captive bolt where the animal was obviously conscious, vocalizing, head and legs thrashing before rendering it unconscious on the final attempt. All attempts occurred in rapid succession. During this time the employee demonstrated that he either did not have the knowledge or else the initiative to try and secure the animal for a successful attempt which was evident because of the actions of other employees who stop the rotating belly belt, squeeze the chute or try to get the animals attention. The PHV inspected the head once it was unconscious, shackled and hanging and could verify 4 knock holes. The line was immediately stopped and the PHV discussed the situation with the (b) (6).</p> <p>After conferring with Deputy District Manager Robert Reeder the PHV applied a US Rejected/Retained tag B41992386 to the pneumatic captive bolt at approximately 0928 hours and notified (b) (6). (b) (6) completed the Certified Stunner Training Program on 6-8-2017 which was verified through signed documents presented by (b) (6). M 969 JBS Swift Beef does have a robust Humane Handling Program.</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
15	M630	CS Beef Packers, LLC	KJN571209 0021G	21SEP2017	<p>On September 20, 2017, at approximately 1210 hours while performing ante-mortem inspection (HATS Category IV) at Est. 630, (b) (6), noticed a semi-truck/trailer pulling up at the unloading dock. While she was performing ante-mortem inspection of cattle in several pens five head of Holstein cows were unloaded from the tail section of the trailer. By the time the ante-mortem inspections were completed, (b) (6) was at the truck and called out for (b) (6) and (b) (6) to come over to the semi-truck. (b) (6) explained that there were possibly six head of Holstein down in the belly section of the trailer with one of the down animals blocking the stairs up out of the trailer belly. The immediate plan was to knock the one animal blocking the stairs as in appeared she would probably be unable to rise unassisted and pull her off of the trailer. He believed the cow lying down next to the first one would be able to get up on her own when the first one was out of the way. He wasn't sure of the condition of the other cattle that were lying down. (b) (6) looked through the left side of the trailer and concurred with (b) (6) assessment regarding the first two head of cattle. She also observed a cow lying down on the right side of the trailer with another cow straddling her. On the left side of the trailer immediately adjacent to the first cow were two more cows – one lying completely on top of another cow; the cow on the bottom was not moving and exhibited no respiratory signs. At 1222 hours (b) (6) proceeded to knock and stick the cow blocking the stairs and had her pulled out of the trailer; the second cow was able to rise unassisted and exited the trailer. The standing cow that was straddling the cow lying down on the right side of the trailer stepped over the cow under it with one back foot and on the cow – in the flank area - with the second back foot; in (b) (6) opinion there was no way the cow straddling the other cow could have been prevented from stepping over/on the cow on the floor without endangering a person. Once that cow had exited the belly of the trailer, (b) (6) knocked the cow on the left side trailer which was on top of the other cow at 1235 hours and the cow on the right side of the trailer at 1236 hours; he verified that the cow under the cow knocked at 1235 hours was dead. The two cows on the left side of the trailer were pulled out and the rest of the cows in the belly were unloaded without issue. After the upper deck cows were unloaded - the last cow came off of the trailer at approximately 1255 hours – the remaining dead cow in the belly was pulled off of the truck. All four dead cows were ante-mortem condemned and Z-tags issued; a plant employee denatured all four carcasses. At 1331 hours (b) (6) notified (b) (6) and (b) (6) by email of the incident. Since (b) (6) was in travel status she notified (b) (6) and Dr. Reeder (DDM) who reviewed the above narrative. After discussion which included input from (b) (6), the decision was made at approximately 1620 hours to issue an MOI to document the incident. (b) (6) then notified plant management by phone of the decision to issue an MOI and that she would issue the MOI on Thursday, 9/21/2017.</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
25	M85O	Swift Pork Company	HEM45190 95923G	23SEP2017	<p>On 09/23/17 I, (b) (6) started the day off by verifying the Ottumwa Hot Weather Action Plan in place at Est. M85O, JBS, Ottumwa. At 1548 I noticed all three docks with trucks backed in and another truck driving through the parking lot full of hogs like it was going to back in but turned around and went back in the opposite direction. I walked around the corner towards the guard shack and noticed a parked truck across the fence in the Parks lot full of hogs. At 1556 I walked back to where I started and noticed the truck I had seen at 1548 parked in front of 4 inoperable fans. I also observed 3 trucks to be waiting in line past the guard shack with their fans operating. At 1603 (b) (6) arrived on the scene and I shared my findings with him and that I would be documenting a MOI for the establishment's failure to comply with the aforementioned plan. In the JBS Swine Well-Being Requirements handbook: page 24/number 7 states (b) (4) At 1745 while reviewing the establishments Robust Humane Handling Plan I noticed a form entitled 'Wapello County Hot Weather Action Plan/Fan Audit Form (WCHWAP/FAF) with a revision date of 10/25/2015, this evidently being a sample form as it was blank. I noted the form to have the following required sections as follows: date, shift, supervisor/designee, manager signature of verification, 24 periods, each 1 hour long (to account for one calendar day), # of trailers inside the fence waiting to unload, # of trailers outside the fence waiting to unload, are drivers on route? Yes/No, fans running? Yes/No, are water hoses functional? Yes/No, and supervisor/designee initials. I requested to see the records for 09/23/17 and (b) (6) handed me the WCHWAP/FAF. I noticed the form to be a revision dated 09/04/2012 and it did not have the following sections: are water hoses functional? Yes/No and 'are drivers on route' Yes/No. The form was filled out for the time periods from 1100 to 1759. I checked the time period that reflected my findings which on the form were from 1500-1559 and it was documented to have 3 trailers inside the fence and 3 trailers outside the fence with all fans operating initialed by (b) (6). I asked (b) (6) what 'inside v. outside the fence' referred to and he informed me that inside the fence referred to the 3 trailer spots that were in line past the guard shack and outside the fence referred to the trucks that were on the designated route shown on page 27 of the handbook. So, the sections 'outside the fence' and 'drivers on the route' are synonymous. (b) (6) advised me that he had a discussion with the driver who was parked in front of the inoperable fans and instructed him that this was not an acceptable location for a truck to be waiting in line.</p>
25	M17D	John Morrell & Co.	WLJ21120 93930G	30SEP2017	<p>At 0856 hours I met with the director of (b) (6) in his office to discuss the verification plan for the NOIE held in deferral. We went through the items that would be verified and how often. (b) (6) had no questions. At 1014 hour I met with the (b) (6), (b) (6), and (b) (6). We reviewed the verification plan for the NOIE held in deferral. We went through the plan item by item. There were no questions from the establishment.</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
50	M45705	Meat Processing Career Center	IGR4906095320G	20SEP2017	<p>On Tuesday 09/19/17 at approx. 0730 hours, the completed "Meat Processing Career Center / Attachment 1 – Robust Humane Handling Daily Assessment" record, dated: 9-18-17, was reviewed. The Attachment 1 (b) (4) record documents evaluations of the various facility and humane handling concerns. As reviewed, it is determined that the Attachment 1 record does not document the occurrence or immediate corrective actions taken by this establishment, in response to a potential noncompliance that occurred during electrical stunning of Swine on Monday 09/18/17. John D Sifrit, Plant manager was advised. On Monday 09/18/17 at approx. 1150 hours, during Swine stunning operations (animal 36 of 40), USDA-FSIS-IPP was directly verifying that Electrical Stunning methods were being appropriately and effectively administered. The stunning operator placed the head fork (or wand) behind the ears to electrically stun a market hog, upon activation of the wand switch, the stunning was ineffective, in which the electrical stunning wand was not properly functioning. The animal did not appear excited as a result of the missed stunning attempt. The stunning operator immediately replied that the stunning wand malfunctioned (short-circuited). The stunning operator and (b) (6) were verbally advised not to continue stunning operations until immediate corrective actions were taken. Immediate corrective actions encompassed retrieval of the backup Stunning Wand from their secure tool equipment storage room. The PWS Supervisor verified that the backup stunning wand was properly functioning prior to stunning operations being resumed. Upon resumption, electrical stunning methods were appropriately and effectively administered. The "Meat Processing Career Center Est. 45705 (MPCC) Robust Systematic Approach to Humane Handling / Animal Welfare", revised 7/24/17, in part documents: Section: (b) (4)</p> <p>in part states: (b) (4)</p> <p>Section: (b) (4)</p> <p>in parts states: (b) (4)</p> <p>Section: (b) (4) in</p> <p>part states: (b) (4)</p> <p>Section: (b) (4) ", in</p> <p>parts states: (b) (4)</p>

