

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M11032+P 11032+V11 032	Northwest Premium Meats, LLC	AOC12101 13604G	04NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On October 31, 2019, (b)(6) was performing online slaughter inspection on (b)(4) when (b)(6) heard two stunning attempts in quick succession. (b)(6) observed the dressed head had two penetrating holes. A meeting was held between (b)(6) and (b)(6) to discuss the incident. During the meeting it was emphasized that the regulatory performance standard is the delivery of an effective stun producing complete insensibility of the animal on the first stunning attempt. It is the establishment's responsibility to provide sufficient restraint per 9CFR 313.15(a)(1) to assure accurate placement of the hand-held captive bolt device in the target area.</p>
25	M1620	Quality Pork Processors	QMO4822 121518G	18DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 2038 hours on December 18th, 2019, I observed a livestock employee attempt to move a group of hogs from pen 213 into pen 317. The group became congested at the turn into the pen, and I observed the employee use his rattle paddle to tap several of the hogs that were at the back of the group and were unable to move. There were also a few hogs that were attempting to climb on top of other hogs. I discussed this with (b)(6) and (b)(6) and had them view the corresponding surveillance footage. In the footage, the employee did not close the inner pen gate as he should have, resulting in hogs walking in the opposite direction and causing the congestion. Regardless of whether there is congestion during moving groups or not, hogs are to be moved with a minimum of stress and excitement. Using the rattle paddle to tap hogs who are unable to move causes excess stress (b)(6) responded that they would take care of the situation.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M17564	Indiana Packers Corporation	MLO55170 11829G	29JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>On January 28, 2020, at approximately 2105 hours, the establishment conducted a test run after the lunch break in response to an increase in the number of hogs coming out of the East Stunner "gasping" for breath prior to the break. The test run consisted of a total of eleven hogs split between two baskets. Upon exiting the East Stunner, I observed all eleven hogs exhibit one or more of the following "gasping" for breath, present palpebral reflex, and/or spontaneously blinking. No vocalizations, eye tracking, righting reflex, or rhythmic breathing were observed. The establishment immediately stunned all hogs with a captive bolt gun and stopped CO2 stunning. Initially maintenance could not find an issue with the East Stunner. On further examination, there may have been an issue with the calibration of the CO2 sensor that was performed earlier in the day. The establishment's corrective actions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Keep CO2 valves fully open. · Run 5-6 hogs per basket. · Perform a single test run on both the East and West Stunner. If no issues with the test run, run every other basket. If no additional issues, then increase to every basket. if no continued issues, run every basket. · Keep a supervisor, with readily available captive bolt gun, at the shackle table to monitor hogs for signs of returning to sensibility the remainder of the shift. I observed both the East and West Stunners during the immediate period after re-starting the stunning process through running every basket and did not observe any of the previous issues. <p>(b)(4)</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M17D+P76 13+V17D	Smithfield Packaged Meats Corp.	WLJ21161 23311G	11DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 1220 hours while performing verification of HATS Category IX - Conscious Animals on the Rail, I saw an unconscious hog gasp three times after being stuck. The employee that watches this area stopped the line and grabbed a hand-held captive bolt gun to give a security knock. When the trigger was pulled the hand-held captive bolt gun did not fire. The second hand-held captive bolt gun that is kept in this area was retrieved there was no round in the chamber. A round was loaded into the secondary hand-held captive bolt gun and the security knock was successfully applied. The hog never regained consciousness. At approximately 1225 hours while continuing to monitor this area, I saw another unconscious hog gasp after being stuck. The employee in the area pushed the red button to stop the line, but the line did not stop. He immediately got the attention of the employee sticking the hogs and had him stop the line. Once again, the hand-held captive bolt gun did not fire when the trigger was pulled despite a round being loaded. The secondary hand-held captive bolt gun was used to administer the security knock. The hog never regained consciousness. After this occurred, (b)(6) and another employee came over to check the hand-held captive bolt guns. Both devices were deemed mechanically sound. The misfiring of the devices was deemed to be due to the rounds being slightly damp due to increased condensation in the area. The rounds in the area were replaced with dry charges. The employee that had tried to stop the line earlier informed (b)(6) that the line stop button was malfunctioning as well. I spoke with (b)(6) after their conversation to let him know what I had seen. I confirmed with him that it is company policy to always have to hand-held captive bolt guns loaded and ready to use in the area, and I informed him that the</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								secondary device had not been loaded during the first incident. These conditions were imperfect, but no hogs regained consciousness.

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
80	M19290+P 19290+V19 290	Working H Meats, LLC	NAW00120 91605G	05SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>Today, September 5, 2019, at approximately 1030 hours, I verbally notified Mrs. Terrie Hardesty, establishment owner/manager, of my decision to suspend slaughter at Establishment 19290. I advised Mrs. Hardesty that I would be contacting (b)(6) and the Raleigh District Office about my decision. At approximately 1025 hours, an Angus steer, less than 30 months of age, was loaded into the knock box. Mr. Grant Hardesty attempted to stun the steer using a .22 Magnum rifle (b)(6) myself, and Mrs. Hardesty were in the USDA office discussing another issue. When I heard the rifle fired a second time, I started toward the kill floor. As I did, the rifle was fired a third time. When (b)(6) (b)(6) and I tried to open the door to the kill floor, it was being held shut by a plant employee, and at this time, I heard the .308 rifle fired. (b)(6) (b)(6) opened the door, and we observed the steer was rendered unconscious with the shot from the .308 rifle. I asked Grant Hardesty for details of the incident, and he said the animal "locked up" after each of the shots with the .22 Magnum but did not go down. Because IPP had not witnessed any of this, I asked to view the video which the establishment records. I accompanied Mr. Justin Hardesty to the computer and watched the entire incident. After the first shot, the steer backed up and threw its head around but did not go down. The same occurred after the second and third shot with the .22 Magnum. The fourth shot, using the .308 rifle, rendered the steer unconscious and it went down. After speaking with (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) at approximately 1045 hours, I confirmed with Mrs. Hardesty that slaughter was suspended. (b)(6) placed US Reject Tag #B40457354 on the knock box. After the establishment had skinned the head, I examined it and found four bullet holes in an "L" shape. The</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								holes are spaced approximately 1 inch apart with the first shot being the middle shot. This shot is level with the eyes. The two bottom shots were the second and third shot, and the top of the "L" is the shot from the .308 rifle. This was confirmed with Grant Hardesty. While the establishment did develop a written systematic approach to humane handling in response to the previous suspension, this plan is not yet considered robust due to the previous suspension and the recent NR.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
80	M19290+P 19290+V19 290	Working H Meats, LLC	NAW30091 03310G	10OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Today, October 10, 2019, at approximately 0840 hours, I verbally notified Mrs. Terrie Hardesty, establishment owner/manager, of my decision to suspend slaughter at Establishment 19290. I advised Mrs. Hardesty that I would be contacting (b)(6) and the Raleigh District Office about my decision. At approximately 0836 hours, an Angus cross steer was loaded into the kill chute and the head gate. The animal laid down and would not get up or lift its head to be locked into the head restraint mechanism recently installed. Mr. Grant Hardesty fired the .22 magnum and the steer appeared to be unconscious. Mr. Hardesty checked the eye reflex twice with no response and stated that the tongue was hanging out. Mr. Hardesty then replaced the gun on the wall. The steer was released from the chute, struggled on the floor, and then began trying to get up. Mr. Hardesty then retrieved the .308 rifle but was not able to get a good shot with the .308 rifle immediately. At 0838 hours, Mr. Justin Hardesty stuck the steer to get it to bleed out. A few seconds later, Mr. Grant Hardesty was able to get a shot with the .308 rifle, and the steer was rendered unconscious. After being informed of the incident on the kill floor by (b)(6) I instructed him to place a US retain tag on the kill chute. US Retain tag B40457349 was placed on the kill chute at approximately 0840 hours, and I notified Mrs. Hardesty that federal slaughter was suspended and that I would be contacting Mr. Wood and the Raleigh District Office. Establishment 19290 is currently under a suspension in abeyance for an egregious stunning incident on September 5, 2019. I am recommending reinstatement of the suspension for the following reasons: (1) The establishment did not follow their previous corrective actions since the steer was not fully restrained, (2) the</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								animal returned to consciousness, and (3) an establishment employee stuck the animal prior to it being rendered unconscious.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M1962+P1 962	Perry Way Foods, LLC	LIN090608 3121G	21AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 0630 hours on 08/02/2019 while verifying the establishment's implementation of their humane handling program at the stunning area (HATS Category IX Conscious Animals on the Rail), (b)(6) observed a sow hung on the rail in the blood pit area following proper electrical stunning being stuck by a relatively recently hired employee (b)(6). (b)(6) noted that the sow did not appear to be bleeding effectively from the stick. The sow was demonstrating signs to indicate she was possibly on the verge of returning to consciousness such as slow back-and-forth eye movements and arching of the back to the side. The sow was not noted to be vocalizing. Another establishment employee noticed that the sow was demonstrating possible signs of return to consciousness and called over a third establishment employee, who proceeded to restick the hanging sow, at which point she began to flail. After the second stick, the sow bled out and exhibited death. Given that these signs were suggestive of return to consciousness and a possible egregious humane handling issue, (b)(6) placed a "U.S. Rejected" tag (#B33511393) on the entrance to the stunning area, and informed establishment management of this incident and the regulatory control action taken. After correlation with the District Office and DVMS about the incident, it was determined that the establishment should be issued a humane handling MOI because the sow was not demonstrating conclusive signs of full return to consciousness. Following this determination by the District Office, (b)(6) removed the U.S. Rejected tag from the entrance to the stunning area and allowed the plant to resume production. At this time (b)(6) met with the establishment management to discuss the incident. The establishment explained that it has in place a robust humane handling</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>program that contains a stunning SOP describing corrective actions to be taken in the event of an animal beginning to return to consciousness. The SOP states (b)(4)</p> <p>(b)(4)</p> <p>(b)(4) The harvest floor supervisor informed USDA that blood pit employees are trained on signs of consciousness and on corrective actions in the event of a mis-stun or return to consciousness and that this training is documented by the establishment. At the meeting, management presented its corrective actions verbally for the failure to follow the SOP for return to consciousness, to include replacing the electrical stunner that had been used in the morning, replacing the employee who had made the initial stick with a more experienced individual, moving the location of the hand stunner to be more convenient for blood pit employees, and training the employee who removes ear tags on use of the stun gun to include supervision from a more experienced employee until the ear tag employee is comfortable on their own. USDA verified follow-through of these corrective actions. (b)(6) advised the establishment that the robust humane handling program may need to be re-evaluated to ensure that the program is being followed as written to prevent a noncompliance or egregious humane handling issues in the future.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M1962+P1962	Perry Way Foods, LLC	LIN0512110726G	26NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On 11/26/2019 at 10am I met with (b)(6) to discuss a summary of a humane handling incident that occurred on 11/18/2019. On 11/18/2019 at approximately 10am a truck driver informed barn employees that the upper deck of the trailer had collapsed. The trailer was full of sows, with sows on both upper and lower decks of the trailer. With help of maintenance personnel, barn employees, and the truck driver, the living sows were removed humanely. There were 2 dead sows: one was clear of the collapsed deck, the other was trapped underneath the collapsed deck. I performed antemortem inspection on the surviving sows as they exited the trailer. I did not find any significant injuries and no lameness was observed. The trailer was driven away from the facility where an investigation would be performed to identify the underlying cause. Based on the identified cause, corrective actions would be provided. On 11/25/2019, Lynch Livestock provided a document showing the underlying cause and corrective actions taken. The underlying cause was determined to be "safety stops" that were not put back in place after the trailer was washed. This resulted in the suspension cables supporting the upper deck to fail, causing the collapse. Corrective actions included repairs to the trailer being completed, ensuring the trucker improves his pre-trip inspection process, and to have the trucker complete TQA recertification. In addition, this situation was reviewed with all drivers who were reminded of the importance of pre-trip inspection.</p>
50	M20856+V20856	Eureka Locker, Inc.	GGG2607013416G	16JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>This morning between 0600 and 0700 I conducted an Odd-Hour-Inspection for Humane Handling. All findings were acceptable. A copy of the report is attached to this MOI.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M21898+V 21898	Farmers Union Industries, LLC	OXG36150 41919G	19APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On 4/17/2019, at approximately 0630, I observed antemortem handling of hogs during antemortem inspection. The establishment's barn employees were attempting to move a full pen of hogs for antemortem inspection. The hogs were laying in the pen with very little extra room available. The establishment employees used rattle paddles to wake and move the hogs at one end of the pen. The hogs were then driven toward the other end of the pen, over those hogs that were still laying down. Given the high number of lame, ill, injured, and down hogs, it is not possible to know if the hogs laying down are non-ambulatory disabled. Many of the hogs require additional time to rise or need physical assistance. 9 CFR 313.2(a) states that driving of livestock...shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort to the animals. Additionally, 9 CFR 313.2(d)(1) states that disabled animals and other animals unable to move shall be separated from normal ambulatory animals. My concerns with driving hogs in such a way as to allow them to be stepped on was discussed with (b)(6) and the barn employees. We discussed ways that this problem could be prevented, including moving hogs to another pen for antemortem inspection, moving hogs by remaining outside the pens and reaching over the walls with the paddles, or decreasing stocking density. The long, narrow pens that are stocked to the maximum number do not allow the hogs to move away from the employees in a normal flocking motion. The lack of separation of lame hogs from the rest of the groups contributes to the handling issues. I had fewer concerns at subsequent antemortem inspections on 4/17/2019 as the employees used the new techniques to move the hogs. On 4/18/2019, at approximately 1300, I again observed antemortem handling of hogs during antemortem inspection. While the barn</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>employees were reaching over the walls from an adjacent pen to move the hogs, they were still moving them in a way that forced the hogs to walk over each other to avoid the employees and resulting in all the hogs piled at one end of the pen. I again discussed my concerns with (b)(6) and later with (b)(6). I reiterated the necessity to protect the hogs that are disabled from potentially being trampled or crushed. (b)(6) stated that he would discuss the issue with the facility manager to develop solutions. Antemortem handling improved on 4/19/2019, with the barn employees moving hogs to adjacent pens for antemortem inspection. (b)(6) stated that he informed establishment management of the humane handling concerns. Additionally, at 1530, while walking back from antemortem inspection with (b)(6) I observed an employee use and electric prod on a hog in the chute to the stunning conveyor at least five times in succession. I told (b)(6) and the employee that it was unacceptable to repeatedly use an electric prod on a hog. 9 CFR 313.2(b) states that electric prods shall be used as little as possible in order to minimize excitement and injury.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M21898+V 21898	Farmers Union Industries, LLC	OXG40170 72119G	19JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 1330 on July 19, 2019, I was conducting ante-mortem inspection at establishment 21898 Farmer's Union Industries in Estherville, Iowa. While conducting this inspection I noticed approximately 50% of the pigs across the entire old barn (the barn with the pit underneath) were panting. Some of the pens at the ends of the barn exhibited nearly 90% of the pigs panting. In the new barn (the part without the pit underneath it) none of the pigs were panting. I noticed a major airflow difference and comfort level for myself between the two barns. In the new barn there are fans over every pen and six misters spraying water in each pen. In the old barn there are three fans on each of two of the walls and two misters per pen. One mister on each end. The temperature outside during this observation was 91 degrees Fahrenheit with a "feels like" temperature of 107 degrees. The temperature in the old barn was (b)(4) and it was (b)(4) in the new barn. At approximately 1530 I asked the Livestock Supervisor if he was doing anything to make the pigs more comfortable. He replied that his crew was spraying the hogs down with water between unloading trucks. He was also decreasing pen density for any of the pigs that were going to be in the barn over the weekend.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M244L+V2 44L	Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc.	TWH59120 91719G	19SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On 9-18-19 at approximately 12:20 PM (b)(6) spoke to procurement (b)(6) about a humane handling problem I had observed. I was performing humane handling verification activities and watching trucks unload. I observed a driver in dock 4 using only an electric prod to move animals off of the truck. The truck driver had an electric prod in one hand and a metal sort board in the other hand but was using the prod to touch almost every hog to move them off the truck. I did not observe the sort board being used. I watched him unload approximately 30 hogs this way. After 2-3 minutes the establishment's dock monitor approached the truck driver and spoke to him. The truck driver then switched to a different tool to move hogs (a paddle or other tool covered with a plastic bag). Federal regulations state that driving of livestock shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort. The establishment's written humane handling program states that the electric prod shall be used as little as possible. Prod use has been discussed multiple times at weekly meetings in this establishment as problematic (meeting dates 5-9-19, 7-18-19, 7-25-19, and 8-1-19) showing a trend of overuse of the electric prod to move livestock. Establishment 244L has a robust written humane handling program at this time. If FSIS continues to observe that establishment employees are not following the humane handling program as written the program may no longer be considered robust.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M245L+P2 45L	Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc	LEI342209 2926G	26SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>HATS task IX Return to Consciousness At 2343 on September 21st, 2019, as a steer left the stack and started down the bleed chain, prior to exsanguination, it attempted to right itself and blinked. An establishment employee noticed this steer at the same time I did and went to stun the steer with a hand-held captive bolt (HHBC) device. The chain continued to run, the steer continued to try to right itself, and the employee was unable to get a good shot to stun the steer. I instructed the establishment employees who were bleeding the animals to stop the line and they did. The employee placed the HHCB device on the steer's skull, but the device did not fire. While the employee fixed the HHCB device, the steer vocalized twice. The employee placed the HHCB device on the skull again. This time the device fired. The animal was rendered insensible and exsanguinated. Approximately 1 minute transpired from when the steer regained consciousness and was rendered unconscious again. I informed (b)(6) of the incident. I tagged the knock box with USDA retained tag B31963126. The establishment cleared the line out after I contacted the FLS.</p>
25	M2460+P2 460	Cimpl's, Inc.	PMB38070 65325G	25JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On June 19, (b)(6) and I (b)(6) were performing a walk-through of the barn when we found the following maintenance concerns: 1. Gates to pens 15 and 16 had rusted piping, no sharp edges noticed. 2. The gate separating pen 3 and 6 had rusted and broken piping. 3. The concrete footing for a support beam between pens 13 and 15 had much of the concrete missing. 4. Bent piping on the gate the separates the front and back of pen 14. 5. Broken welds on the crowd gate to the circle tub. No sharp objects were noticed.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M2460+P2 460	Cimpl's, Inc.	PMB12040 81328G	28AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	On the morning of August 28, 2019, I (b)(6) performed an odd-hours inspection of the barn and animal-handling facilities. During this inspection I found the following concerns: 1. There is a sharp edge on a piece of sheet metal on the side door to the alternate knock box. 2. The water guard in Pen 7 is broken and hanging loose on one side.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M2460+P2 460	Cimpl's, Inc.	PMB03121 00210G	10OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On October 9, 2019 at approximately 1650, (b)(6) was performing HATS Category VIII – Stunning Effectiveness observations at the restrainer. A mature Black Angus cow was moved into the restrainer. When it approached the head catch, the cow managed to get a leg through the head catch. The restrainer operator noticed that the leg was in the catch and attempted to back the cow back through the catch. The cow then proceeded to jump and get its other leg through the head catch. The cow at this point was very agitated and was vocalizing. The cow struggled its way through the head catch and into the Halal pit. This is a drop of approximately four feet. The cow then began running into the door of the Halal pit until it opened and then entered the shackle pit. The metal screen door to the shackle pit was closed so the cow could not exit. The cow then went behind the shackle station guard where it became stuck between two posts. Establishment employees were able to open the door and get the cow to back up from the shackle guard. The cow found its way back to the barn where it was placed with another lot of cattle. The cow did not appear to be injured but was very agitated. This incident did not appear to be due to equipment failure or employee negligence. The cow was already worked up prior to entering the restrainer. The restrainer operator did not have the head catch open any more than they usually do. The establishment employees also attempted to do everything they could to quickly and safely get the cow back to the barn.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M2460+P2 460	Cimpl's, Inc.	PMB27091 04211G	11OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On October 10, 2019 while I (b)(6) (b)(6) was performing an odd-hours inspection of the barn and animal handling facilities I noticed the following concerns: The first steel post (closest to alley) on the east side of pen 19 had a small burr forming on it. The tin hung above the concrete wall that separates the alley and the US Suspect Pen/Pen 1 was bent out in multiple places which formed sharp edges. Also, the west side of this tin was not secured and could be bent out easily. This tin would be at eye/shoulder level for Holstein cattle. (b)(6) (b)(6) was notified of these findings and repairs were made.</p>
25	M2460+P2 460	Cimpl's, Inc.	PMB59081 10626G	26NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 0750 hours, while walking past the tub area I (b)(6) noticed the crowd gate was open, at this point I observed 3 different points on the bottom edge closest to the pivot point where the weld had let loose or rusted. These points are not firmly affixed to the frame of the gate. I felt the 3 points and did not feel any sharp areas, but they do have the potential to become sharp as they wear. At approximately 0805 hours I brought my concerns to the attention of (b)(6) (b)(6)</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M2460+P2 460	Cimpl's, Inc.	PMB47200 13014G	14JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On the evening of January 14, 2020, I (b)(6) conducted an odd-hours inspection of the barn and live animal handling facilities. During this inspection I discovered the following potential issues: 1. The gate separating pen 23 to the feed storage area had sharp points on both bottom corners. 2. The northwest support beam in pen 22 had an outward facing sharp point. 3. The northwest support beam in pen 21 had an outward facing sharp point. 4. The tin wall paneling on the south side of the drive alley from pen 18 had multiple sharp points and loose corners. These areas were shown to (b)(6) on the morning of January 15. He said he would get them taken care of today.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M253	Long Prairie Packing Company, LLC	AGL371209 2627G	27SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 1430 on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, I, (b)(6) was conducting a Livestock Humane Handling Task. While conducting this task I was observing cows enter the restrainer. One of the cows stopped at the restrainer. The establishment employees tried to drive the cow forward in the restrainer. While this was occurring the door to the restrainer closed on the cow next in line. This caused the cow to go down. It did not appear to injure the cow, but the cow could not rise again and had to be euthanized. It appeared that her foot got caught underneath her which caused her to be unable to get up. The establishment employees stated that the door went down on its own. I informed (b)(6) (b)(6) that unless he put in place something to ensure the door did not close on another cow I would be placing a U.S. Reject tag on the restrainer. He found a large metal bar and placed it underneath the door so it could not close. He also stated that he would have maintenance look at the door at the end of the shift. I told him these measures were adequate to continue running the restrainer. On Thursday, September 26, 2019, during the weekly USDA Meeting I asked for an update on the door. The establishment responded that they replaced the handle that operated the door and that they thought the actuator inside the handle was faulty. They also stated that they would be adding the handle to their regular maintenance schedule to prevent this from occurring again.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M253	Long Prairie Packing Company, LLC	AGL260912 2626G	26DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>12/17/2019 Time: 10:03 AM Central Time Location: Long Prairie Pack At approximately 10:03 AM on December 17, 2019, I was walking back to the restrainer and carousel area (zone 1) to perform HATS task IX, return to consciousness. While I was back by the driving lanes to the restrainer, I noticed a black angus cow that had been stunned with a hand-held captive bolt followed by a jugular stick (I did not witness the cow being euthanized) lying in the right lane leading to the restrainer with a chain around her neck. The cow was lying in the left lateral position and was moving her right eye and blinking. At the position that I was at, I was unable to determine if there was any eye tracking. In addition to the eye movements, the cow was letting out deep agonal gasps consistently every couple of seconds. In between these gasps, the cow had a deep muffled groaning noise that was also consistently occurring every couple of seconds. I informed (b)(6) (b)(6) and (b)(6) that this animal needed to be stunned again. A plant employee stunned the cow with a hand-held captive bolt with 2 additional security knocks. After the first stun, the eye movement stopped completely. A couple minutes after the security stuns, the cow started to let out slow, deep agonal gasps again. No additional signs of returning to consciousness were seen at this time. The establishment employee then extended the cut on the neck of the cow. (b)(6) informed me that when the cow was stunned, he did not witness any signs that the cow was conscious/returning to consciousness. I stayed and verified no additional movements or reflexes occurred and that the cow was unconscious. Once that was confirmed, I informed the plant that no additional knocking could occur. I informed the plant that they could run out the line of the</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								animals that were already stunned and exsanguinated and the cows held in the restrainer. The restrainer was tagged up with reject tag B41501115 at approximately 10:12 AM. After further discussion, it was determined that the cow did not regain consciousness, and I removed my reject tag. Afterwards, I looked at the unconscious cow's head to look at the position of the stun holes. I was able to find 3 stun holes but not the fourth stun hole (the cow still has her hide on, so I was only able to palpate the holes and not visibly see the stun holes). The 3 stun holes were located halfway between the poll of the head and the eyes, in addition to being at an equal distance from one side of the head to the other.
15	M27440	Valley Beef, Inc.	VEJ591404 3425G	25APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	At 1050 on April 15, 2019, (b)(6) performed ante-mortem on a small lot of cattle from the overhead catwalk at M27440. A Holstein cow, backtag #4741, that had been previously reviewed earlier in the day, was the only cow waiting in the raceway leading to the stun box. There was fresh blood on the floor and along the one solid wall of the raceway, as well as on the cow's tail, hindlimbs, and udder. The cow's tail was fractured with exposed bone. (b)(6) performed the ante-mortem assessment on the lot this cow arrived in at 0840 on April 25, 2019. (b)(6) does not recall this cow with an injury to its tail nor that this cow was bleeding. The cause of the injury could not be determined, and the animal was slaughtered and processed per normal procedures. The operator must ensure facilities are maintained in good repair and are free of objects which may cause injury or pain to the animals. Handling of livestock, from receipt through slaughter, must be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort.