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
50	M45358	Countrystyle Meats	HFJ290909 0129G	29SEP2017	At CountryStyle Meats, the morning of 9/27/2017 at 0915 Central time a livestock trailer was getting ready to unload nine hogs into the scales pen, before the livestock was to be put into a holding pen. There was an opening between the floor for the scales and the frame of the door going into the scale that was five inches wide and ten inches deep. If animals were too hasty in going from the trailer to the scales pen and stepped into this opening there is a substantial chance of having a foot or lower leg injury. This situation was observed by (b) (6), (b) (6) and (b) (6). The situation was brought to the attention of the establishment owner Mr. Yoder. He put a piece of plywood from the scales into the trailer, covering the opening. The hogs were unloaded and there were no injuries. On closer examination of the scales pen, there were gaps from the scales floor edge horizontally to the side of the pen also in a few places. No livestock was injured, no NR was written, but the situation was brought to the attention of Mr. Yoder so hopefully he will make the repairs and no livestock is injured. SOMETHING TO CHECK ON LATER.
60	M9428	East Conway Beef & Pork Processing	XML58070 93314G	14SEP2017	At approximately 9:15 AM on 09/13/17, I observed a missed stunning of a market swine. The wand of the electrical stunning device used was first placed on the back of the head, behind the ears of the animal and electrical current was delivered to the animal for approximately five seconds. However, the animal was not immediately rendered insensible and, instead, remained upright, vocalized, and tried to run away by taking a few steps forward in the kill box. The employee performing the stunning then applied the wand to the chest of the fully conscious, upright animal and delivered electrical current for an additional five seconds. A combination of the electrical current and physical force of the wand knocked the animal down on its side. When the wand was removed, I observed the tracking of eyes, continuous vocalization, and the swine trying to upright itself. After a third attempt, the animal was successfully rendered insensible with a shot to the head using a captive bolt gun. I immediately took regulatory control action by applying "U.S. Rejected" tag NO. B41286123 to the kill box and reported to establishment officials, informing them that no more stunning could take place.

Table: Memorandums of Interview for 04C02 from 9/1/17-9/30/17

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOI#	Date	Description
80	M5900	Niblock's Pork Products	HLD18110 95912G	12SEP2017	On Tuesday, September 12, 2017, at approximately 11:10 am, I (b) (6), observed the following at Est. M5900 Niblock's Pork Products. A market pig was stunned normally using a head stun with electrical stunning equipment. Following the initial stun which appeared to be effective, the animal was shackled with a chain, and hoisted for sticking. While the operator was moving the blood bucket under the animal before sticking, I observed the pig exhibiting a righting reflex characterized by lifting the head in a vertical motion. The front limbs were stiff and were pointed in a downward direction (towards the ground). Upon closer observation, I also observed eye movements and eye blinking which was not different from the eye movements and eye blinking that would be observed in a live animal in the pen. At this time, I informed the operator that the pig was conscious and needed to be re-stunned immediately. The (b) (6), used the electrical stunning equipment to immediately and effectively render the shackled animal unconscious. He subsequently stuck the animal for bleeding. After consulting with the District Veterinary Medical Specialist, I placed US Rejected tag No. B38059713 on the stunning area at approximately 11:20 am to stop further stunning of animals and informed (b) (6) of the regulatory control action. Allowing a stunned animal to regain consciousness is an egregious humane handling non-compliance of regulation 9 CFR 313.30(a)(4).
90	M27449	O'Guire Farm Meats Inc	DKG24140 93026G	26SEP2017	Robust Systematic Approach Determination Task for O'Guire Farm est# 27449 Date task was performed 9-25-17 at 12:30pm Determination "NO" (Not Robust) establishment management was notified of these facts This MOI # is DKG0814091526G