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M27472	Noah's Ark Processors, LLC	DRO56121 15212G	12NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Observations at the roll box area by (b)(6) on 11.10.2019 On 11.10.2019 at approximately 0700 hours I was standing on the platform near the secondary stun box observing the establishment test out a newly fabricated carcass separation system for the stack when the employee who does the shackling alerted (b)(6) (b)(6) to contact the kill supervisors because there were two animals in the roll box. From my position I could not observe what was going on, but there was obvious urgency in the way the establishment personnel were reacting to the situation. By the time I made it down to the roll box area, the first animal that was restrained in the roll box had received the ritual slaughter cut and had already been released from the box and the second animal that had made its way into the stun box, sometime during the slaughter of the animal before it, was lying unconscious. The second animal was only partially in the stun box. The back end of the second animal was still in the alleyway before the stun box. The establishment had applied a stun to the animal from a handheld captive bolt device. I applied US rejected tag number B31963211 to the roll box at approximately 0715 hours.</p> <p>Disposition of Beef Carcass for the second animal partially trapped in roll box by (b)(6)</p> <p>HH Incident at Roll Box 11.10.2019 While performing the disposition process of carcass 007, the viscera and pluck were without any notable gross lesions. The carcass sides reveal moderate bruising over the shoulders and lumbar region of the carcass with some blood set in the musculature of these areas. With the evaluation of the spinal vertebrae there were notable signs of injury to the cervical and thoracic spine. The lumbar spinal vertebrae had visible fractures at L2 and L4. The tongue had no gross lesions. The skull had multiple fractures of the vomeronasal bone;</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>temporal and occipital bones had multiple fractures, with the right ramus of the mandible being fractured as well. My assessment after observing the carcass with multiple fractures of skull bones and blood set within the musculature of the head is that the animal succumbed to the traumatic injuries prior to the administration of the single stun with the handheld captive bolt (HHCB) device (b)(6) confirmed with IPP that the animal was unresponsive prior to the stun application with the HHCB device by plant employees. The evidence suggests that the animal died from the traumatic injuries and not the HHCB stun. "After investigating the incident, plant management proffered the following measures to improve on the roll-box performance and prevent recurrence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting was held with all employees from the circle pen to the roll box. • Maintenance placed a new handle on the live scale gate to prevent the gate from opening while roll box is in use. • There will be two employees will be stationed at the ramp area. • Employees were instructed not to operate at the live scale if there are any mechanical issues observed. • Yellow paint was added to the top of the air gate so that the operator knows when the air gate is properly closed and not blocked. • Maintenance and QA will check gate and outside areas on a daily basis to ensure that there are no animal handling issues and all mechanical equipment is properly working".