Table: Memorandums of Interview for Livestock Humane Handling in August 2017

District	Est#	EstName	MOI#	Date	Task	Code	Description
25	M17D	John Morrell & Co.	WLJ132 008530 2G	2017-08-02	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	<p>This MOI is to document a conversation between (b) (6) and me. The conversation was regarding a question I asked about the humane handling program last week that hasn't been answered. At the weekly meeting on July 27th, 2017, I asked a question regarding a statement in a 2016 reassessment. The reassessment indicates that there is a procedure that allows for moving previously non-ambulatory animals. Although this procedure is mentioned in the reassessment, I could not find this procedure in the humane handling plan. (b) (6) indicated he did not know the answer and would need to refer this to (b) (6) on 1st shift. To help make my question clear, I provided (b) (6) a written request to pass to (b) (6). It is 5 days later and I have still not received an answer from the company. The reason I am asking this question stems from an incident that occurred in the barns: A hog from 1st shift was placed in the "(b) (4) fatigue pen" directly off of a truck. This pen is typically not used for truck cripples and is reserved for hogs that become fatigued on their way to slaughter. If hogs that had not received antemortem inspection are placed in the "(b) (4) fatigue pen", I want to ensure that there is not a program in place that allows hogs that recover in the fatigue pen to be placed back into the system without antemortem inspection. This lack of response to my questions from 1st shift management to is an ongoing frustration. The mailboxes in the USDA office may be utilized by 1st shift management to communicate with 2nd shift USDA personnel. *Attached is the correspondence I provided to (b) (6) at the meeting on July 27th, 2017. I also provided this letter to (b) (6) on the evening of August 31st in a second attempt to get answers from the company.</p>
25	M1361	VPP Group, LLC	QQO10 180805 03G	2017-08-03	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	<p>Attendees: Montana Stewart ~11:30am (b) (6) described an observation, leading to a concern. She described that, on a regular basis, she observes fresh bruises and clotted blood on the top-side of the necks, around the 2nd or 3rd cervical vertebra; at the final rail station. It is not seen on all animals, and she noted that a lot of them tend to be larger dairy cows. She observed that the location of the bruise correlates well with the placement of the drop-bar on the head restraint. There are two concerns: The head restrainer may be injuring some of the animals; although she has not witnessed any vocalization at that point (however, cattle may not vocalize while in the chin lift). The drop bar may be causing a fulcrum in taller cattle when the chin lift is fully activated. The bruises must be trimmed as they are unwholesome. (b) (6) respectfully asks the establishment to look into this concern to assure that animals are not being injured. Later in the day, Corina Turriff, Plant Manager responded to my observations. (b) (6) believes the bruises occur on long necked Holsteins from when they drop after the stun. (b) (6) encouraged Corina to continue looking into this issue.</p>

Table: Memorandums of Interview for Livestock Humane Handling in August 2017

District	Est#	EstName	MOI#	Date	Task	Code	Description
35	M2316	Whisnant Meat Packing LLC	FSF200 708292 5G	2017-08-25	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	At 1100 hours on August 24, 2017, while I was performing inspection duties on the kill floor I noticed several employees at the knock box. I went over to see what was happening and observed several (more than two) animals in the knock box and the end gate was open. As I was observing employees opened the side gate and applied the wire loop to a hind leg on the bottom hog. It was elevated with the hoist over the bleed barrel, stuck, and began bleeding out. I then saw the jaws moving so I motioned to elevate the animal so I could see the eyes. The hog then began moving its head to the side in a righting reflex and vocalizing. I yelled "vocalizing", stepped back and an employee knocked the animal with a captive bolt gun rendering it unconscious. I immediately tagged the knock box with USDA reject tag #39323391.
40	M51309	Robinson Premium Beef, LLC	OLR520 508212 5G	2017-08-25	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	In the establishment meeting yesterday, I notified establishment management of recent inaccuracies in the totals on the pen cards for the animals presented for antemortem inspection. This morning at 0530, while I was performing antemortem inspection, Lot 82517-4, from (b) (4), listed at 33 animals, had 43 total. I notified (b) (6) of the discrepancy. I was told that so many cattle had been received that there was difficulty finding pen space for them all, and that the night personnel moved animals around, making it difficult to obtain accurate counts. At the very least, having counts off by that degree could throw off internal lot records, resulting in carcasses being assigned to the wrong lots, which could in turn lead to condemned or retained carcasses being assigned to the wrong producer. At worst, if the establishment slaughters more animals than are recorded as having received antemortem inspection, some or all carcasses of one or more lots could be rejected by the USDA as not having received antemortem inspection prior to slaughter. USDA personnel are instructed in directive 6100.1 to periodically verify the accuracy of the counts on the pen cards, but it is the responsibility of the establishment to ensure that the numbers on the cards give an accurate count of the animals presented for inspection. (b) (6)
50	M31578	Trenton Processing Center, Inc.	LKK431 108102 5G	2017-08-25	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	At 7:45 AM the (b) (6)) and (b) (6)) noticed that the holding pens were over crowded to the point that not all of the animals had access to water. There is no written plan on maximum capacity and is highly suggested to the establishment to implement one in the humane handling portion of slaughter HACCAP.
60	M51250	Najaf Halal Meat Company	000390 708320 3G	2017-08-03	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	July 28-2017- Najaf Halal During a Routine Human handling Task at 7:05 am inspector found approximately (7) goats in pen one that did not have access to clean drinking water. In alleyway that contained approximately 6 (sheep) has access to an empty bucket . Bucket was completely dry and from the appearance had not contained water for some time. This is a clear violation of (9 CFR 313.50) that this is noncompliance with the regulations as cattle/livestock need access to water at all times.