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M2926	Pork King Packing, Inc.	ODK30160 94309G	09SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	While doing antemortem inspection of hogs in pens 4 at about 1pm, I found one of the large drain grates approximately 1 foot long by 8 inches wide, completely removed and moved to the opposite side of the pen. This pen was holding approximately 30 market hogs at the time. I called over barn personnel to replace the grate and have them notify maintenance. This grate had previously been able to be removed by the hogs and was since modified with a large basket-like welding attached to the bottom as the fix so the hogs could not pull it up. This modification is not working. With the grate out of place, when the hogs were moved away from the area to put it back in place, 2 hogs stepped into the hole to the basket below. This is cause for concern as this step could easily cause injury to the hogs, especially injuries such as broken legs, bruises, etc. Maintenance was called to the barn to see the problem. Later I was informed that due to other maintenance issues in the plant, the grates would not be fixed that night but possibly the next night. This is a recurring problem as 2 weeks earlier I had pointed out a drain grate out of place in pen 6 that sows had rooted up. This is an area of concern that needs to be addressed immediately with some sort of permanent mechanism that will not allow for hogs to remove it any more. This issue should have been addressed as part of the robust systematic approach to humane handling system that Pork King has in place.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
35	M320M+V 320	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	VWK48080 61806G	06JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>A meeting was held to discuss the ante mortem procedures at establishment 320M, Smithfield Foods, on May 23, 2018 at 12:30 pm. The following people were in attendance: Smithfield Tim Messman, Plant General Manager (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) FSIS</p> <p>(b)(6) (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) (b)(6) (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) Through collaboration and discussion, the following guidance document was produced: ANTE MORTEM INSPECTION PROCEDURES for 320M MILAN, MISSOURI 05/23/2019 All ante-mortem inspections procedures will be conducted in accordance with FSIS Directive 6100.1 Rev 2, "Ante-Mortem Livestock Inspection." Pre-shift antemortem inspector will begin donning at 0530 hours. A plant employee will accompany the inspector on antemortem inspection to ensure all animals can be observed at rest and 10 % in motion. Antemortem inspection may be performed in pens 1-12 A, 1-12 B, 13, 14 B, 1-12 C, 1-12 D, Hall B, and Hall C. Inspectors should perform antemortem in designated pens only, not 'alleyways' or 'walkways'. Inspectors are not to enter areas with animals in them, or traffic through areas where animals are being driven. The establishment should provide safe access to all pens needing inspection so that 100% of animals can be observed at rest and 10% in motion. This is in accordance with FSIS Directive 6100.1 Rev. 2 Section V. Any animals placed into the Recovery Pen are intended for veterinary disposition only and cannot be inspected and passed by any other FSIS personnel. Once animals are presented for inspection they are no longer eligible for resale. Any animals intended to be "resales" should be segregated prior to</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>inspection, in accordance with FSIS Directive 6100.1 Rev 2 Section XI. Once animals have passed ante mortem inspection and the pen card has been signed, the establishment is responsible for maintaining identity in accordance with FSIS Directive 6100.1 Rev. 2 Sections VI and VII. Either a tattoo (lot) number or a pen number may be used to maintain identity. If previously inspected and passed animals need to be moved to a new pen and they do not have a tattoo, the establishment has two options. a.The animals may be presented for reinspection in the new pen. b.The establishment may notify the offline inspector and present the already signed pen card with both the old pen number and the new pen number to be initialed by the inspector prior to moving the animals from the pen. These procedures and guidance are intended for normal operations with a focus on a safe and orderly process. They may be subject to modification on an as-needed basis due to extenuating circumstances, such as severe weather or humane handling concerns.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
35	M320M+V 320	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	VWK04150 94325G	25SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>I spoke with (b)(6) at approximately 1545 hours on 09/24/2019 regarding a basket containing six live hogs in the top cage of the South (b)(4). The hogs had been in the (b)(4) cage since 1500 hours (approximately 45 minutes) at that time due to a mechanical breakdown. The CO2 had not been evacuated as the problem was with the hydraulic system. The hogs were lying down but panting heavily and appeared fully conscious. A plant employee had begun spraying the hogs down with water about five minutes previously. There was no estimated completion time for repairs. I told (b)(6) this situation was less than ideal and may develop into a humane handling noncompliance for hogs being confined with no water or if they became distressed. (b)(6) immediately contacted Maintenance to discuss removing the hogs from the cage while repairs were completed. He stated they did not have a way to evacuate the hogs from the cage but could lower them to Stop 1 (approximately 90% CO2) to be immediately stunned. The cage was lowered and the hogs were stunned around 1600 hours, approximately 60 minutes after being loaded. A separate cage of hogs that had been raised showed no animals with any signs of consciousness. (b)(6) confirmed that the 31 animals in the (b)(4) would be condemned in accordance with establishment policy and the (b)(4) would not be put back into use until repairs were completed and it was fully operational.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M322+V32 2	Double J Meat Packing, Inc.	QOE30100 72415G	15JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On July 11, 2019, at approximately 7:45a.m., (b)(6) notified me (b)(6) that there was a bison on his back he needed to shoot. I followed (b)(6) out to the pens. When I arrived, I saw a bison in the alley down on his back leaning towards his left side, facing south (opposite direction) of the knocking box. The animal back legs were wrapped up in-between the bars, head lying against the side panel along the ground. The animal appeared to be very work up and breathing very heavily. The section of the alley way that the bison was trapped was approximately 2 ½ -3 ft wide. Do to these factors it was not possible to get the bison up. Therefore, the company made the decision to shoot the animal. Unfortunately do to the awkward position of the head it was hard to get a clean shot. It took 3 shots in a period of approximant 10 to 12 mins, before the animal no longer showed signs of sensibility and no longer had rhythmic breathing. (b)(6) (b)(6) and (b)(6) employee who shot the animal), both verified the animal was dead before they dragged the animal out of the alley way and brought it inside to be harvested. This MOI is to remind Double J Meat Packing of the FSIS requirements of Handling livestock in 9CFR 313.2. Which states "Driving of livestock from the unloading ramps to the holding pens and from the holding pens to the stunning area shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort to the animal. Livestock shall not be forced to move faster than a normal walking speed."</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
40	M337+V33 7	STX Beef Company	UNG14080 74126G	26JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>An anti mortem inspection was done by (b)(6) today @ 7:30 am. He found one cattle dead in pen 11 and gave me 10 pen cards and one FSIS FORM 6150-1 the corresponding data filled up except the post mortem report. After I settled my things in the office, I immediately conducted an investigation on this matter. I was met by (b)(6) detail at the stockyard that does the receiving, unloading and depositing the cattle in the respective pens. The said cattle was removed from pen #11 and moved to the back area of the hide building where I examined the animal. The cattle had a deep gapping wound on the right hindleg on the lateral side and a foot from the ground/hoof. The wound was very deep that upon palpation I could feel the torn arterial blood vessel. The mucus membrane of the mouth and the tongue was pale white instead of the normal pinkish white color. The cattle died of blood loss/exsanguination. The wound was inflicted yesterday evening when the cattle were delivered and it's been 24 hours enough time to bleed out the cattle from the arterial vessel cut. I inspected pen #11 together with (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) detailed at the stock yard, and we were able to identify the place where the injury occurred. It was assumed that the metal base hinge of the iron pipe fence could be the source of injury. I suggested that the metal base be trimmed to prevent another incident. At 11:00 am I returned to the site of injury and I found out that the metal base had been trimmed and also in pen s#12 and #13.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M34384+V 34384	Elkton Locker and Grocery, Inc.	TLN360806 2219G	19JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	On Monday, June 17th, during a DVMS follow-up verification visit, irregular post-stun movements were observed on the third sheep. The movements included movements of the chest and abdominal wall that were suggestive of rhythmic respiratory efforts and head and neck movements that mimicked a righting reflex. There was not a progression of signs signaling an imminent return to consciousness. A review of all four sheep heads revealed a consistent projectile path the only barely impacted the very front of the brain and in the case of the third sheep, the projectile path missed the brain by approximately 1 cm. The head catch in the knocking chute causes the head of sheep to be held in a very acute angle with the plane of the poll to nose being almost vertical. Consequently, the rifle needs to be held at an upward angle in a confined area. Based on these findings, FSIS IPP suggest continued ongoing review of split heads to monitor projectile paths so any changes in stunning technique or ammunition that may cause altered penetration can be identified and addressed.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
05	M354	Cargill Meat Solution	RNK13131 22413G	13DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Monday 11/25/19, during a routine HATS inspection of the feedlot pens on the west side of the premises, (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) became concerned that some of the animals had not been recently fed. In-Plant Personnel (IPP) observed that the feed bunks in Feedlot Pens 7 and 8 looked significantly emptier than the surrounding bunks and that the animals quickly attempted to consume hay pushed towards them. IPP reviewed the Establishment's feeding logs and discovered multiple discrepancies that made it hard to verify when the animals on premises had been fed. First, the log for Saturday 11/23/19 was incomplete for all pens on premises. IPP noted "11/23" was filled out on the top of the log, but the rest was empty. After IPP brought this up to (b)(6) (b)(6) she populated the log to reflect the feeding completed on 11/23/19 for all pens on premises. She noted this change by writing "filled out 11-25-19." Second, the log for Sunday 11/24/19 was not completed for the feedlot pens, despite animals being housed in these pens since 11/22/19 and the pens in the yards being filled out for this date. On Friday 11/29/19, (b)(6) (b)(6) informed (b)(6) that the feedlot pens were checked at approximately 0600 hours on 11/24/19, but there was no annotation of this check on the log. At this 0600 hours feedlot check it was reported that these pens did not require additional feed because they already had feed. (b)(6) also reported to (b)(6) (b)(6) on 11/29/19 that, although it was not documented, the feedlot pens were all fed between 1200 hours and 1500 hours when it was documented on the log that the usual yards pens were fed. Third, the feeding logs for Sunday 11/24/19 and Monday 11/25/19 show an interval between feedings that is greater than 24 hours. The last feeding time on 11/24/19 is documented</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>as 1200 hours to 1500 hours and the next documented time is Monday 11/25/19 between 1600 hours and 1800 hours, which represents a 25-hour interval. On Friday 11/29/19, (b)(6) (b)(6) reported to (b)(6) that the feedlot animals were also fed on Monday 11/25/19 at 1430 hours. Despite this matter being investigated by multiple IPP throughout the week, this was the first time that this information was presented to IPP and it was not documented on the 11/25/19 log. According to the Daily Inventory records kept by the Establishment, approximately 420 head of cattle, received on either 11/22/19 or 11/23/19, were present in the yards pens during the 25-hour interval described. Maintenance of accurate feeding logs is not a regulatory requirement. However, IPP recommend plant management complete feeding logs accurately and at the time of feeding to ensure consistency in the feeding of animals, regulatory compliance, and promote clear communication among all parties. Poor communication can lead to animals inadvertently not being fed or not being fed within the 24-hour window required by regulation. IPP would like to remind plant management that to remain compliant with 9 CFR 313.2(e), all animals held longer than 24 hours on premises shall have access to feed. This memorandum is issued to give plant management the opportunity to address the aforementioned issues and proffer necessary measures to prevent failures.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
05	M400	Los Banos Abattoir	ZJG291805 2010G	10MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Food Safety and Inspection Service Albany District 800 Buchanan St. Albany, CA 94710 Phone: (510) 769-5712 Fax: (510) 337-5081</p> <p>To: (b)(6) From: (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) Location: HACCP Office Date: May 10, 2019 Subject: Humane Handling MOI On Thursday, May 9, 2019 at approximately 10:05, (b)(6) informed (b)(6) about 2 heads that were stunned multiple times. She informed (b)(6) of her hearing 2 stuns while on the kill floor and other plant employees crowding around near the dry landing area. (b)(6) observe the first head had one stun between both eyes (normal location) and one stun at the nuchal crest. The second head had two stuns between both eyes (normal location) and 2 stuns at the left side of the frontal bone. The stunner informed (b)(6) (b)(6) that the cows were wild (b)(6) suggested to (b)(6) supervisor, to have the stunner wait until the cows calm down before applying the stun. Therefore, the first stun can be efficient. Since (b)(6) was not aware of any evidence of egregious behavior, a noncompliance was not observed. However, these scenarios raise a concern due to the frequency of cows having multiple stuns present in the skull. (b)(6) will continue to observe this issue to verify regulations are met. Respectfully, (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) Alameda District, OFO, FSIS, USDA Plant management response: The two cows were beef cows and were excited at the knock box (b)(6) (b)(6) informed the stunner to wait until cows have calmed down before stunning. M400 management will have a discussion with the stunner on how to efficiently stun a beef, steer or any excited cows in the knock box.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M40463+V 40463	Alaska Interior Meats, LLC	NZS071911 3207G	07NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On November 6, 2019 at approximately 0830 hours while verifying HATS Category VIII Stunning Effectiveness and HATS Category XI Conscious Animals on the Rail on the slaughter floor, I, (b)(6) observed an animal regain consciousness after being stunned, shackled, hoisted and stuck for bleeding. I observed the stun operator effectively stun a market swine with the electrical stunning device to the head on the first stunning attempt. The swine's rear leg was shackled. While the swine was being hoisted, the shackle loosened and fell off the animal's leg, releasing the swine to the ground. While the swine was lying in lateral recumbency on the ground and still unconscious, the animal was stuck for bleeding. The swine's rear leg was re-shackled, and the swine was fully hoisted off the ground while unconscious. I observed, after a few seconds, the shackle loosen a second time and the swine fall to the ground, initially landing on its head. I observed the animal regain consciousness. I observed the swine sit upright and maintain a sitting position with the back legs bent and the front legs straight with hooves on the ground. Chris Miller, plant manager, was present and immediately instructed the stun operator to re-stun the swine. The stun operator applied a second attempt with the electrical stunning device to the head, which rendered the animal unconscious. I observed the swine re-shackled, re-hoisted and re-stuck for bleeding. Mr. Miller immediately addressed the incident with verbal instruction to the stun operator. I verbally informed Mr. Miller of the non-compliance. Mr. Miller was not present for the next market swine. I observed the stun operator effectively stun the swine on the first stun attempt with the electrical stunning device to the head. The animal was shackled and hoisted. When the swine was about 90% hoisted</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								and its head was still lying on the ground, the shackle loosened, and the swine fell to the ground. The swine did not regain consciousness. The animal was re-shackled, re-hoisted and effectively stuck for bleeding. The animal remained unconscious. I notified Mr. Miller of the ineffectual shackling. Mr. Miller directly supervised the next two market swine's. They were effectively stunned on the first stunning attempt with the electrical stunning device to the head. The animals were shackled, hoisted and stuck for bleeding without sliding out of the shackle or regaining consciousness. The Denver District Office was contacted via supervisory channels and the incident was determined to be egregious. USDA Reject tag B37157201 was applied to the stunning box.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV09130 51022G	22MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Faulkner Meats (M44779) Taylorsville, KY holds animals on the premises which the establishment considers to be custom exempt until they are declared for federal inspection. While the establishment did engage in federally inspected slaughter activities this day, the following observations involving the custom exempt animals were made by the SVMO at approximately 1330 hrs. EDT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A large boar (greater than 500 lb.) was observed without access to water. The bottom portion of the plastic drum being used as a water trough was empty; the automatic waterer in the back corner of the pen was observed crushed against the wall. · A large pen holding lambs and sheep ranging in size from roughly 40 lbs. to 200 lbs. was observed with feces covered flooring; the bedding component was minimal and mostly wet; puddling was observed (urine?) in one area of the pen; pelts on the majority of the animals was contaminated with fecal; one lamb was observed in a moribund state; one small automatic waterer (1-2 gallon bowl capacity?) was functional and insufficient for the volume of animals (number too numerous to count) in the pen in the SVMO's opinion. A second small automatic waterer in another section of the pen contained no water (functional?). <p>The establishment is once again reminded that the FMIA (Federal Meat Inspection Act) and the HMSA (Humane Methods of Slaughter Act) applies to custom exempt livestock per USDA FSIS Directive 5930.1 revision 4.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV52080 62228G	28JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>June 27, 2019 Faulkner Meats (M44779) Taylorsville, KY performed USDA inspected slaughter this day. The SVMO observed the following conditions at approximately 1445 hrs. EDT in the holding pens: 1. A pen housing two mature boars was found with the automatic water bowl in a non-functional position (it was torn from the wall in a vertical rather than horizontal position) and no visible means for water access. There was the bottom portion of a drum with waste products being used for food, but no water in the pen. 2. The pen just outside the back door was in the process of being cleaned; sheep (too numerous to count) and a calf were crowded into another pen; the automatic water bowl was dry (functional?) and no means for water access observed. The floor had soupy manure and minimal manure-soaked bedding. The CSI was unable to relay how long these animals may have been in this pen. The above animals are considered custom exempt by the establishment until they may be declared for federal inspection. The establishment is once again reminded that the FMIA (Federal Meat Inspection Act) and the HMSA (Humane Methods of Slaughter Act) applies to custom exempt animals per FSIS USDA Directive 5930.1 revision 4. This continues a trend in humane handling issues for the establishment; a MOI dated May 22, 2019 documents a similar observation.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV01120 71609G	09JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>USDA inspected slaughter activities were performed this day at Faulkner Meats (M44779) Taylorsville, KY. The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) verified conditions in the holding pens at approximately 1500 hrs. EDT. What appeared to be a pot-bellied pig was observed being held on the scale without access to water; no means of holding water was found in the "pen". In-plant personnel left the establishment at approximately 1330 hrs. EDT. How long the pig was held on the scale without water is unknown. Management considers all animals in the holding pens to be custom exempt until the time they are declared for USDA inspection. Upon returning to his vehicle in preparation to leave the establishment, the SVMO was confronted by establishment owner Mitchell Warren. Mr. Warren stated, "USDA is done; stay out of my barn." The SVMO informed Mr. Warren of his right to be in the barn; Mr. Warren reiterated "stay out of my barn." The SVMO encouraged Mr. Warren to contact chain of command; again Mr. Warren stated for the SVMO to "stay out of my barn." It is recommended establishment management review Title 9 CFR 300.6 Access to establishments and other places of business. Particularly 9 CFR 300.6(a)(1) which states in part that persons subject to provisions of the FMIA (Federal Meat Inspection Act) must afford representatives of the Secretary access to establishments that slaughter or otherwise prepare livestock products and 9 CFR 300.6(b)(1) which states in its entirety "At all times, by day or night, whether the establishment is being operated or not, inspection program employees must have access to the premises and to every part of an establishment that slaughters livestock or otherwise prepares meat products or slaughters poultry or otherwise processes poultry products that are subject to inspection for the</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								purpose of conducting an inspection or performing any other inspection program duty. The numbered official badge of an inspection program employee is sufficient identification to entitle him or her to admittance to all parts of such an establishment and its premises.” Again, the establishment management is reminded that per Directive 5930.1 revision 4, custom exempt operations are subject to the FMIA and HMSA. This continues a trend in custom exempt humane handling issues.
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV28080 70726G	26JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	Faulkner Meats (M44779) Taylorsville, KY engaged in USDA inspected slaughter this day. At approximately 1330 hrs. EDT the Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) brought to the attention of the Consumer Safety Inspector (CSI) the conditions observed in the swine holding pen in the barn. The floor of the holding pen was covered in liquid feces and all swine were covered in manure. The establishment considers all animals in the holding pens to be custom exempt until declared for federal inspection. Again, per USDA-FSIS Directive 5930.1 revision 4 the FMIA and HMSA applies to custom exempt animals. This continues a trend in humane handling observations related to custom exempt animals at the establishment.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV11060 92220G	20SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Faulkner Meats (M44779) Taylorsville, KY engaged in federally inspected slaughter this day. The establishment considers all animals being held in the holding pens as being custom exempt animals until so declared for federal inspection. The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) made the following observations while performing the livestock Humane Handling Animal Tracking System (HATS) task at the establishment:</p> <p>1. At approximately 1200 hrs. EDT:</p> <p>a. A pen of lambs was observed with flooring covered in fecal material roughly 2 inches in depth, some areas wet, and no visible dry bedding.</p> <p>b. A pen of sheep and goats was observed with flooring covered in fecal material roughly 2 inches in depth, some areas wet, and no visible dry bedding.</p> <p>c. A pen of lambs was found to have one dead lamb present; a second lamb was found hanging by a horn entangled in the wire panel fencing attached to the gate---the lamb was lying lateral recumbent with its front end slightly elevated from the floor (hanging from the gate/wire panel.)</p> <p>2. At approximately 1230 hrs. EDT:</p> <p>a. While observing slaughter floor activity of the federally inspected animals a beef was found in the knock box.</p> <p>i. The beef was observed with its hindquarters facing the head gate of the knock box and an establishment employee was observed striking the beef in the head/face with the broom portion of a push broom to have the animal turn around. The SVMO inquired of available plant personnel if the animal was declared for federal inspection or custom exempt slaughter—plant personnel did not know.</p> <p>ii. The same individual above was observed kicking the beef in the hindquarters to have the animal turn around. (b)(6)</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>(b)(6) appeared on the kill floor and the SVMO inquired if the beef was declared for federal inspection or custom exempt slaughter- (b)(6) stated the animal was intended for custom exempt slaughter.</p> <p>iii. The same individual observed striking the beef in the head with the push broom and kicking it in the hindquarters was observed with a water hose running at full stream, first spraying the hindquarters (animal still not turning around in the knock box) then proceeding to spray the animal in the face/head. At that point the SVMO stopped the individual and instructed (b)(6) (b)(6) that the observed activity was not acceptable, understanding the animal was declared for custom exempt slaughter. The establishment is once again reminded that per FSIS Directive 5930.1 revision 4 the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt animals. The above observations were brought to the attention of (b)(6) (b)(6) who was likewise informed of the documentation of those observations.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV26081 11627G	27NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Tuesday, November 26, 2019 Spencer County Butcher Block (M44779) Taylorsville, KY engaged in federally inspected slaughter activities. The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) made the following observations in the holding pens while performing the livestock humane handling activities tracking system (HATS) task at 1530 hrs. EST: · The swine pen was found to have approximately 75% of the floor covered in roughly one inch of liquid feces; the cut-off bottoms of plastic drums were likewise coated in feces and contained a small volume of some type of black liquid (feces?); the bedding covering the remaining 25% of the floor was wet. · Multiple sheep pens were found with roughly 2-3 inches of packed manure and no visibly clean bedding. The animals in question had not been declared for federally inspected slaughter. The establishment considers all animals in the holding pens to be custom exempt until declared for federal inspection. However, the establishment is once again reminded that the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt animals per USDA FSIS Directive 5930.1 revision 4. Similar recent custom exempt MOIs were issued July 9, 2019, July 26, 2019, and September 20, 2019. (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) was made aware of these observations and the forthcoming documentation.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV35171 24111G	11DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Spencer County Butcher Block (M44779) Taylorsville, KY engaged in federally inspected slaughter activity on December 11, 2019. The (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) made the following observations at 1030 hrs. EST while performing the livestock Humane Handling Activities Tracking System (HATS) task: · A pen of 5 beef calves was found without access to water; no visible means of watering the animals was observed. · Above a pen of beef calves a foam insulation panel was hanging precariously. · A pen containing sheep and goats too numerous to count (TNTC); these animals held overnight had questionable room to lie down. · A pen of sheep and goats was found to have one dead goat. · A pen holding swine was found to have approximately 50% of the flooring covered in 1-2 inches of soupy manure; approximately 25% covered in wet bedding; and approximately 25% in borderline acceptable bedding. The bottoms of plastic drums being used as feed troughs contained some type of "slop" as a food source. Two swine were observed ambulatory disabled amongst the normal population; one possibly having a hip injury, the other a swollen rear distal extremity with an open wound and walking three-legged lame for the most part. While the animals involved with the above observations are considered custom exempt by the establishment until presented for federally inspected slaughter, the establishment is once again reminded that the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt animals per USDA-FSIS Directive 5930.1 revision 4. MOI #VMV5012111626I dated November 26, 2019 was the most recent documentation concerning custom exempt livestock. The above</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								observations were brought to the attention of (b)(6) who was likewise informed of the documentation of these findings.
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV35101 25727G	27DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Spencer County Butcher Block (M44779) Taylorsville, KY engaged in federally inspected slaughter activity on December 26, 2019. The remaining livestock in the holding pens that did not receive ante-mortem inspection by IPP are considered custom exempt by the establishment. That stated, at approximately 1400 hrs. EST the Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) made the following observation: the swine pen holding swine of various sizes and too numerous to count was found to have standing liquid feces of approximately one inch in depth covering roughly one-fourth of the floor, soupy feces covering roughly one-fourth of the floor, and the remainder of the floor covered with recumbent swine. Some of the swine were observed lying on the fringe of the recumbent pile in the soupy manure portion of the floor. The condition of the bedding where the swine were lying could not be evaluated at the time of observation. The three bottoms of cut-off plastic drums were observed covered in feces and contained liquid material consistent with that covering the floor. (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) was notified by IPP of this observation and the forthcoming documentation. Per Directive 5930.1 revision 4 the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt livestock. The above observation continues a recent trend in humane handling issues involving custom exempt animals at the establishment.</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M44779	Spencer County Butcher Block	VMV42050 14403G	03JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Spencer County Butcher Block (M44779) Taylorsville, KY engaged in federally inspected slaughter activity January 2, 2020. The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) made the following observation at approximately 1030 hrs. EST: swine in the swine holding pen were found to be without access to water. The swine pen was observed to hold animals of varying size (20 lbs. to over 500 lbs.). Water was conveyed to the holding pen via a pipe extending from the ceiling to a "T" with a nipple waterer on each end; the nipples were suspended roughly 24 inches from the floor (somewhere between knee and hip high on a human). The SVMO observed a small black pig (estimated 20 lbs.) near the nipple waterers eagerly trying to drink the water that was falling from the mouth of a larger pig capable of reaching and drinking from the nipples; the nipple waterers were the sole water supply for the holding pen. Numerous pigs in the 20-30 lb. range were observed in the pen (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) was informed of this observation and the forthcoming documentation. (b)(6) placed a drum with a nipple waterer at a level reached by the smaller pigs in the pen. The establishment considers all animals held in the holding pens to be custom exempt until the time declared for federal inspection. The above animals had not been declared for federal inspection at the time of observation. Directive 5930.1 revision 4 states that the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt animals. The above observation continues a recent trend in the handling of custom exempt animals at the establishment; conditions in the holding pens involving custom exempt animals have been documented in MOIs dated November 27, 2019, December 11, 2019, and December 27, 2019.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M44911+P 44911+V44 911	Kinikin Processing	PNQ05140 54106G	06MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Memorandum of Interview Humane Handling Establishment #44911 Date: 5/6/2019 Time: 0810 FSIS (b)(6) At approximately 0810 on 5/6/2019, while stepping off the slaughter floor for the stunning of a large sow, I, (b)(6) heard one shot and a squeal from the sow. I opened the door and the sow was still standing but it was not vocalizing (b)(6) (b)(6) left the slaughter floor and proceeded to the office to retrieve a larger round of ammunition. (b)(6) returned and readied the 357-caliber round in the firearm, giving me a warning of fire-in-the hole. I immediately stepped off the kill floor and (b)(6) applied a second stunning attempt which effectively rendered the animal insensible. I talked to (b)(6) about what had happened. He stated that he had started to knock the sow with a 22 Mag rifle but had decided it may not be large enough so decided to go with a 38-caliber bullet for a more effective stun, but after firing the 38-caliber round it was evident that the 38-caliber round was insufficient, so he obtained the 357-caliber round. One large hole was observed in the skull of the sow. Knocking box was tagged with US Rejected B 11002921.</p>
25	M45321	Upper Iowa Beef LLC	BYF391311 4706G	06NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On November 6th, 2019 approximately at 1315 hours I went to the outdoor holding pen to perform a humane handling task on truck unloading. I observed 40 fat cattle depart from the trailer, approximately 80% of the cattle slipped 8-15 feet from the trailer on what appeared to be a buildup of frozen manure on the concrete pad between the dock and the building entrance door. Three to four head of cattle fell, getting up without appearing to have any injuries. I informed (b)(6) and (b)(6) Maintenance of the finding at 1330 hours. This is the last load of cattle to arrive at the establishment for today's slaughter.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M45321	Upper Iowa Beef LLC	BYF421511 1306G	06NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	On 11/5/2019 approximately at 1300 hours I went to the indoor holding pens to perform ante-mortem inspection. While there I observed a plant employee holding a rattle paddle with two hands using it in a jabbing motion impacting the beef animal held in the alleyway in the middle of the back several times. The animal moved forward after several uses of the rattle paddle in this manner. A similar use of the rattle paddle was discussed during the 10/31/2019 weekly meeting.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M454+P49 88+V454	Owyhee Meat Company	HKD22060 90218G	18SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Animal Handling Incident at Establishment M454: Date: 09/11/2019 Phone: (509)- 876-6051</p> <p>The following are the events that transpired on the specific dates and times documented down below and that are documented in my words to the best of my ability. On 09/11/2019, at approximately 1513 hours, while returning back into the kill floor, I (b)(6) heard an animal vocalizing loudly outside the knock box; I immediately proceeded to the door that leads outside the kill floor by the knock box. As I opened the door to investigate why the animal was vocalizing loudly, I observed the employee repeatedly jabbing the animal in the chute in the area between the flank and the rib area trying to force it to proceed forward. The animal reared its head back as he jabbed it with the hot shot. I told the employee to stop doing that and that he was only allowed to use the hot shot once and not as many times as he had done. Shortly after this, I saw (b)(6) coming out to the kill floor and proceeded outside, so I left the area to continue inspection in the kill floor. This concludes this chain of events. ----- At approximately 3:15pm on September 11, 2019, (b)(6) (b)(6) while entering the slaughter floor at Est. 454, heard a cow repeatedly vocalizing. She immediately went to the chute leading to the stunning area and observed (b)(6) (b)(6) repeatedly prodding a black beef cow that was balking at the entrance to the stunning area. The black beef cow continued to vocalize excessively (b)(6) instructed (b)(6) (b)(6) to immediately stop prodding the cow. As I proceeded from the slaughter floor the cattle chute area I clearly heard the repeated vocalizations until (b)(6) intervened in the situation. I spoke with (b)(6) who oversees the driving cattle from the pens to the stunning area. He indicated to me that (b)(6) was not</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								a slaughter floor employee and was not authorized to use the prod. (b)(6) was not present at the time the incident started (b)(6) (b)(6) then allowed the black cow to back out of the chute and return to the pens. After my discussion with (b)(6) I returned to the slaughter floor and spoke to (b)(6) to gather further details of the incident. At 3:40PM I placed a US Rejected tag (B 30 665850) on the stunning area and informed (b)(6) that slaughter was immediately suspended based on the inhumane event. (b)(6)