Table: Memorandums of Interview for Livestock Humane Handling in August 2017

District	Est#	EstName	MOI#	Date	Task	Code	Description
80	M5425	Salem Halal Meat Packaging, LLC	NWL19 090850 27G	2017-08-27	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	MOI – Summary of Odd Hour Inspection Visit 8/27/17 9:30 am Attendees: Mr. Kamran Iftikhar, (b) (6) Livestock trailer was being unloaded humanely by establishment management and trailer driver. I checked all pens; feed and water was available in all pens. Pens were in good repair, with the exception of a board starting to come loose from the outside wall of the long pen being used to hold custom animals. I informed Mr. Kamran Iftikhar about the loose board, and he immediately began to fix it. Animals were not in immediate danger due to this issue, and no sharp objects were observed in the pens. There are many small livestock on site at this time, but not to the point of overcrowding. There were two dead animals on site which were removed from the livestock unloading area and properly denatured and disposed of. I checked the outside concrete pad which is used to store inedible materials until the time of pickup. Barrels in this area did not appear to be creating an insanitary condition or pest harborage condition, and there were fly control pellets sprinkled on the ground to control flies. Mr. Iftikhar informed me that he was diligently checking the feed and water yesterday and overnight. I did mention that it is a good practice to have water available in the pens before unloading new animals into pens. Thank you for your effort in humane handling.
80	M8496	Central Meat Packing	UKC341 108353 0G	2017-08-30	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	A meeting was held with (b) (6), to discuss the ramp up to the knock box from the pen system. During a previous humane handling visit about one month ago, a broken board was noticed above the ramp and directly underneath the roof. Some sharp pieces of wood were protruding from the broken end of the board and the wood is rough length-wise as the board runs across the roof to a point from the break. The long, angular portion of the board that runs the length of the roof is still present with sharp/rough surfaces. The establishment has since removed the sharp pieces of wood protruding from the broken end. I spoke with (b) (6) regarding the remaining piece of the board still in place and it's rough/sharp surfaces and removing the entire board rather than just the few splinters present. I notified (b) (6) that a NR may follow this MOI if the plant does not adequately fix the board.

Table: Memorandums of Interview for Livestock Humane Handling in August 2017

District	Est#	EstName	MOI#	Date	Task	Code	Description
90	M45533	Mississippi State University Meat Laboratory	000451 308371 7G	2017-08-17	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	At approximately 12:48 PM, August 17, 2017, the establishment (MSU Meat Lab M45533) attempted to stun a steer. The captive bolt operator placed the captive bolt to the animal's head. The animal was moving its head for a couple of minutes, approximately 2 minutes. The stun operator patiently waited for a proper application of stun by the captive bolt. Right after the stun attempt, the animal remained standing, vocalized, and had conscious eye movement. Another establishment employee cut the animal's throat to initiate bleeding. No second stun attempt for corrective action was attempted at the point of the cut of the animal's throat, resulting in the cutting of a conscious animal. I immediately applied U.S. Reject tag number B43321597 to the knock box. The establishment was immediately informed of the noncompliance and the rejection of the knock box. (b) (6), immediately notified the Jackson District Office, specifically Acting District Manager Dr. David Thompson, DDM.
90	M8332	Porter Road Butcher Meat Company	YTJ540 908432 2G	2017-08-22	Livestock Humane Handling	04C02	At approximately 08:25 hours, while I was performing the Livestock Humane Handling task at M8332, Porter Road Butcher Meats Company, there was a steer that needed to be shot 5 times before it was stunned. With the first shot, the steer went down in the rear, elevated its front and turned around in the knock box. The steer did not vocalize, was standing, conscious and the only sign of a gunshot being delivered was blood coming from the nostrils. Several different locations were tried in an effort to stun the steer; the forehead, the back of the head and the side of the head in the temporal region. The steer showed signs of consciousness after each shot until the fifth shot was delivered. After the steer was finally stunned and made unconscious with the fifth shot, it was hung on the rail, had a limp tail and did not have a righting reflex. It was breathing more than normal, but did not vocalize. It was bled out and did not regain consciousness. The skull was split and the gunshots examined. Most did not penetrate the skull or horn sinus. Two shots penetrated, but one did not disrupt the brain enough to cause unconsciousness. I notified (b) (6) of what occurred since I did not have the DVMS's number with me. She notified District. At 08:45 hours I tagged up the knock box with U.S. Rejected tag number B42268009 and notified Co-owner Chris Carter of my actions for failure to satisfy 331.16(a)(1) and also 313.16(b)(2). As a corrective action, Mr. Carter proposed to change the ammunition used to Mini-Mag .22 LR Copper plated round nose from the .22 lead bullet standard velocity that was used on the animal.