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
05	M45422+V 45422	Messina Meats	BEJ401108 0928G	28AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	Date/Time of Inspection: August 28, 2019, 0430 to 0515 HATS I: Weather; Mild, 68 degrees, dry, covered pens are available for animals for protection from inclement weather HATS II: Truck Unloading; One farm trailer unloaded 3 market hogs, establishment employees moved them without incident HATS III: Water and Feed; Three pens of cattle had water and feed, one pen with 20 goats had water and feed HATS IV: Ante-Mortem Inspection; Employees drove market hogs from trailer to holding pen without excess discomfort or excitement. No disrepair observed in holding pens, alleyways HAT V: Suspect/Disabled Animals; No suspect or disabled animals on premises HAT VI: Electric Prods/Alternative Devices; No driving tools used to move hogs off trailers or into pens HATS VII: Slips and Falls; None observed HATS VIII: Stunning Effectiveness; No slaughter HATS IX: Consciousness on the Rail; No slaughter Conclusion: Based on the observations during this odd hour inspection I conclude that: There was no heavy equipment lying in the immediate pen area. There was also no evidence of animals skidding, dragging or any mistreatment of animals. I have determined, based on my observations, that the plant is compliant with humane handling regulations during my odd hour Humane Handling Inspection visit.
05	M45422+V 45422	Messina Meats	BEJ451608 0230G	30AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	MOI for Odd hours goes here

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M45554A+ P45554A+V 45554A	Great Frontier Meats	OXR07121 05804G	04OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>This is to document a meeting between (b)(6) and Plant Owner Tom Pioske about Humane Handling. On the second hog of the morning, the electric wand was applied without being plugged in. The employee applying the wand released the hog within seconds after application and the pig became fractious. A second application occurred before (b)(6) stopped the activity. Mr. Pioske identified the wand as not being plugged into an outlet. The wand tips are circular with an outer ring of teeth approximately 1/4 inch in length and an inner spiked tooth extending 1/2 inch. There was no sings of blood or breakage of the skin when (b)(6) examined the pig. During this examination, the pig reacted with a lesser degree of excitement. (b)(6) and Mr. Pioske discussed ensuring all stunning equipment was properly maintained/energized prior to application to avoid exciting the animal being stunned. Mr. Pioske understood and agreed.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M45629+V 45629	Andy's Meats Inc.	DJP291211 2915G	15NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On November 8, 2019 while observing HAT category VII observation for slips and falls at about 8AM, I (b)(6) along with (b)(6) (b)(6), made the following observations and discussed the findings with plant manager Andy Zubek, (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6). Slaughter was underway and we observed an establishment employee sorting pigs and guiding them to the chute. He was using a louder than ideal voice when moving the pigs and instead of using his BB filled paddle to simply make noise to move the pigs he was using it to tap on the pigs regularly and once appeared to tap on a pig's head when it started to climb on other pigs. I discussed the situation with Mr. Zubek who spoke with the employee in question. We observed the same employee a few minutes later quietly guiding the pigs to the chute with little contact from the paddle. The barn was much quieter and he was using the paddle to guide pigs in a wide arc to the chute. The pigs were much more calm and moved easier with the gentler treatment. We also noticed that the design of the backup chute currently in use while the regular stunning equipment is awaiting repairs is not ideal. The pigs are guided behind a heavy metal gate which is difficult for the employee to open and close and then to enter the chute from the crowd pen, pigs must make a sudden 90 degree left turn. At this point we observed many pigs slip from the slippery conditions on the floor. We discussed the possibility of more frequent cleaning or other means to improve footing at this location. We also noticed during our second round of observations that about 25% of the pigs needed to be prodded with a battery powered prod to get onto the belt while very few had needed it during our first round of observations. The establishment does not have a written animal welfare program but (b)(6) and (b)(6).</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								mentioned that the establishment is considering reintroducing their written records of animal handling in the barn and stunning effectiveness.
15	M45948	Ida-Beef LLC	AKL271505 5729G	29MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 0819 hours I (b)(6) was called to verify stunning of a non-ambulatory dairy cow in the holding pens. I proceeded to the holding pens to verify. I observed the stun operator and the quality assurance monitor were inside the pen with the non-ambulatory dairy cow. I observed the stun operator holding the primary hand-held captive bolt (HHCB) device and the quality assurance monitor holding a back-up HHCB device. The stun operator applied the first stun attempt to the non-ambulatory dairy cow. I observed the rod of the primary HHCB contact the cow's skull. I observed a dark gray spot with hair sticking out on the cow's skull. I observed the cow was on its sternum with its legs underneath it when the first stunning attempt was applied. Following the first stunning attempt, the cow remained conscious with eyes wide open and blinking, ears erect and started to crawl away. The cow did not vocalize. I observed the stun operator reload the primary HHCB by unscrewing the gun, removing the shell and the quality assurance monitor placed a new shell in the gun, then the stun operator screwed the HHCB device back together. The stun operator applied a second stun attempt, which rendered the cow unconscious. I observed the stun operator retrieve the back-up HHCB device from the quality assurance monitor and apply a security stun to the pole of the cow. I placed U.S. Retain Tag #B45142233 to the stun box. (b)(6) verified three stun holes had penetrated the cow's skull."</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE441209 3609G	09SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Monday, September 9, 2019 at approximately 11:35am, while performing Humane Handling Task, (Category 8) on the last inspected animal of the day (b)(6) observed establishment owner/ HACCP Coordinator Matthew Lawrence performing Stunning procedures on a Kune-kune pig over the age of two. Establishment uses a hand held captive bolt (HHCB) as their primary and secondary stunning method. On his first attempt it was ineffective. The owner immediately retrieved his backup HHCB, which was in arms reach resting on scalding machine, and immediately conducted the second attempt. The Second attempt was also ineffective, failing to render animal insensible. Owner reloaded the primary HHCB and issued the third attempt which was ineffective, again failing to render animal insensible. The owner reloaded backup HHCB and delivered the fourth attempt, again ineffective. The owner then retrieved a .22 Caliber Rifle from his front porch, approximately 200ft away. The first attempt with the rifle (5th overall) was also ineffective at rendering the animal insensible. Finally, On the second rifle attempt (6th overall) the animal was rendered insensible and remained so thereafter (b)(6) (b)(6), tagged the knocking box with US REJECT Tag # B-45 308594, and contacted his (b)(6)</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE080909 3426G	26SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>Summary/Recommendation: The Following contains the Verification Plan for Marble City Meats, LLC. Establishment #M46070, Sylacauga, AL. All task's were observed and verified on 9/19/2019. The establishment did not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations outside the aforementioned date. Based on the plants adherence to their corrective action plan and regulatory compliance, I recommend the abeyance continue without any further action at this time. Handling of Livestock Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment utilizes an SOP to not accept hogs with an "atypical head formation". Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based on my review of establishment records, establishment has implemented the SOP for animal type acceptability on 9/18/2019. The SOP for animal body type states "(b)(4)" "(b)(4)". Additionally, the SOP has images of Acceptable and Not Acceptable animals. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment maintains two (2) functioning hand held captive bolts (HHCB), and a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon, near the stun area, and during stunning operations. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon visual observation and record review on 9/19/2019, Establishment had 2 Functioning captive bolts as well as a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon near the stun area during stunning operation. The Establishment repaired and replaced the springs and the busheling in both HHCB as well as performed a dry test on all devices prior to start of slaughter operations. Establishment pre-op and operational logs as well</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>as their robust systematic approach paperwork have sections that indicate Primary, Secondary, and backup stun are present and in good working order in the room. Establishment affirms on their data log sheets that the said stun equipment is present in the room. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment, if necessary, upon need for a third stun to render an animal insensible, utilizes the .22 rifle for said third stun attempt. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based on visual observation, the establishment did not need to utilize the .22 rifle for a third stun attempt on 9/19/2019. Although the .22 rifle backup stun weapon was in slaughter room near the stun area loaded with safety on in gun case. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the stun operators are trained and have successfully passed the establishment's test, prior to the stun operator being allowed to resume the actions of stunning. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon my review of establishment Stunning training logs, Establishment stun operator & owner Matthew Lawrence successfully completed and passed all necessary retraining and testing of stunning effectiveness on 9/18/2019. His training included "strike zone and angle placement, wooden block testing, Humane handling and effective slaughter written test and weapons training." The training was witnessed and signed by (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has verifiable procedures for stun weapon cleaning, maintenance, and charge selection and usage. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(ii), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings:</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>Based upon my review of Establishment records, Establishment created a SOP for Stunning weapon Maintenance and implemented SOP on 9/18/19. SOP state that establishment will clean all stun weapons weekly. The Captive bolt devices will have their springs and rubber chamber replaced after every 200 stuns. The Maintenance of the stunning weapons are documented on the "Gun Maintenance Record Log". The Establishment documented on 9/18/2019 that they replaced springs and rubber busheling/chamber, cleaned and returned it back to operational standards. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has provided and posted stunning "landmark charts" and that such are clearly posted in slaughter room and near stun area. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon direct visual observation on 9/19/2019, Establishment placed two (2) landmark charts in the slaughter room near the knocking box. One chart is the procedures for Humane Euthanasia of Beef located on the wall near the scalding, while the other is the Anatomical site for Livestock Euthanasia located next to knocking box door. Both charts are from the University of Iowa College of Veterinary Medicine. The Charts are clearly posted and visible from any spot in the room. Inspection program personnel will perform the PHIS Inspection Task to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the establishment's Humane Slaughter program including all procedures specified therein</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE381110 1021G	21OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>Handling of Livestock Summary (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) covered for (b)(6)</p> <p>on 10/10/2019. The Following contains the Verification Plan for Marble City Meats, LLC. Establishment #M46070, Sylacauga, AL. All tasks were observed and verified on 10/10/2019. The establishment did not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations outside that date. Establishment Owner/Manager Matthew Lawrence informed inspection personnel that due to his new outside job responsibilities the establishment would not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations for several of the upcoming weeks. No timeline was given as to when establishment would start back operations. Based on the plants adherence to their corrective action plan and regulatory compliance, I recommend the abeyance continue without any further action at this time. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment utilizes an SOP to not accept hogs with an "atypical head formation". Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based on my review of establishment records, establishment has implemented the SOP for animal type acceptability on 10/10/2019. The SOP for animal body type states (b)(4)</p> <p>(b)(4)" Additionally, the SOP has images of Acceptable and Not Acceptable animals. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment maintains two (2) functioning hand held captive bolts (HHCB), and a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon, near the stun area, and during stunning operations. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon visual observation and record review,</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>Establishment had 2 Functioning captive bolts as well as a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon near the stun area during stunning operation.</p> <p>Establishment pre-op and operational logs as well as their robust systematic approach paperwork have sections that indicate Primary, Secondary, and backup stun are present and in good working order in the room. Establishment affirms on their data log sheets that the said stun equipment is present in the room. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment, if necessary, upon need for a third stun to render an animal insensible, utilizes the .22 rifle for said third stun attempt.</p> <p>Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based on visual observation, the establishment did not need to utilize the .22 rifle for a third stun attempt on 10/10/2019. Although the .22 rifle backup stun weapon was in slaughter room near the stun area loaded with safety on in gun case. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the stun operators are trained and have successfully passed the establishment's test, prior to the stun operator being allowed to resume the actions of stunning. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon my review of establishment Stunning training logs, Establishment stun operator & owner Matthew Lawrence successfully completed and passed all necessary retraining and testing of stunning effectiveness on 9/18/2019. The training was witnessed and signed by (b)(6) No additional training has been performed or recorded Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has verifiable procedures for stun weapon cleaning, maintenance, and charge selection and usage. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv), 9</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(ii), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon my review of Establishment records, Establishment created a SOP for Stunning weapon Maintenance and implemented SOP on 10/10/19. SOP (b)(4) (b)(4) The Captive bolt devices will have their springs and rubber chamber replaced after every 200 stuns. The Maintenance of the stunning weapons are documented on the "Gun Maintenance Record Log". The Establishment documented on 10/6/2019 that they cleaned and returned it back to operational standards, Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has provided and posted stunning "landmark charts" and that such are clearly posted in slaughter room and near stun area. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon direct visual observation, Establishment placed two (2) landmark charts in the slaughter room near the knocking box. One chart is the procedures for Humane Euthanasia of Beef located on the wall near the scalding, while the other is the Anatomical site for Livestock Euthanasia located next to knocking box door. Both charts are from the University of Iowa College of Veterinary Medicine. The Charts are clearly posted and visible from any spot in the room. Inspection program personnel will perform the PHIS Inspection Task to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the establishment's Humane Slaughter program including all procedures specified therein</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE121311 1404G	04NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>Handling of Livestock Summary: The following contains the Verification Plan for Marble City Meats, LLC. Establishment #M46070, Sylacauga, AL. The establishment did not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations during the two-week period since the last verification task was performed. Last verification was conducted on 10/10/2019. Establishment Owner/Manager Matthew Lawrence informed inspection personnel the establishment would not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations for the next several weeks. No timeline has been given as to when establishment would start back slaughter operations. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment utilizes an SOP to not accept hogs with an "atypical head formation". Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No inspected slaughter operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment maintains two (2) functioning hand held captive bolts (HHCb), and a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon, near the stun area, and during stunning operations. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR §, 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon visual observation and record review, Establishment had 2 Functioning captive bolts as well as a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon near the stun area. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment, if necessary, upon need for a third stun to render an animal insensible, utilizes the .22 rifle for said third stun attempt. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No inspected Slaughter operations performed during the verified time</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the stun operators are trained and have successfully passed the establishment's test, prior to the stun operator being allowed to resume the actions of stunning. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Training was completed on 9/18/2019. No additional training has been performed or recorded. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has verifiable procedures for stun weapon cleaning, maintenance, and charge selection and usage. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(ii), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon record review of establishments weapon maintenance log, establishment has documented that they have cleaned Captive Bolt #1 & 2 as well as .22 Caliber rifle on Saturday, 19 @ 26, 2019. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has provided and posted stunning "landmark charts" and that such are clearly posted in slaughter room and near stun area. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Establishment placed two (2) landmark charts in the slaughter room on 9/18/2019. The Charts are clearly posted and visible from any spot in the room. No additional information has been added. Inspection program personnel will perform the PHIS Inspection Task to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the establishment's Humane Slaughter program including all procedures specified therein</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE551411 5719G	19NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Handling of Livestock Summary: The following contains the Verification Plan for Marble City Meats, LLC. Establishment #M46070, Sylacauga, AL. The establishment did not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations during this two-week period. Last verification was conducted on 10/10/2019. It is unknown when establishment will start back slaughter operations. I recommend continuing the abeyance until the plant can show continued compliance</p> <p>Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment utilizes an SOP to not accept hogs with an "atypical head formation". Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No inspected slaughter operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment maintains two (2) functioning hand held captive bolts (HHCB), and a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon, near the stun area, and during stunning operations. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR §, 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon visual observation and record review, Establishment had 2 Functioning captive bolts as well as a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon near the stun area. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment, if necessary, upon need for a third stun to render an animal insensible, utilizes the .22 rifle for said third stun attempt. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No inspected Slaughter operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the stun operators are trained and have successfully passed the establishment's test, prior to the stun operator being allowed to resume the actions of</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>stunning. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Training was completed on 9/18/2019. No additional training has been performed or recorded. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has verifiable procedures for stun weapon cleaning, maintenance, and charge selection and usage. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(ii), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon record review of establishments weapon maintenance log, establishment has documented that they have cleaned Captive Bolt #1 & 2 as well as .22 Caliber rifle on Saturday, November 2 @ 9, 2019. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has provided and posted stunning "landmark charts" and that such are clearly posted in slaughter room and near stun area. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Establishment placed two (2) landmark charts in the slaughter room on 9/18/2019. The Charts are clearly posted and visible from any spot in the room. No additional information has been added. Inspection program personnel will continue to perform the PHIS Inspection Task to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the establishment's Humane Slaughter program including all procedures specified therein</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE410912 4403G	03DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Handling of Livestock Summary: The following contains the Verification Plan for Marble City Meats, LLC. Establishment #M46070, Sylacauga, AL. The establishment did not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations during this two-week period. Last verification was conducted on 10/10/2019. It is unknown when establishment will start back slaughter operations. I recommend continuing the abeyance until the plant can show continued compliance</p> <p>Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment utilizes an SOP (b)(4)</p> <p>(b)(4) Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No Red Meat slaughter inspected operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment maintains two (2) functioning hand held captive bolts (HHCB), and a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon, near the stun area, and during stunning operations. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon visual observation and record review, Establishment had 2 Functioning captive bolts as well as a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon near the stun area. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment, if necessary, upon need for a third stun to render an animal insensible, utilizes the .22 rifle for said third stun attempt. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No inspected Slaughter operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the stun operators are trained and have successfully passed the establishment's test, prior to the stun operator being allowed to resume the</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>actions of stunning. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Training was completed on 9/18/2019. No additional training has been performed or recorded. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has verifiable procedures for stun weapon cleaning, maintenance, and charge selection and usage. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(ii), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon record review of establishments weapon maintenance log, establishment has documented that they have cleaned Captive Bolt #1 & 2 as well as .22 Caliber rifle on Saturday, November 23 & 30, 2019. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has provided and posted stunning “landmark charts” and that such are clearly posted in slaughter room and near stun area. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Establishment placed two (2) landmark charts in the slaughter room on 9/18/2019. The Charts are clearly posted and visible from any spot in the room. No additional information has been added. Inspection program personnel will continue to perform the PHIS Inspection Task to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the establishment’s Humane Slaughter program including all procedures specified therein</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M46070+P 46070	Marble City Meats LLC	KLE050801 4603G	03JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Handling of Livestock Summary: The following contains the Verification Plan for Marble City Meats, LLC. Establishment #M46070, Sylacauga, AL. The establishment did not conduct any inspected red meat slaughter operations during this two-week period. Last Slaughter verification was conducted on 10/10/2019. Establishment Owner has decided to voluntarily suspend inspected livestock slaughter operations. He also stated that he does intend on returning under inspection after he has did a complete overhaul of his entire slaughtering system; Moving from Captive Bolt to Electric Stun. He anticipates that will be Spring 2020. Attached is the letter in which he delivered to inspection personnel. Inspection Personnel recommends that his letter be accepted and his voluntary suspension be granted. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment utilizes an SOP (b)(4) Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No Red Meat slaughter inspected operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment maintains two (2) functioning hand held captive bolts (HHCB), and a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon, near the stun area, and during stunning operations. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR §, 313.16(a)(3) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon visual observation and record review, Establishment had 2 Functioning captive bolts as well as a third .22 rifle backup stun weapon near the stun area. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment, if necessary, upon need for a third stun to render an animal insensible, utilizes the .22 rifle for said third stun attempt. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: No inspected Slaughter operations performed during the verified time period. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the stun operators are trained and have successfully passed the establishment's test, prior to the stun operator being allowed to resume the actions of stunning. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Training was completed on 9/18/2019. No additional training has been performed or recorded. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has verifiable procedures for stun weapon cleaning, maintenance, and charge selection and usage. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(ii), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(ii) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Based upon record review of establishments weapon maintenance log, establishment has documented that they have cleaned Captive Bolt #1 & 2 as well as .22 Caliber rifle on Saturday, December 21 and Monday December 29, 2019. Issue/Action Plan: Verify that the establishment has provided and posted stunning "landmark charts" and that such are clearly posted in slaughter room and near stun area. Regulations: 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(1), 9 CFR § 313.15(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.16(a)(3), 9 CFR § 313.15(b)(1)(iv), 9 CFR § 313.16(b)(1)(iv) PHIS Task: HATS CATEGORY VIII (8) Findings: Establishment placed two (2) landmark charts in the slaughter room on 9/18/2019. The Charts are clearly posted and visible from any spot in the room. No additional information has been added. Inspection program personnel will continue to perform the PHIS Inspection Task to verify the adequacy and effectiveness of the establishment's</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								Humane Slaughter program including all procedures specified therein
90	M46240	Light Hill Meats	MKE38110 71824G	24JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>At approximately 0810 hrs (b)(6) observed one bull, weighing 1688 lbs., being loaded into the knock box at Light Hill Meats (est. 46240). Using .22 mag long rifle ammunition, the plant employee administered a first stun attempt and the animal subsequently exhibited sternal recumbency (b)(6) (b)(6) checked dentition for validation of age. The plant employee administered a stick to the carotid artery, and in the process of severing the spinal cord without cutting it, the animal regained consciousness, vocalized, and stood on all four legs. It was noted that the first stun attempt was ineffective. At this time the employee went back to the table where the gun is kept, retrieved the gun, and administered a 2nd stun to the forehead rendering the animal unconscious. It remained unconscious and insensible to pain throughout shackling, sticking, and bleeding. The knocking box was immediately tagged with Reject tag# B37-373667. Plant manager Patrick McCord was notified of the regulatory control action. Light Hill Meats (est. 46240) is not currently operating under a Written Robust Systematic Approach to Humane Handling Plan.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M46297	Lockhart Meat Company	CPO56090 52014G	14MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>HATS Category: VIII (Stunning Effectiveness) At approximately 10:00 am today while performing a routine Humane Handling Category VIII task at Lockhart's (M46297), I (b)(6) observed (b)(6) walked up to the head restraint with a hand-held captive bolt device to stun a steer in the chute. After the first stun attempt, the animal remained standing and conscious, with no evident wound or blood. (b)(6) immediately applied a second stun to the steer, with the backup hand-held captive bolt device. The animal by this time was vocalizing loudly and still standing. (b)(6) stunned the animal for a third time which rendered the animal unconscious. (b)(6) followed up with a safety knock. This was the last animal offered for slaughter for the day. I placed a U.S. Rejected Tag (# B-45 316510) on the entrance to the stunning area. Upon review of the steer skull, there were 4 holes in the skull of the animal. I learned the establishment had just received a new tin of orange .25 caliber 3.5 grain charges for the hand-held captive bolt device. The establishment has decided to stop using those charges and will purchase some new charges. The Establishment operates under a Robust Systematic approach of Humane Handling.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M46407	Open Range Beef, LLC	LPN291411 4613G	13NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Wednesday November 13, 2019 at approximately 0910 hours I (b)(6) observed a non-ambulatory disabled (NAD) bovine present on a livestock trailer on the top deck inside the trailer. Establishment animal handling personnel applied 2 electric prod attempts to encourage the cow to stand up on the trailer. Following the first electric prod attempt the cow fell over on her left side. With the second electric prod attempt the cow stood up. When the cow stood up it was obvious that the cow couldn't put weight on her left forelimb and wouldn't even toe touch with it. The cow struggled to take a few steps and then went down again on the ramp inside the trailer. An animal handling employee radioed (b)(6), to bring his equipment to stun a NAD cow. (b)(6) came out and checked the cow without bringing any equipment with him. I told (b)(6) (b)(6) that the cow needs to be stunned and is displaying signs of pain. (b)(6) left to go inside to get his equipment. It took (b)(6) an extended amount of time to come outside with the hand-held captive bolt (HHCB) stunning device and his knife to bleed the cow. In the meantime, while waiting for (b)(6) the cow was crawling on her fetlocks down the ramp, trying to move forward and vocalizing. The cow attempted to get up a few times but fell back down and banged her head on the trailer floor. The cow was eventually stunned and rendered unconscious with the HHCB device on the first stunning attempt. A second security stun was applied with a backup HHCB device, and the animal was then stuck and bled out. Spoke to the (b)(6) about the incident that happened on the trailer with the NAD. (b)(6) said that the regular employee who handles all of their HHCBs left at 6 am this morning, therefore the devices were not cleaned or logged this morning for the day. That is</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								why there was a delay in the knocking of the cow. I expressed my concerns about the cow being in obvious pain and struggling to rise. (b)(6) said that he would talk to the appropriate managers to figure out how to make the HHCBs available first thing in the morning for use.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M46433	SeraTec Inc.	VGF26150 11903G	03JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>January 2, 2020 at approximately 1515 hours, while performing post mortem inspection, (b)(6) (b)(6) heard an animal make a noise from the shackling area. (b)(6) turned around and was able to observe an establishment employee bleeding out calves on the rail. (b)(6) observed that one of the calves was exhibiting an involuntary mouth movement and assumed this was the calf which had made the noise. The establishment employee lifted the head of the calf and (b)(6) observed the pupils dilate. The establishment employee then removed the head. (b)(6) placed U.S Rejected Tag B40245952 on the pneumatic captive bolt stunning device. Plant Manager, Mackensy Priest, had entered to the slaughter pen area and was informed of the incident. The dressed head was noted to have two penetrating stun holes. Although (b)(6) (b)(6) observations do not support a directly observed noncompliance, this incident raises concerns about the humane handling practices of the establishment. Based on the head evaluation it is clear that one of the stun attempts was not located in the correct area. Additionally, if an animal regains consciousness or exhibits signs of returning to consciousness, an effective re-stun needs to occur immediately prior to any cuts to facilitate bleeding or prior to continuing the dressing process. The establishment's proffered corrective actions are to provide additional training to the establishment employees immediately and weekly for two weeks. If no additional issues are noted, the establishment will return to the usual training schedule of once monthly. The retraining will include literature and/or videos on proper knocking position, signs of consciousness, signs of returning to consciousness, and how to check for consciousness versus unconsciousness. The employees involved in stunning and shackling will</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								both check for signs of consciousness on every animal. The retraining will also include procedures to follow if signs of consciousness or returning to consciousness are observed. Specifically, the establishment will immediately re-stun any animal observed to be conscious or exhibiting signs of returning to consciousness. Either the primary pneumatic or back-up hand-held captive bolt stunning device will be used for re-stuns with the decision based on which is closest and will ensure the quickest effective re-stun. The establishment will increase their humane handling audit assessments from twice weekly to once daily for two weeks. If no additional issues are observed, the humane handling audits will return to twice weekly. After review of the establishment's corrective actions, the US Reject tag was removed from the pneumatic captive bolt stunning device at 0835 on January 3, 2020.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M46491+P46491	WholeStone Farms Cooperative, Inc.	CHU4508121527G	27DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Category VIII – Stunning Effectiveness (9 CFR 313.15(a)(1)) On 12/26/2019, at approximately 1414 hours, an establishment employee applied a hand-held captive bolt (HHCB) device to a market hog (tattoo #0185) marked for condemnation by the PHV in the segregation pen. The first stun attempt did not render the animal unconscious. The animal was standing and ran in the opposite direction from the stun operator. The same establishment employee applied a second stun attempt with the HHCB device to the market hog from behind the right ear. The second stun attempt did not render the animal unconscious. The hog was still standing, vocalizing and ambulated in the opposite direction from the stun operator. Another establishment employee attempted to stun the animal for a third time; however, the HHCB device fired but did not make contact with the animal (missed stun). The hog was not agitated by this. An establishment employee began to approach the hog for another stun attempt. The hog was moving its head around and I intervened by recommending the employees restrain the animal using a hog board or the like. The establishment employees immediately retrieved a hog board to confine the animal between the concrete wall of the segregation pen and the hog board. Then, an establishment employee applied a stun attempt with the HHCB device to the market hog and rendered the animal unconscious. I instructed one of the Livestock Department employees to radio to the front end to stop CO2 stunning and notified the (b)(6) of the egregious humane handling incident. U.S. Reject tags #B39982436 and #B39982444 were applied to each alleyway to the CO2 stunners at approximately 1428 hours. The facility implements and maintains a robust systematic approach to humane handling.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
80	M46877+P 46877	Seven Hills Abattoir	NOA13110 84526G	26AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On August 26, 2019 at 10:00 AM, a meeting was held between plant owner, Ryan Ford, (b)(6) (b)(6), and (b)(6) to discuss the footing problems in the pen system. (b)(6) (b)(6) began the meeting by describing the historical issues in the pen system. December 2018, an NR was documented for poor footing in the pen system and knock box which led to cattle slipping and falling. The plant responded by trying to spread the cattle thinly over the large pen system and throwing down some sand. They also addressed the knock box issue with a rubber mat that has helped tremendously. In February 2019, Raleigh (b)(6) visited for a routine humane handling review and also noted that cattle continued to slip and fall on the floors. (b)(6) documented in her report a meeting between her and plant manager, Dalton Mosser, discussing the need to fix footing in the pens. As a result, the plant placed down woven tire mats at strategic locations in the pen system where the cattle have to make 90-degree turns or typically slipped and fell. On (b)(6) humane handling visit last Thursday, August 22, 2019, 3 out of 12, or 25% of the cattle monitored during movement out of the pens and through the alleyways slipped or fell. The goal for slips and falls is between 1-2% so this level is way too high. The movement of the animals by establishment personnel is not the underlying cause of the slips and falls and is done proficiently and with minimal excitement. However, the majority of the animals handled in this facility are typical more high strung than those handled at a very small abattoir for individual customers. Possible solutions to the problem were discussed/proposed. Some of the potential solutions discussed were: grooving of the concrete (diagonal or crosshatch), placing woven tire mats throughout the pen system, cleaning less</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>frequently to allow build up of bedding, metal cleating adhered to the floor, covering the cement with a grip epoxy, or re-pouring a concrete floor with gravel/pebbles or metal strips protruding from the top surface to provide grip. (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) also mentioned using the small plant help desk and colleagues within the abattoir and farming community as a resource for the plant to determine which option may best fit their situation. (b)(6) was notified that this is a priority issue for the establishment and should be handled in a reasonable time frame. (b)(6) stated that he is unsure of why this is a problem in his facility since it is constructed out of concrete, sturdy metal gates, and a replaced roof, along with being kept clean on a consistent basis. (b)(6) and (b)(6) explained that most of the issue lies in the footing- the concrete is sturdy but also has a smooth surface which becomes slick with water, urine, and feces. Most other facilities with concrete floors tend to have some sort of rough surface such as grooving or broom sweeping (not recommended since this wears down over time). (b)(6) mentioned that all of the possible solutions may take some time since they are all big projects and may require more research, contractors, and testing in one or two pens. (b)(6) acknowledged that the possible solutions are major changes but the inspection program expects this issue to be taken seriously and actively worked on over the next few weeks. A potential solution should be proposed and in the stages of implementing within 3-4 weeks. It is understood that several different options may need to be tried prior to finding a working solution, but these need to be actively underway and cannot wait for several months before anything is done. (b)(6) also discussed the possibility of placing netting/covering along the walls of the pens so</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								that when the pen gate is opened, the cattle can easily view the exit and where to move instead of circling in the pens. This is also a potential partial solution but will not solve the larger issue of the flooring being too smooth. (b)(6) indicated that he will begin working on the problem and keep (b)(6) updated with the establishment's research and progress. When no more questions were asked, (b)(6) thanked (b)(6) for his time and the meeting was adjourned.

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M47040+P47040	Indiana Halal Farms LLC	EYZ1206021605G	05FEB2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At the conclusion of the slaughter process on February 3, 2020 (b)(6) inquired with the kill floor employees if there were animals left in the barn that would be held overnight. The response was yes and a breakdown of what animals were in the barn was given including 2 baby calves or bob veal. (b)(6) then went to the barn with the employee responsible for feeding the animals to observe the food source they have available for each class of animal. Upon entering the barn (b)(6) observed the 5 sheep were in a pen with adequate room to move around as well as lay down at their leisure. The sheep had been given an adequate amount of hay and the water trough was full. The next pen observed had 3 total calves in it including 1 small started calf and 2 bob veal calves. There was an adequate amount of hay and a full trough of water in the pen. (b)(6) evaluated the 2 bob veal calves and determined that the hay was not considered the most appropriate feed source for the age of the animal. The last and final pen had 1 older beef in it with a pile of hay and a trough full of water. (b)(6) asked the employee if they had any other food options for the bob veal calves. He stated that he did not know and deferred the conversation to the plant owner Mr. Farook Abashaer. (b)(6) then went to the office and spoke with Mr. Abashaer explaining that the age of the bob veal calves was too young to think that hay was an acceptable feed source due to the lack of rumination in those animals. It was also discussed what options there may be for that class and age of animal. Mr. Abashear responded by stating that he would contact the producer and get some milk to feed the calves yet that afternoon. The regulatory expectation of providing feed if animals are to be held for 24 or more hours was discussed per 9 CFR 313.2e as well as the expectation that</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								the feed be suitable for the class and age of the animal.
15	M48144	Abe's Kosher Meats LLC	CFR180905 2817G	17MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On May 16, 2019 at approximately 12:36 pm, I, (b)(6) went outside to perform ante-mortem and observe stunning effectiveness. As I walked outside I saw a driver unloading more cows. As I came around the corner of the corrals, I observed the driver raise a shovel over his shoulder and bring it down and hit a cow in the head. I observed the driver give the shovel to a yard person. After the driver hit the cow, the cow ran out pf the trailer and the driver closed his trailer door. I verbally notified (b)(6) (b)(6) of the occurrence, and then notified (b)(6) via phone. I then tagged the stunning box at approximately 12:45 PM with US Reject tag B37602817.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M48144	Abe's Kosher Meats LLC	CFR451606 0613G	13JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On June 12th, 2019 at approximately 1:45 pm, I (b)(6) stepped outside into the pen area to perform a routine water availability check when I observed a calf laying on its left side in the alleyway to the stunning area with its legs sticking out from under the metal wall. I lifted the cover on the side of the alleyway to find that the calf had its head stuck in between its back and the alley wall and facing the opposite direction of its feet. It was laying passively. I immediately notified (b)(6) of the calf's condition, and he was able to place the calf's head back in a forward-facing position. However, the calf was still unable to respond normally to stimuli, sit up, or stand. I instructed the employees to go ahead and stun the calf, as she was now non-ambulatory. She was rendered immediately unconscious on the first stunning attempt and moved out of the alleyway. I spoke with (b)(6) about the incident, who offered to make the alleyway narrower if possible to prevent calves from getting their feet under the gap between the wall and the concrete floor.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
05	M4969+P4 969	J J Meat Co.	JCO001508 2516G	16AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On August 12, 2019 at approximately 1906 hours, (b)(6) observed two mis-fires of the power-knocker during multiple stun attempts when an establishment employee was euthanizing a bob veal calf for production. At approximately 1915 hours, I (b)(6) reviewed the establishments Humane Handling Maintenance records. I observed the last record for maintenance of the Power Knocker to have been recently dismantled and cleaned on 8/4/19, although no establishment employee initial was documented on the form. At approximately 1920 hours, Plant Manager Javier Juarez Jr. and I (b)(6) reviewed the previously acceptable penetration depth that was performed before the operation of slaughter for bob veal. Then, we reviewed the most recently performed acceptable penetration depth of the Power Knocker before resuming operations. After resuming operations, the bob veal was humanely stunned at approximately 1925 hours. USDA IPP continues to advise further continuation of maintaining HH Maintenance records to support their Humane Handling Program. Previously at JJ Meats, a humane handling suspension occurred on April 3, 2019 in which the plant stated it was due partially to equipment error. Described in the Verification Plan as: "The establishment conducted an internal review and concluded that a "combination of equipment and operator error occurred" and as such has ordered a new stunner". Corrective actions listed in the verification plan were: "The establishment updated the "JJ Meats Robust Humane Handling Program", dated April 4, 2018, and proffered to follow and implement all aspects of the program. Specifically, the establishment has included the following oversight procedures in the humane handling program: The Pen Foreman and Assistant Pen Foreman will ensure that daily preventive maintenance is documented. The plant</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								manager will verify on a monthly basis that the daily preventive maintenance is being documented." And: ""JJ Meats Robust Humane Handling Program Section 313.3 Stunning Methods-Mechanical Captive Bolt/Hantover Pneumatic Power Knocker" indicates that the establishment will have clearly numbered captive bolt stunners and will document preventive maintenance being applied prior to each production shift" "JJ Meat Company will ensure the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Sanitation/Maintenance of Stunning devices is being implemented for the Hantover Power Knocker and the Jarvis Captive Bolt Stunner."