EstNbr	EstName	Task_Code	MOI#	Date	Description
M1620	Quality Pork Processors	04C02	QMO2222 072219G	19JUL2017	<p>At approx. 8:30 pm while performing the Humane Handling task for water availability I observed the following incident. The alley way on the west side of the livestock barn in front of the pens 316 to 320 was full of approx. 90 head of hogs and all the gates were shut denying them access to water. This was during the company lunch period so the hogs were in the alley way approx. 30 minutes with no water. I discussed this issue with (b) (6) and (b) (6) and told them I would be documenting this incident. According to Regulation 313.2 (e) hogs will have access to water at all times. After I talked with (b) (6) about the incident he opened the gates to give the hogs access to water.</p>

EstNbr	EstName	Task_Code	MOI#	Date	Description
M4653 A	Agri Star Meat and Poultry, LLC	04C02	HRJ091108 4013G	13AUG2017	<p>At approximately 0500 this morning while performing beef ante-mortem inspection, I was told by an establishment employee that they had a down animal with a broken leg. The animal was in Pen #3 of the new barn, resting sternally in the middle of the pen. The leg was at an awkward angle, and there was blood spread around where the animal had laid down. In an attempt to see more clearly what the condition of the animal was, I went into the neighboring pen where I could make out the irregular angle of the animal's left front leg. I told the establishment employees and supervisor that I would condemn the animal. I went to the office for a U.S. Condemn tag while the establishment gathered their appropriate people. Upon returning to the pen around 0545, we waited a few moments for the employee tasked with shooting the animal to arrive. The establishment uses a shotgun for any stunning other than traditional kosher slaughter. The shooter entered the pen, but upon doing so the animal managed to get up and began acting aggressive (snorting, shaking its head, putting its head down and taking a step forward). The shooter took his time and waited for a clear shot. When he attempted the first shot, nothing appeared to happen, however, a few moments later blood began to come out of the animals nostrils. The employee with the extra bullets gave one to the shooter who then took aim and had to wait again for the animal to stop moving. The second shot was not effective either, although the animal did appear to be affected. By this point or around this time, one of the pen end-gates had been opened into the drive alley because the bobcat had been brought into the barn to move the carcass. The animal started moving towards the open gate into the drive alley, with the shooter following waiting for another chance to stun the animal. Another shot was taken while the animal was in the alley, although I could not see from where I was standing. The barn supervisor asked me if we could walk it up to the knock box area. I asked if we could put walk it to the suspect pen as it had a head gate and it was closer. The supervisor said they had no way to get it out of that pen. So I agreed that the best way to regain control of the animal was to move it up to the knock box. While I assumed they were moving it to the knock box, I went back to the USDA office to try and call my FLS. As my phone did not have service, I went back out to the barn. In the few minutes I was gone they had managed to</p>

Table:Memorandums of Interview (MOIs) in response to FOIA2018_00012_October 10, 2017

EstNbr	EstName	Task_Code	MOI#	Date	Description
					successfully shoot the animal, denature it, and were loading it onto a refrigerated truck for storage until a rendering truck could pick it up.