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
05	M4969+P4 969	J J Meat Co.	JCO191409 2005G	05SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Ineffective Stun MOI This MOI is to inform establishment of the conversation that occurred after an ineffective penetrative stun on a bob veal calf that did not render the animal unconscious immediately, on September 3, 2019. (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) was approached by Plant Manager Javier Juarez Jr. regarding his understanding of their Humane Handling Program and how its implemented. (b)(6) stated due to JJ Meat Co. having a "Robust Humane Handling Program", it exempts them from USDA IPP tagging a knock box when a humane handling incident occurs, and it exempts them from USDA IPP issuing an NR when they do not produce an effective penetrative stun on the first attempt. I explained to (b)(6) that in order to have a "Robust Humane Handling Program" you must be implementing the program as written and that the program does not exempt the plant from the above examples provided by (b)(6) Per Directive 6900.2, if an establishment develops and implements a robust systematic approach to humane handling and slaughter (voluntary program), FSIS would consider this when determining enforcement actions following an egregious inhumane treatment event. An example provided to (b)(6) for a non-egregious act was if an animal received a 1st stun, and was not effective, the immediate corrective action is to immediately stun again producing an effective knock. This example is still considered a Humane Handling noncompliance with regulation 9 CFR 315.15(a)(1) using a captive bolt as the stunning method. An example provided for an egregious inhumane handling per Directive 6900.2 Rev. 2 is, "Multiple attempts, especially in the absence of immediate corrective measures, to stun an animal versus a single blow or shot that renders an animal immediately unconscious". With an Egregious Inhumane Handling event, the district</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>office can consider the following: Does the establishment have a written, proffered, and demonstrated "Robust" Systematic Humane Handling plan? Does the establishment have a good history of Humane Handling? Note that these examples provided are not all that is considered of whether an incident is recommended for a potential NOIE in lieu of immediate suspension without prior notification. Recently audited by (b)(6) on 8/14/19 the program was described as: The establishment operates in a systematic manner for humane handling and slaughter, and as a written animal welfare plan. As discussed in the exit meeting with (b)(6), "The program addresses most of the steps outlined in Federal Register Notice Docket No.04-013N, Humane Handling and Slaughter Requirements and the Merits of a Systematic Approach to Meet Such Requirements and follows some of the recommendations in Directive 6900.2 Rev. 2 Humane Handling and Slaughter of Livestock, Attachment 3; Elements of a Robust Systematic Approach to Humane Handling and Slaughter (page 32)." The program is not robust, as not all steps are addressed and the program has not been implemented as written, so the portions of the Directive involving consideration of robust status in the event that an egregious event occurs would not apply to this plant at this time.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M562	JBS Green Bay, Inc.	QSM08150 44023G	23APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>A meeting occurred at JBS Green Bay on April 23, 2019 at approximately 1:45 pm – during (b)(6) routine Humane Handling audit exit meeting. This is to document the incidence of prodding observed by (b)(6) on April 23, 2019 at approximately 9:40 am. (b)(6) was observing Humane Handling with (b)(6) in the establishment's chute leading into the restrainer. (b)(6) observed the associate at the entrance to the restrainer use a hand-held electric prod (HHEP) on 3 animals in separate events within 8 minutes. The third animal was prodded twice with the HHEP to move it from 5 feet before the entrance to the restrainer to the entrance of the restrainer. The animal balked again at the entrance to the restrainer. The associate was then again used the HHEP on the animal another 3 times with the animal vocalizing and kicking with its rear legs. The animal directly behind the prodded animal was far enough behind the first animal it did not get hit with the front animal's rear feet as it kicked. A Quality Assurance associate was present and shouted "Hey!" to the responsible associate after the first 2 animals had the HHEP applied. The QA associate took no action during the prodding of the third animal and (b)(6) intervened by alerting (b)(6) who then took control of the situation by stopping the associate from using the HHEP on the balking animal. The establishment is reminded that per 9 CFR 313.2 "Driving of livestock from the unloading ramps to the holding pens and from the holding pens to the stunning area shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort to the animals" and "Electric prods, canvas slappers or other implements employed to drive animals shall be used as little as possible in order to minimize excitement and injury. Any use of such implements which, in the</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								opinion of the inspector, is excessive, is prohibited.” And 9 CFR 313.15 “The driving of the animals to the stunning area shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort to the animals. Delivery of calm animals to the stunning areas is essential since accurate placement of stunning equipment is difficult on nervous or injured animals.”

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M562	JBS Green Bay, Inc.	QSM57060 42126G	26APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 11:05am on April 5th, 2019, (b)(6) and (b)(6) entered the push gate area of the chute and heard cattle vocalizing inside the chute. As they entered the chute, they observed an establishment employee using the hand-held electric prod on steers. The first steer was already vocalizing and the employee was observed to continue to prod the steer 2 times. The animal moved forward about foot and then the employee immediately started prodding the second animal 3-4 times rapidly without giving it a chance to move forward after the first prod. This animal also vocalized and kicked then moved forward about a foot. The prod was used at the tail head on both steers. As soon as the employee saw (b)(6) approaching, he stopped prodding and walked the prod up to its normal place near the entrance to the restrainer. The production line had not been started, there were no holes in the line and the animals had minimal space to move forward in the chute. The establishment is reminded that per 9 CFR 313.2 "Driving of livestock from the unloading ramps to the holding pens and from the holding pens to the stunning area shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort to the animals" and "Electric prods, canvas slappers or other implements employed to drive animals shall be used as little as possible in order to minimize excitement and injury. Any use of such implements which, in the opinion of the inspector, is excessive, is prohibited." And 9 CFR 313.15 "The driving of the animals to the stunning area shall be done with a minimum of excitement and discomfort to the animals. Delivery of calm animals to the stunning areas is essential since accurate placement of stunning equipment is difficult on nervous or injured animals."</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M562	JBS Green Bay, Inc.	QSM56110 51502G	02MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On May 1st, 2019, (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) met with establishment management regarding the recent concerns with prod usage documented in HH MOIs on 4/23/19 and 4/25/19. Establishment personnel present included (b)(6) and (b)(6). The employees involved in those incidents were retrained and FSIS personnel needed to understand the establishment's expectations for employee electric prod usage going forward. The following is a summary of the establishment's plan for prod usage and training (to be completed with all barn employees in the next 2 days). All management has been trained on these expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The establishment stated they follow NAMI guidelines for prod usage which involves using no implements (point of balance), rattle paddles, air prod and then the electric hand-held prod if necessary. · The electric prod will be used 3 times if necessary and then the animal will be allowed a rest period if they do not move into the restrainer. · Another 3 prods will be applied, if necessary, in attempt to move the animal into the restrainer. · If animals vocalize at any point, the animal will be allowed to rest and one more attempt may be made. If the animal vocalizes again, the animal will be euthanized and plant condemned. · Depending on the gap in the line, the establishment may decide to euthanize and plant-condemn animals that do not enter the restrainer at any time.

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M562	JBS Green Bay, Inc.	QSM28070 53222G	22MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>This MOI is to document events occurring on 5-20-19 and 5-21-19, observed by (b)(6). On 5-20-19, the establishment was forced to take an afternoon break about 1:05 pm due to the fact that a large cow was lodged in the chute. The live weight of this cow was 2770 pounds. The facilities and equipment an establishment utilizes need to be able to manage the size and type of cattle the establishment intends to harvest. On 5-21-19, (b)(6) was observing Humane Handling activities, Category VI – Electric Prod/Alternative Object Use; Category VIII – Stunning Effectiveness; and Category IX – Conscious Animals on the Rail in the establishment's chute leading to the knock box and in the knock box area. (b)(6) arrived in the chute at approximately 11:20 am for about 5 minutes. During that time (b)(6) observed a barn associate take the air prod and place it continuously at the hips of a cow that was 3 animals back from the cow that was stopped in the chute. The animal in the chute that was being prodded had no where to go. (b)(6) stopped the activity by telling the barn associate to stop prodding the animal as it had no where to go. The barn associate then put the air prod down and left the area temporarily and came back with a rattle paddle. (b)(6) then proceeded to the knock box to continue Humane Handling activities. (b)(6) was leaving the knocking area about 11:35 am and noticed the head of a cow sitting on the steps leading up to the blood pit with no identification. (b)(6) asked the associates in the area about the head and (b)(6) approached the area. (b)(6) explained the head was from a cow that had gotten stuck in the restrainer. The rest of the carcass associated with the head was on the production line in the blood pit area. (b)(6) placed retain tag B 45157700 on the head and asked to speak to</p>

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>(b)(6); (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) and (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6). (b)(6) arrived at the knocking area and asked (b)(6) about the head with no identification. (b)(6) explained to (b)(6) the head was from a smaller animal that had gotten stuck in the restrainer with another larger animal lodged on top of it. Both animals were rendered unconscious and the chain was utilized to pull the carcasses from the restrainer. The smaller animal was removed first, and with the force needed to move it out of its lodged position, the head was pulled off with the chain. (b)(6) asked what the intention of the establishment was to present the head with no identification to USDA for inspection. (b)(6) stated it would be presented at the USDA PHV Disposition station. (b)(6) instructed offline USDA personnel to ensure the carcass of the smaller animal (the one with the head still in the restrainer area) was USDA retained by online personnel. (b)(6) asked why FSIS was not notified of the occurrence of the animals getting stuck in the restrainer and the head of the smaller animal being removed with the chain. Upon Post mortem inspection by (b)(6) and (b)(6) FSIS PHVs, the following perimortem injuries were noted about Carcass 210918 (the carcass of the smaller animal with the head removed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant bruising in the intercostal muscles from the level of T1 to T12 o Bilateral rib fractures from T3 to T6 o Bruising visible on the exterior surface of the carcass over the ribs o Torn musculature at the cervical area and significant bruising at the neck o Hematomas around the heart and in the lungs <p>The establishment is reminded that they are responsible for maintaining the identification of every carcass and all its parts until final inspection has been completed; presenting all parts of every</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								animal for USDA inspection; and having adequate facilities to manage the types of animals they intend to harvest.
15	M6173	Masami Foods, Inc.	CCC251808 4705G	05AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On 08/05/2019 at 1045 hours, while observing truck unloading of 7 cattle from a livestock trailer, I observed one <30 month-old steer slipped onto both knees as it was leaving the trailer. The animal was able to quickly stand and walk to the holding pen with no apparent injury or lameness. None of these cattle were coaxed to get out of the trailer and they moved at a normal walking pace without being driven by an establishment employee. The lower edge of the stock trailer threshold distance to ground is over 12 inches. I verbally informed (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) of the incident and he was also advised that a copy of this MOI has been sent to Denver District Office and to the District Veterinary Medical Specialist (b)(6) was also informed that there is a potential for livestock injury which may result in a noncompliance record citing 9 CFR 313.1. I advised the establishment to make the necessary corrective actions to mitigate potential for slips and falls when unloading cattle from similar stock trailers.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M6423+P6 423+V6423	Walt's Wholesale Meats, Inc.	MFO04191 05426G	26OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On 6/26/19, at approximately 4:10pm, I, (b)(6) notified establishment management of an issue with their suspect handling procedures. At approximately 3:00pm, while performing antemortem inspection, I suspected a red dairy-type cow who appeared to have an injection site lesion on the left neck. She was otherwise bright, alert, and responsive, ambulating normally, and appeared relatively healthy besides a mild amount of purulent discharge from both nostrils (suggestive of pneumonia). I instructed the outside cattle handler Baz to suspect this animal and handed him suspect tag M-2310161 to apply to the animal, and because this establishment has a good previous history of applying suspect tags to the correct animals, I did not remain to verify that the tag was put on. At approximately 3:50pm, while I was giving USDA breaks to our line inspectors, the suspected animal reached the USDA FI viscera inspection station. I was surprised to see the carcass was in quite bad condition, with evidence of septicemia in multiple areas of the carcass, including pneumonia, petechiated kidneys, and adhesions in the peritoneum.</p> <p>(b)(6) enquired if I wanted to condemn the carcass there at the viscera table and take KIS test samples, and I agreed, moving on to perform disposition on additional carcasses. After finishing multiple other dispositions, I proceeded to the head inspection table to condemn this and multiple other heads. The hide was left on the head of the suspected carcass, and it was then that I noticed that the hair on the suspected head, which had the aforementioned suspect tag attached, was black, and not the red of the cow that I had instructed the tag be put on. This was when I collected an ear sample and the suspect tag and approached Plant Manager Rafael Gomez and</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<div>(b)(6)</div> of this issue. The fact that the wrong carcass was tagged as a suspect animal is a potential food safety issue because while the marked carcass was appropriately condemned, a suspicious carcass that potentially had excessive medicinal/chemical residues went unmarked and untested. Since I did not personally verify that the tag was affixed to the correct cow leaves the possibility that this incident was simply a case of miscommunication, and not an intentional switch to a different cow likely to be condemned. Plant Manager Rafael Gomez informed me that he would talk to the antemortem handlers to make sure an incident like this does not happen again.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
80	M6590	Randolph Packing Co., Inc.	YBB591304 4426G	26APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Date/Time: 04/26/2019 at approximately 11:45am Location: USDA office of M-6590</p> <p>Attendees: (b)(6) (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) The purpose of this memorandum of Interview (MOI) is to document a discussion with Randolph Packing Co. establishment management on April 26, 2019. At approximately 11:35am this morning, I was performing a humane handling verification task in the knock box area. I looked out the window to observe the cattle driver. One cow was driven into the area immediately before the knock box. Another cow also attempted to also enter this area. The employee used the gate to try to prevent this without excessive force, but the second cow's head entered this area. I saw the employee use an electrical prod on the right cheek of this animal. From the placement of the employee's hand on the equipment, it did not appear that he placed his finger on the activation button. I did not observe any reaction from the animal that would indicate the animal was driven with excessive excitement or discomfort. However, I discussed with management that this may not be the best practice to get into the habit of. I reiterated that use of an activated electrical prod on the sensitive regions of the animal, including the face, genital or anal area, or driving animals with excessive excitement or discomfort would constitute regulatory noncompliance. (b)(6) stated that he would discuss the matter with the employee. The information provided in this MOI includes all the topics discussed during the meeting.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M6785	Bob Evans Farms Inc.	NRL120804 1429G	29APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Wednesday 4/24/2019 at approximately 2 pm while performing the Livestock Humane Handling task, I, (b)(6) observed the following situation. I observed the truck driver unloading the sows off the trailer into the barn. During the entire 10 minutes that I observed him unload the sows he was carrying a hot shot (electric prod) and occasionally touching moving sows with it. I noticed that some of the sows vocalized and picked up their walking pace once they were touched with the hot shot. I never noticed the truck driver put the hot shot down. Once all the sows were unloaded I then asked the truck driver if he used electricity on every sow every time he touched them with the end of the hot shot. He said no and that his trigger finger was only resting on the trigger. I then informed the (b)(6) of my observation and told him that I had no proof that the truck driver was not shocking the sows every time he touched the sows with the hot shot. I also informed him that I believed that the truck driver used the hot shot excessively. (b)(6) then informed me that he would be getting in touch with the truck driver. He also informed me of (b)(6) protocol when it comes to truck drivers using the electric hot shot. (b)(6) protocol is that the truck drivers are not to hold a hot shot while unloading sows at all unless the establishment gives them permission to do so. 9CFR 313.2 Handling of livestock (b) Electric prods, canvas slappers, or other implements employed to drive animals shall be used as little as possible in order to minimize excitement and injury. Any use of such implements which in the opinion of the inspector, is excessive, is prohibited.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
40	M7162	Preferred Beef Group	OFF201708 5803G	03AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 1055 on August 2, 2019, (b)(6) and I observed a plant employee place a live calf (approximately less than a week old) into a metal crate so that the calf could be moved to another location. Once the cage door was closed, the calf jumped over the side of the crate onto the ground. Although the calf was not injured, the potential for injury existed. I immediately informed the livestock receiving (b)(6) (b)(6) about the incident that I witnessed. I informed him that this metal crate needed attention to keep an animal from being able to escape and possibly get injured. (b)(6) also told him this in Spanish so that there would not be any misunderstanding that the crate needed immediate attention. He stated that he would have it taken care of. The metal crate is approximately 4 ft long, 2 ft wide and 4 ft tall. The front gate has a wire panel that spans the entire gate. The sides and back of the crate only came up about 18 inches, thus having an opening of 2 ½ feet. At approximately 1250 on August 3, 2019, (b)(6) and I went to verify that the metal crate had been properly fixed to prevent any animal from escaping or injuring themselves. I immediately noticed that nothing had been done to the crate. The plant had also not placed any identifying device on the crate stating that this crate was not to be used until it was repaired. I placed US Reject Tag B-45009546 to the crate. I then notified (b)(6) about my concerns and showed him the deficiencies with the metal crate. He immediately had maintenance repair the metal crate. At 1443, (b)(6) asked me to look at the crate to see if the repairs to the crate were satisfactory. I determined that they were and released regulatory control. USDAs concerns are that the establishment is utilizing equipment that has the potential for serious injury to an animal. When</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								the equipment is brought to their attention, the establishment is failing to ensure that this equipment is immediately repaired or tagged out in a fashion that it could not be used until it was repaired. USDA strongly urges the establishment to respond to this MOI since MOIs associated with Humane Handling are subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
25	M717+P19 051+V717	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	TAE471606 2025G	25JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	During AM witnessed employee dragging dead pig from the blood pit over the wall of the downer pen and fall onto the floor. Live downer pigs were in pen but none were hit during this incident. Notified Donovan employees are not to do this when live pigs are in the pen or near vicinity. Donovan said he would talk to them.
25	M717+P19 051+V717	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	TAE421409 3111G	11SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	While performing ante-mortem inspection of pen 3 and 4, I observed water leaking from roof at the junction of the new/old roofs above a plugged in light bulb, the water was pouring into a pen with pigs in the space and water pooled on the ground. I immediately spoke with (b)(6) (b)(6) about getting power to this light bulb shut off until the leak stops/is fixed. He called maintenance and within 5 minutes, the light bulb was unplugged from its electrical source, removing potential for electrocution from the water leak.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M7356+P7 356+V7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK5208043 526G	26APR2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	Harmon Bros. Meats (M7356) Warsaw, KY has been on suspension of Federally Inspected slaughter activity since October 2018. While performing a routine visit to the establishment, the SVMO observed at approximately 1030 hrs. EDT the following: · A holding pen with goats and lambs was found to have a dead goat and water of questionable drinking quality; the water was brown with fecal material present. Another dead goat was observed outside of the rendering storage room. · An adjacent holding pen with goats and lambs was densely populated, most of the floor covered with liquid feces and no indication of having bedding added to it, and water of even more questionable drinking quality—brownier than the other. How long the animals had been in the pen was unknown to the SVMO, but all animals had hair coats/wool coated in dried manure. The establishment is reminded the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt operations. The establishment has a history of similar observations.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M7356+P7 356+V7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK3010055 729G	29MAY2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Harmon Bros. Meats (M7356) Warsaw, KY has been on suspension of federally inspected slaughter since October 2018. While verifying conditions at the establishment, the SVMO observed a holding pen in the barn containing custom exempt goats and lambs. At approximately 1100 hrs. EDT the following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The floor was covered in fecal material, most of which was soupy in consistency; puddling of liquid fecal in multiple areas of the pen was present. No indication of bedding being in the pen. · The whole corn present in the feed troughs was covered in fecal material. · Water available was brown. <p>The above observations were brought to the attention of establishment owner Mr. Dave Harmon, who likewise was informed of the forthcoming documentation. The establishment is once again reminded that per FSIS USDA Directive 5930.1 revision 4, the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) applies to custom exempt livestock. This continues a recent trend in humane handling issues related to custom exempt animals.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M7356+P7 356+V7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK2413072 711G	11JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Upon arrival at 0700 hrs. EDT the Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) observed at Harmon Bros. Meats (M7356) Warsaw, KY, a trailer backed-up to the animal unloading dock of the facility. The SVMO inquired of establishment owner Mr. Dave Harmon, if sheep would be slaughtered under USDA inspection this day; Mr. Harmon stated the establishment would begin with the two beef held over from a previous day being held in the holding pens. At approximately 0830 hrs. EDT, plant personnel informed the SVMO they were ready to unload the trailer. The SVMO brought to the attention of (b)(6) (b)(6) the fact that the sheep and goats observed on the trailer had been on the official premises for at least 90 minutes and that they had no access to water; in conversation with the transporter, he stated he arrived at the establishment between 0630-0645 hrs. EDT after a roughly 3-hour drive from the Columbus Ohio area. The transporter unloaded the trailer in the presence of the SVMO, Humane Handling Coordinator (HHC), the HACCP Coordinator, and the Office Manager for Harmon Bros. Meats. The SVMO observed two obviously lame sheep come off the trailer and be placed in the general population. After the trailer was unloaded by the transporter, the SVMO observed a mature sheep laying lateral recumbent and paddling (moribund) next to a side wall of the trailer. This observation was brought to the attention of the (b)(6) (b)(6). Shortly thereafter, the transporter acknowledged to the SVMO the sheep was down and proceeded to get into his truck and drive away from the unloading dock with the live moribund animal still on the trailer. (b)(6) stopped the transporter and told him to return to the unloading dock with his truck and trailer. The sheep was euthanized by the HHC. The proffered</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>corrective actions resulting from a humane handling incident occurring in October 2018 states "Harmon Brothers Meats Inc. understands that animals are under the purview of our company at the point that the transportation vehicle turns onto the physical driveway and passes through the entrance gates to the property." Title 9 CFR 313.2(e) states in part that "animals shall have access to water in all holding pens". In conversation with Mr. Harmon, he communicated the awareness of the trailer being on the official premises and elected to begin the day by slaughtering the beef already present in the holding pens prior to unloading the trailer in a timely manner, ultimately leaving the animals on the trailer without access to water for approximately 2 hours in the "trailer" holding pen. Posted establishment policy at the livestock unloading dock states transporters are not allowed to assist in the unloading process. This statement was brought to the attention of (b)(6).</p> <p>(b)(6) The proffered corrective actions states "The HHC will visibly inspect all livestock on trailers prior to unloading, rather they be destined for Federal, or Custom Slaughter." It continues by stating "The HHC will be looking for visible signs of injury" and that "Any injuries seen will be evaluated as to severity and best course of action will be determined to minimize animal suffering." The paragraph concludes "If the animal's injury is deemed of high severity the animal will be euthanized promptly following subsequent "down animal" procedures." The SVMO did not observe the HHC visibly inspect the livestock on the trailer. Plant personnel did not identify the non-ambulatory animal on the trailer. Neither was it observed or communicated by the transporter to plant personnel the presence of a non-ambulatory animal on the trailer. Likewise, the non-ambulatory animal was not euthanized in</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								a "prompt" or timely manner. (b)(6) was informed of the forthcoming non-compliance record and MOI.
90	M7356+P7 356+V7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK2212075 718G	18JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) and Consumer Safety Inspector (CSI) were observing kill floor activity at Harmon Bros. Meats (M7356) Warsaw, KY at approximately 1215 hrs. EDT. After placing mature sheep in the knock box, kill floor personnel raised the side of the knock box and were observed grabbing an animal by the front leg thereby casting the animal to its side and proceeded to drag the conscious animal on its side for approximately 5 feet to the site where the ritual cut was made on the neck of the animal. This observation was brought to the attention of Mr. Dave Harmon, owner of the establishment, who was advised of the regulatory control action being taken with the placement of "U.S. Rejected" tag number B37427566 on the knock box by IPP. The chain of command for the Office of Field Operations (OFO) Jackson District was notified of the action taken at the establishment.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M7356+P7 356+V7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK3312073 619G	19JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Harmon Bros. Meats (M7356) Warsaw, KY, while on suspension of federally inspected slaughter resulting from a humane handling incident occurring July 18, 2019, engaged in the slaughter of custom exempt animals this day. The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) made the following observations at approximately 1150 hrs. EDT while observing activity on the kill floor at the request of (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) for the establishment: Three mature sheep were placed in the knock box by plant personnel; plant personnel raised the side of the knock box and without the benefit of restraint attempted to stun one of the sheep with the captive bolt device; in this attempted effort, the three sheep escaped from the knock box onto the kill floor and began to scamper about; plant personnel were able to apprehend one sheep as it attempted to exit the kill floor down the walk-way adjacent to the chute that leads to the knock box; plant personnel (2) restrained the sheep and the captive bolt device was fired after placing it on the skull of the animal; following the firing of the device, the sheep attempted to continue to exit the kill floor, remained upright, though going down on a knee(s) while still being somewhat restrained by plant personnel (conscious righting reflex, conscious eye tracking); a second shot from the captive bolt device did render the sheep insensible. An examination of skull, as (b)(6)</p> <p>(b)(6) thought the device misfired/jammed, revealed two holes in the skin of the skull; one hole in the skin on the top of head was such that it suggested the bolt struck the skull at an angle and did not penetrate the bone; the second hole in the skin was more rostral and coincided with a hole in the bone and penetration into the brain cavity. (b)(6) was advised this mis-stun and failure to render the sheep insensible with the first stunning attempt would be documented in a MOI.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								USDA-FSIS Directive 5930.1 revision 4 states the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) applies to custom exempt animals.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M7356+P7 356+V7356	Harmon Brothers Meats, Inc.	IJK4410085 521G	21AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>The Supervisory Veterinary Medical Officer (SVMO) made the following observations at Harmon Bros. Meats (M7356) Warsaw, KY while performing the Livestock Humane Handling task at approximately 1100 hrs. EDT: Ø The whole shelled corn being offered as feed to animals held in the holding pens was observed to be heavily contaminated with fecal material in multiple pens; in one pen (custom exempt animals) the corn was so contaminated that it could barely be distinguished from fecal material. Ø In a holding pen housing lambs and goats, a lamb was observed to be ambulatory disabled; the lamb was obviously lame, carrying the left front limb, and in the opinion of the SVMO, appeared to be fused at the carpal joint in a 90-degree angle. According to the whiteboard attached to the pen, the animals were placed in the holding pen August 16, 2019. The above observations were brought to the attention of IPP (in-plant personnel) and (b)(6). (b)(6) As the animals were placed in the holding pen on Friday, the SVMO inquired as to why the animal in question was not considered "priority slaughter" on the day of delivery; the response received was the animal was not observed lame on Friday. The SVMO inquired as to why the animal was not segregated from the normal population; the response received again was the animal was not observed lame the morning of August 19, 2019. The HHC immediately had establishment personnel remove the fecal contaminated corn, clean the feed troughs and place fresh corn in the troughs. The ambulatory disabled lamb was slaughtered. The SVMO examined the carcass of the lamb; suspicion was confirmed in that the articular surface of the left carpal joint (knee) was angled roughly 90-degrees indicating the long-term position of the affected limb. The establishment</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								is reminded of 9 CFR 313.2(d)(1) which states in part that "(D)isabled animals and other animals unable to move shall be separated from normal ambulatory animals" and per the establishment's Humane Handling Workbook "(A)ny injuries seen will be evaluated as to severity and best course of action will be determined to minimize animal suffering. If the animal's injury is deemed by HHC to be of low severity the animal will be unloaded marked for priority slaughter of the day." Likewise from the Humane Handling Workbook, "Food and water troughs/buckets, will be inspected for cleanliness."

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M791C	Clemens Food Group, LLC	QCF47111 23604G	04DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>I met with Est. 791C (b)(6) from approximately 0925-0933 hours today (12/04/19) in the barn just opposite the serpentine next to the southwest suspect pen. I informed him of a truck that I had observed being unloaded a little after 0700 hours that had an estimated 20-30% of hogs with mild frostnip. Upon examining the livestock trailer that these hogs arrived in I observed that approximately 75% of the vents were closed, in accordance with current TQA standards for the current weather conditions (34F), however I also found approximately 26 individual vents that were open at "hog level", whereas the TQA version 6 Handbook (p. 34) states that there should be "No open vents in direct contact with pigs". The driver delivering these hogs had a current TQA certification (exp. 10/21). Although I did not observe the affected hogs to be in any form of distress, the number of hogs exhibiting this minor form of thermal injury did seem to correspond with the number of vents open at hog level (b)(6) (b)(6) indicated that he would have CFG hog procurement notify producers of this issue so that it could be corrected. I also indicated to (b)(6) (b)(6) that it would be reasonable to expect an establishment with a robust animal welfare program to document such findings as well as any corrective actions taken.</p>
50	M791C	Clemens Food Group, LLC	QCF58131 23618G	18DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Wednesday, December 18, 2019 at approximately 1220 hours (b)(6) met with (b)(6) and (b)(6) (b)(6) concerning the grated flooring above the drains. (b)(6) expressed her concern that hogs could get their foot caught in the floor drainage trough, if the grating over these troughs was not properly maintained and monitored.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
90	M8078+P8 078+V8078	Boone's Abattoir, Inc.	APM14070 63713G	13JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	Livestock pen had no water available to animals this morning. Water was running but all the hoses going to troughs were displaced not allowing water to fill the troughs, all the water was going on floor instead.
50	M85B	Swift Pork Company	GYM15160 64004G	04JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	At approximately 8:20am while exiting the scale house with pen cards I observed a livestock employee attempting to close a gate. He paddled a hog that seemed to be having some difficulty with it's hind legs and wasn't moving very well. It didn't rise to the level of inhumane handling, but I did believe he should have noticed this hog was in distress and ceased using the paddle to try to drive the animal. I alerted (b)(6) and asked her to review the video as I don't think it was overly aggressive, but should result in review especially since this employee has a gold hat training with him. (b)(6) directly addressed the event with the employee before I left the barn and agreed to review the video and follow up as necessary.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M85B	Swift Pork Company	GYM04020 60707G	07JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>On June 7, 2019 at approximately 00:25, while I was performing antemortem inspection duties in the barn, I passed through the alley adjacent to row 21-25 as a front-end employee was moving hogs to the kill alley from the row. The employee was opening the gate nearest the side alley I was in, swinging it from the middle alley toward the back of the pen. He unlatched the gate and pushed it to open, letting go of the gate, and allowed it to swing back toward the wall under its own momentum. A hog was standing behind the gate nearer the wall and facing toward the gate. The gate swung unimpeded until it struck the hog in the left side of the face and head. The hog jumped and squealed as the gate hit it. The front-end employee had turned and was opening the gate on the opposite side of the pen when I looked back to him. At approximately 00:29, I located (b)(6) and informed him of what I had observed. He said he would speak to the employee and investigate further. At 00:40, I notified (b)(6) that I would be writing an MOI detailing what I had seen and documenting that I had spoken to him. He requested that I speak with (b)(6) (b)(6). (b)(6) was contacted, and once he arrived I explained what I had seen to him. He said that he understood that was not the way gates should be opened and said he would review the video and take appropriate actions. I informed him that I planned to write an MOI about this incident. At approximately 00:52, (b)(6) also asked me details of the incident and stated that they would closely review the video and would retrain front-end employees to handle gates properly.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M85B	Swift Pork Company	GYM59230 70802G	02JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>On July 2, 2019 at approximately 17:50, while I was examining subject pigs in subject pen number 1 with (b)(6), I observed as he attempted to get two pigs up near the gate from the barn area. He attempted to several times with each pig to get the animals to rise, one only made it to a sitting position and the other refuse to rise at all. I observed as he left those hogs and directed his attention to hogs bunched on the other side of the pen and successfully got several of those hogs up on their feet and walking. One of those pigs then moved toward the pig laying down near the gate to the barn area, that had refused to rise earlier. The ambulatory hog stood over that disabled hog and then stepped on and over the down pig (b)(6) then herded the walking pig away from the down pig. Shortly thereafter the decision was made to humanely euthanize the down pig due to its inability to rise. I then had a conversation with (b)(6) explaining that when hogs are disabled and unable to rise they should be separated from ambulatory hogs. I also informed (b)(6) that I would create an MOI documenting these events and our conversation.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M85B	Swift Pork Company	GYM04031 00327G	27OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Open	<p>On October 25, 2019 at approximately 17:57, while performing antemortem examination in the livestock barn I was observing truck unloading at the unloading docks. As I was observing at the third unloading dock, I noted a group of hogs was reluctant to leave the trailer and were pushing together facing into the trailer and away from the unloading ramp. The trucker was attempting to turn the hogs and one of the hogs placed its forefeet on the back of another hog and rode up on the hog. As I observed, the trucker reached out with the paddle and struck this riding hog several times in the face with the paddle. I then proceeded to the unloading gate and informed Pedro the dock monitor of what I had seen. He proceeded into the truck and began unloading the hogs himself. I then informed (b)(6) (b)(6) of my observations and that I would create an MOI to document these observations.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M85B	Swift Pork Company	GYM41031 24101G	01DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On November 30, 2019 at approximately 17:59, while performing antemortem examination in the livestock barn, I was observing truck unloading at the unloading docks. As I was observing at the fourth unloading dock, I noted a single hog was on the ramp of the trailer facing up the ramp and not moving. I saw the trucker approach the front of the hog as it stood on the ramp. Then the trucker's paddle struck the hog in the face, the hog jerked its head and squealed. The paddle then struck the hog in the face two times in quick succession with the hog jerking its head both times and squealing both times and then it started to turn to go down the ramp. I then proceeded to the unloading gate to get the attention of livestock personnel. I notified the (b)(6) of what I had seen and he then went into the trailer to speak to the driver. (b)(6) arrived, and I also explained to him what I had seen. He stated he would review the video and speak to the trucker. He stated he would forward this information to (b)(6) for further review. I informed him that I would create an MOI to document my observations.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
50	M85B	Swift Pork Company	GYM24020 10414G	14JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On January 13, 2020 at approximately 18:08, while I was performing HATS task II (Truck Unloading) as part of humane handling verification, I was observing unloading at dock 4. The unloading ramp was elevated in the barn to meet the ramp from the second level of the hog trailer. As I observed a hog came down the ramp as part of a group and then backed up slightly and its back leg fell through a hole in the unloading ramp. The hog pulled its leg out and then as another group of hogs was pushed down the ramp the hog backed up again and it appeared both back legs fell into the hole in the ramp and the hog fell to its belly on the unloading ramp. I called to the barn personnel to try to get them to stop hogs from running over the down hog. However, the hog was able to free itself and come down the ramp before other hogs ran over it, I did not see signs of obvious injury. I approached the unloading ramp, and on closer examination, the unloading ramp flaps that were positioned to cover the gap between the truck and ramp had not been flipped over on each side of the ramp. This left a gap of approximately 10-12 cm by 16-18 cm on the right side of the ramp where the hog had fallen through. The left side also had a slightly smaller gap. I notified (b)(6) of my observations and he observed the gaps on each side of the ramp. He clarified with the trucker that all the hogs had been unloaded. He confirmed that the last group pushed down the ramp had been the last in the truck. I also informed (b)(6) of these findings and notified him an MOI would be documented. 9 CFR section 313.1 states: (a) Livestock pens, driveways and ramps shall be maintained in good repair. They shall be free from sharp or protruding objects which may, in the opinion of the inspector, cause injury or pain to the animals. Loose boards, splintered or broken</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								planking and unnecessary openings where the head, feet, or legs of an animal may be injured shall be repaired. Thus, the establishment has an obligation to prevent unnecessary openings such as the observed gap in the unloading ramp as this presents a real risk for injury to the hogs during unloading.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M85O+P17 775+V85O	Swift Pork Company	HEM49050 83301G	01AUG2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>I talked with Livestock (b)(6) around 4:30am on July 31, 2019 about my concerns from 2 weeks ago about the misters. I told him that I had (b)(6) bring my concerns up and that something got lost in that because the establishments response was just that the misters are on a timer. I explained to (b)(6) (b)(6) that I've been here 8 years, I'm well aware that the misters are on a timer in the summer and it is set so that they are hardly off. My concern with the misters during the hot weather was that the valves were shut off. I explained that on July 18th, during one of the rounds of ante mortem in the middle of second shift I found 5 pens that had the overhead misters off. These pens all had hogs that were very stressed out, to the point that I refused to sign for the pen; one of these pens had been filled for 90 minutes. There is no reason for there to be hogs stressed to the heat that long. Also, during that same round I found 4 dead hogs in the pens I was inspecting. Normally I find a dead hog during ante mortem once every 4-8 weeks. With how hot it was during the week of July 15th I can't say the hogs died from the heat; but it raises concerns when considering the stressed out hogs in pens with the misters off combined with the amount of hogs that died within just a couple hours after arriving. I've seen some misters off this week, but it is cooler this week and the hogs appear comfortable so there is no issue. More attention needs to be taken when there are stretches of real hot weather. Also, I did odd hour inspection Wednesday night (July 17th) and saw that the misters in pen 38 had barely any water coming out. When I checked the valve, the valve didn't even have a handle to try and open the valve more. I mentioned this to (b)(6) (b)(6) The hogs were resting comfortably at that time, but with the hot</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								weather expected, he called maintenance out right away to fix it.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M85O+P17 775+V85O	Swift Pork Company	HEM52000 94512G	12SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Around 21:15 on 9/10/19 while doing HAT category 1V Ante Mortem Inspection I (b)(6) was given a pen card to pen 8 that said that there were 106 hogs in the pen. The company's target head count in this pen is 105, although more hogs can be placed in it without overcrowding. When I got to the pen, I observed that at the near end of the pen the hogs were sitting so tightly that not only was there no space between them, some were on top of a few others laying down. At the far end of the pen there didn't appear to be much space either. There were some squealing noises coming from one of the hogs that had others on top of it, and since the pen next to it was empty; I entered that pen to try and help move the hogs to get them off the others. As I tried to do this I observed that there was extremely little to no space for the hogs to move around freely. I asked the stun tech operator who was with me to open the pen to count the hogs; we counted 159 hogs in the pen. There was a dead hog in the area that the anxious sounds were coming from, it was removed from the area. I immediately had the stun tech operator radio for (b)(6).</p> <p>(b)(6). He came out a little after 21:20 and he also got 159 when counting the pen and adding the removed dead hog. I notified him that I was going to be issuing a noncompliance for over crowding the pen. The back gate to the pen was left open to allow more space to the hogs while still providing water while the company figured out what happened. They split these hogs into 2 pens which were inspected and signed for the next time I went out to the barn. At 16:20 on 9/11/19 while doing HAT category IV Ante Mortem Inspection, (b)(6) came to explain what occurred the previous day. He said a ghost pen was added to pen 8; where the scale operator called for 19 head</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								to fill the pen, but the counters filled a draft of 53 the first scale then 19 on the second. They only called in the scale of 19 as that was what was asked for; but when the scale operator signaled for the scale to be taken to the pen, both scales were taken instead of just the one. This is why all the other pens were correct, those 53 never were entered into the system. They were going to discipline the employee involved. Around 18:50 on 9/11/19 I informed (b)(6) that the documentation would be a MOI instead of a noncompliance. We discussed 9 CFR 313.2(e) and the requirement for all animals to have access to water, and how this could become an issue when the animals when the animals don't have enough room to move freely in the holding pen.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M85O+P17 775+V85O	Swift Pork Company	HEM54211 03818G	18OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Wednesday October 16th, while watching electric prod usage by stunner number 1 I noticed the some rusty jagged ends for the stand that holds a barrel fan for the employees. Upon closer examination I noticed some potential sharp edges. This fan is in an area that occasionally has hogs that get kicked out of the irons or from the swing gate area for stunner 1 that get stressed or balk. I pointed out to (b)(6) (b)(6) that the jagged ends are sticking out and though not likely, could be a potential issue if one of the kicked out hogs decide to walk by or lay down by the fan. She immediately removed the fan from the area. On Friday October 18th (b)(6) let me know that 1st shift must have moved the fan back, but she would remove it again. Around 17:00 I showed the concern to (b)(6) as well and talked to him about the concern, so that he could make sure the concern was relayed to 1st shift. I also let him, and later in the night (b)(6) that I realize that this has likely been in this condition for a while and the chances of it being an issue are slim, but I was going to document this in a MOI to make sure that everyone is on the same page as one shift has removed the fan but the other shift put it back.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M85O+P17 775+V85O	Swift Pork Company	HEM14021 20428G	28DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Around 16:38 on 12/27/19 I was watching prod use by stunner 2. At this time, the hogs weren't coming in to well so there were no hogs in the irons. When 2 hogs did enter the left side of the irons for stunner 2, the employee immediately used the electric prod on them. Upon seeing this I had another employee with a radio call for a supervisor. When (b)(6) arrived, I informed him of what I observed and why the employee used the prod as soon as the hogs entered the irons. He then went to talk to the employee. He came to me around 16:58 to tell me that he watched the time frame on the video and that the employee said the hog balked at the entrance, so he used the bat, then left and used the prod when he first came back. I told him what I observed was at the entrance to the irons, to which he said the cameras don't get that area; but he did talk to the employee about needing to use the plastic bats prior to the electric prod. At 16:46 I observed a hog get stressed and go down right after the 90 degree turn with the front part up to the shoulders just past the longer door in the wall. The employee saw this and instead of opening the door out into the walkway, the employee started to lift the hogs head up and appeared to be in a position to try to move the front of the hog to open the door into the alley way (as it opens in either direction). (b)(6) saw this and jumped into the alley way to stop the employee before he did anything other than lift the hogs head up. (b)(6) then called for another employee to bring the black sled to place the hog into and they used that to move the hog into the area for slow hogs to rest. At 19:11 I was again walking past the stunners when I again noticed the employee a different individual, but same position) at stunner 2 use the electric prod on the hogs prior to the plastic bat. I again asked the same employee as before to radio</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								<p>for a supervisor. After about 1 minute of watching the employee use only the electric prod, including on hogs with multiple others directly in front of it so it had nowhere to go, I asked another employee to take that person's spot until a supervisor arrived. (b)(6) was again the one who showed up, I again told him what I saw and when; he said he would talk to this individual as well about proper prod use. I told (b)(6) that my concern is that after talking with the individuals, is there a supervisor that is able to monitor for improvement or is it up to USDA, as he (b)(6) oversees the final rail area and is usually found around there. (b)(6) used to be in the center alley in livestock but has been moved to the heads area on the harvest floor; and (b)(6) who I believe is still in charge of the stick area, the only time I've seen him in that area a good amount of time was the previous day (12/26) out of the last several times I've been on second shift. I did observe (b)(6) out in the area by the stunners several times throughout the rest of the night. On 1/7/20 around 8:30am I talked about this with (b)(6) as this was the first day we were both working at the same time since the incident. He said the employee was talked to after the incident. (b)(6) also informed me that he talked with (b)(6) of the importance of keeping a supervisor in the stick area and that even if they are short staffed, the supervisor should not be used to fill a line spot for extended times so that he can properly monitor the stick area.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
25	M85O+P17 775+V85O	Swift Pork Company	HEM26231 21528G	28DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>Around 16:15 on 12/28/19 I was watching prod use when I noticed a hog was going through the irons to stunner 2 backwards. The employee used the tip of the electric prod to push up the angled stopper that prevents the hogs from going away from the stunner in the irons. While he was doing this and focusing on getting the backward facing hog to try exit the irons, a hog moving in the correct direction approached and came very close to the hot portion on the electric prod. I could not tell if the prod made contact with the hog's forehead, or if the hog was spook by some movement of the prod; but the hog quickly reacted by taking a few quick steps backwards. A few minutes later I saw (b)(6) (b)(6) and I explained to him what I saw. I also mentioned that I've seen this on occasion on both shifts and have mentioned it to a couple different supervisors, so I was going to write a MOI. I explained that even though the employee had no obvious intent to use the prod in the face of a hog, if the prod had done so it still would have been considered an egregious act. (b)(6) said he would talk with all the employees and then get with (b)(6) (b)(6) on Monday to retraining people and try to find a way to prevent this from happening again. On 1/7/20 around 8:30am I talked about this with (b)(6) as this was the first day we were both working at the same time since the incident. He said that they are working with the maintenance department to find a way to make it so the they can add something to extend the back part of the restraint so that they employees could lift the restraint without having to put the prod or anything else inside the irons near the hogs. The individual employee was alos instructed right after the incident and they were also going to add this issue to the January team meeting so that they could go over it with all the employees.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M86R	Cargill Meat Solutions	EHN35170 61007G	07JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Monday 6/3/19 at approximately 1830 hours while conducting humane handling verification inspection under HATS category VIII: Stunning Effectiveness at the knocking area, (b)(6) (b)(6) observed the following events. A stun was applied with a pneumatic captive bolt to a market beef in the knock box. The animal appeared unconscious – the animal's head dropped and the body went lax. The knocker released the animal from the knocking area and the stunned animal was pulled forward on the belly conveyor out of the knock box and dropped onto the shackle table. After it landed on the shackling belt the animal reflexively rolled from its right side to a sternal position and the eyes were starting to blink, but the animal did not react to its surroundings, did not demonstrate controlled movements, and was not vocalizing. The knocker called down to the shackler to knock the animal. The shackler immediately retrieved the back-up handheld knocking gun and applied a security knock. The animal fell on its right side with tongue out and eyes unresponsive. The shackler then attempted to apply a second security knock to the visibly insensible animal. The handheld captive bolt misfired twice, but worked on the third attempt and a second security knock was applied. The animal remained insensible throughout the security knock attempts. This raises a concern that the device was not functioning reliably, which could become a noncompliance with 9 CFR 313.15(b)(1)(ii). After reviewing the situation with Dr. Jessica VanHook, DDM, we determined that this constitutes a potential vulnerability within your humane handling system. This information was discussed with (b)(6) at 1415 on June 7th, 2019.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M86R	Cargill Meat Solutions	EHN10181 04210G	10OCT2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 12:38am on October 10, 2019 (On B shift for October 9, 2019) while performing the Livestock Humane Handling Task; I (b)(6) (b)(6) observed the following. Two conscious cows that were not stunned went over the belly belt and dropped down onto the discharge belt where the cows are normally shackled and hoisted prior to bleeding. The pneumatic stunning device operator was not at the controls, as he was checking on the animals being loaded into the chute. The belly belt became operational and the two cows went over onto the discharge belt below. The cows landed on their chests but quickly got their feet under them. The two cows proceeded to stand up, stepped down from the discharge belt without slipping or falling, and were walking around on the floor below. Both cows appeared uninjured and neither cow vocalized during the event. Neither cow was stunned prior to these events, nor were the cows shackled and hoisted while conscious. The cows were corralled between a set of gates and the establishment employees immediately and effectively rendered each cow unconscious with hand-held captive bolt devices on the first stunning attempt. I notified (b)(6) (b)(6) of the situation and informed him that this would be documented in an MOI or possibly even an NR. This is the second time an incident of this nature has occurred in less than 2 weeks time. On Friday, September 27th (b)(6) witnessed a similar incident where a live cow went over the belly belt and was loose on the floor around the discharge belt where the cows are shackled and hoisted This event was discussed and documented at the weekly establishment meeting dated 10/3/2019.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M86R	Cargill Meat Solutions	EHN33081 21005G	05DEC2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	On Wednesday December 4, 2019 at approximately 1448 I was called out to the cattle unloading dock by M 86R, Cargill Meat Solutions management to observe the following situation: A 2 deck semi cattle trailer had backed into the unloading dock and when the gate was lifted on the trailer, it was found that the upper deck door had come open; thereby resulting in 2 cattle falling from the top deck onto the cattle in the rear jail. One heifer was dead and 4 were nonambulatory disabled. I observed 4 nonambulatory disabled heifers effectively stunned and pithed before being removed from the trailer. The driver has been suspended by M 86R, Cargill Meat Solutions pending an investigation.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M889A+V8 89	J.F. O'Neill Packing Co. Inc.	DSC261507 5802G	02JUL2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>HATS Category VIII Stunning Effectiveness At approximately 1005 hours, while verifying stunning operations at establishment 889A O'Neill Packing, I observed the following inhumane noncompliance. The establishment stun operator was attempting to stun a slightly fractious bovine. He tried to move the animal forward into the head catch of the stun box, but when the animal refused to move and turned its head towards the stun operator, he applied the hand-held captive bolt (HHCB) device to the head and fired. The HHCB device became lodged in the head and briefly removed from the stun operators control as the animal fell down and backwards. As the stun operator retrieved the HHCB device the animal emitted a short vocalization. The animal regained it's footing and began trying to escape the knock box. The stun operator vacated the slaughter floor. In order to ascertain what contact had been made with the animal, I moved towards the front of the stun box where I could clearly see the head. I saw the hole as well as blood smeared right nostril. I asked for three supervisors (b)(6), (b)(6), (b)(6) and (b)(6) to observe the event. (b)(6) was the first to arrive and I pointed out the hole in the animals skull. (b)(6) arrived next who I also pointed out the hole in the animals skull.. The stun operator returned with two HHCB devices. The stun operator spoke to (b)(6) about something that I could not hear. (b)(6) arrived next. The animal was still in the stun box completely ambulatory and sensible. The stun operator moved the animal into the head catch of the stun box. The stun operator applied a second stunning attempt, but there was no noise from the HHCB nor reaction from the animal. The HHCB device was reloaded and a third stun attempt was applied which</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

District	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								rendered the animal insensible. I verbally informed the establishment that stunning operations would cease, although the already stunned carcasses could be processed. U.S. Reject tag B42025027 was applied to the stun box. The Denver District Office was contacted through supervisory channels. Upon review of the dressed head, I observed two stun holes had penetrated the skull. (b)(6)

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M9230+P9 230	Dayton Natural Meats, LLC	KDD07160 11206G	06JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>At approximately 1030 hours on January 6, 2020, (b)(6) informed (b)(6) (b)(6) that (b)(6) observed a beef carcass still breathing after being stunned. The (b)(6) (b)(6) stated that she had checked the eye for movement after the stun was administered and did not notice any signs of movement. The animal was then rolled to the bleed/stick area. Both (b)(6) and (b)(6) observed an employee repeatedly stick the animal to complete the bleeding process. (b)(6) walked around the bleed basin to stand closer to the animal and employee conducting the sticking. (b)(6) (b)(6) was instructing the employee on how to properly place the stick knife when (b)(6) (b)(6) observed the hanging beef carcass exhibit rhythmic breathing and the head draw slightly upward then move right and left after each failed stick attempt. The tongue was not protruding from the mouth. There was no vocalization (b)(6) observed (b)(6) retrieve the backup hand-held captive bolt device from the stun area on the other side of the pivoting metal door which dumps the carcass from the stun box into the bleed zone (b)(6) (b)(6) administered a second stun which fully rendered the animal unconscious. (b)(6) observed the neck and head become limp and relaxed. (b)(6) did not observe any further signs of breathing. (b)(6) informed (b)(6) (b)(6) of a possible humane handling issue and began collecting information from (b)(6) and (b)(6). (b)(6) applied US. Reject Tag #B35731518 to the stun box. (b)(6) notified establishment administrator (b)(6) and (b)(6) of the incident. (b)(6) (b)(6) was informed of the incident and contacted the Denver District Office via supervisory channels.</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M9265+P9 265	Marks Meat Inc.	CFJ311401 4229G	29JAN2020	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Wednesday January 29, 2020, I, Enforcement Investigations and Analysis Officer (EIAO) (b)(6) (b)(6) was on site at Est. M9265, Marks Meats, to conduct a follow up visit for non-compliances issued during a food safety assessment conducted in December 2019. On this date, I, accompanied by (b)(6) observed the establishment perform the stunning procedure on a landrace type market hog around 0720 hours. The stun box is in the same room as the slaughter processing floor allowing full visibility of inspection personnel of all stunning procedures. On this date the EIAO and CSI were standing roughly 5ft away from the stun box. The first pig of the day was loaded into the stun box and the designated establishment employee applied the first stun attempt using the hand-held captive bolt (HHCB) device. The pig remained conscious, as it was standing, looking around with eyes tracking and vocalizing (repeated, ongoing loud squealing). The establishment employee immediately applied a second stun attempt using a back-up loaded HHCB device which was readily available to the stun operator. Following the second stun attempt, the pig become ventrally recumbent in the stun box, but remained conscious with rhythmic breathing and continued to squeal. The stun box obscured the eyes of the pig from view once the pig became recumbent in the stun box. At this time the establishment employee applied a third stun attempt using a larger HHCB device, which was readily available to the stun operator and rendered the pig immediately and effectively unconscious. At this time (b)(6) approached (b)(6) (b)(6) who was also observing the stunning procedures, to notify him of the egregious incident and verbally notified him to stop operations until further notice. Establishment management were already</p>

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
								implementing humane handling procedures and applied an establishment reject tag to the stun box in response to the incident. Denver District Office was contact through supervisory channels and (b)(6) applied US Reject Tag No. A1281816 to the stun box. The EIAO continued to observe slaughter operations, specifically the sanitary dressing of the market hog and splitting the carcass and skull. The split skull showed three penetrating stun attempts. (b)(6) (b)(6) also verified three penetrating stun attempts of the dressed skull.
05	M934	Charlie DiMaria & Sons	VMH57150 62504G	04JUN2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	Meeting with Plant management (Daniel Bove) and (b)(6) Items discussed: 1. Water access in pens: Some pens have water troughs that have the water valves turned off and there is very low levels of water for the cows. The troughs have not been flushed regularly and some have a green discoloration present. Plant stated they will work with the pen employees to help fix this issue. 2. Pens have a buildup of manure: Some pens (furthest from water hose) have excessive manure and this will attract flies and could lead to slips and falls. The large piles of manure have been removed but continued maintenance is required. 3. Feed for the cattle is required every 24 hrs while they are here. The plant has been using small amounts of hay for the large amount of cattle present. (b)(6) noted about 4 bales of hay given daily this last Saturday for the approximate 180 cattle. Today (6/4/19) the plant has dispensed about 8 - 10 bales for the same amount of cows. This seems a more reasonable amount. (b)(6) stated they will be going to pellets (on order) so they can keep track of how many bags are used per pen. 4. We also discussed the weekly meeting and determined that we work together to determine a time that works for both of us.

Table: MOIs in Response to FOIA2020-111

Dist rict	EstNbr	EstName	MOINbr	Date	Task Code	TaskName	Status	MOI Agenda
15	M969G	Swift Beef Company	NDH48180 92506G	06SEP2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On September 4th, 2019, around 1930 (b)(6) was observing stunning effectiveness (HATS category VIII). He observed a beef move its head and blink after receiving a stun from a hand-held captive bolt stunning device. The establishment employee immediately administered a security stun. It was unclear if the animal was still fully sensible after the initial stun. Upon examination of the head post skinning, there were two knock holes in the skull: one hole was on the target and one hole was an inch below the target and to the left. On September 5th, 2019, (b)(6), and I met with plant manager, Zach Ireland, and discussed concerns with stunning accuracy and the potential for animals to remain sensible if employees are not accurate. Mr. Ireland acknowledged the concerns and will follow up with additional training for all employees responsible for the stunning of animals.</p> <p>(b)(6)</p>
15	M981	Northern Beef Products, Inc.	SND43151 14414G	14NOV2019	04C02	Livestock Humane Handling	Finalized	<p>On Friday November 1, 2019, at approximately 0945 hours, while performing Ante-Mortem Inspection, I, (b)(6), observed an employee misusing a cattle paddle on an animal (Beef Cow) by paddling the animal with excessive force. This is in violation of humane handling 9CFR 313.2 (a) (b) A warning was given to Assistant Plant Manager Gerardo (Lalo) Morales by (b)(6) due to the company taking a preventive measure by immediately terminating the employee.</p>