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Calm animals are easier to handle than excited fearful animals. *20 to 30 minutes is required for an excited animal to calm down.*
A calm animal will look at the distraction
Tie up loose chain ends that scare animals
A change in flooring or a drain may retard movement

Allow the leader time to investigate
Reflections scare animals
Cattle can see people through the open sides

To find distractions: Get in the chute to see it from the animal’s point of view
Shadows may impede movement.

Sunny days are the worst.
Cattle may refuse to enter a dark building
Skylights installed in the walls will improve cattle movement into an existing dark building.
Solid fences keep animals calmer.

Solid fences are especially important for animals with a large flight zone.
Curved systems work better than straight ones because animals will turn back in the same direction they came from.
The Flight Zone Is The Animal’s Safety Zone

Calm animals will have a small flight zone and tame animals will have no flight zone.
A flag can be used to turn an animal by blocking the animal’s vision on one side.
The crowd pen should be filled half full with cattle or pigs
Animals also “watch” with their ears for potential danger.

The horse has an ear pointed at both a photographer and a zebra.
Behavioral Principles of Restraint

- Non slip flooring – Prevents fear of falling
- No sudden jerky motion
- Optimal pressure – not too tight, not too loose
- Block vision (grazing animals)
Cattle that become agitated in the squeeze chute have lower weight gains.

Cattle that run fast out of the squeeze chute may perform poorly.

Voisinet et al 1997, Fell et al 1999
Cortisol Levels During Restraint

- Beef Cattle - Rough Handling: 63
- Beef Cattle - Electric Prods: 55.6
- Deer - Tranquilizer Dart: 45.3
- Deer - Netted: 24
- Beef Cattle - Quiet Handling: 13
- Dairy Cows: 4.25
- Cattle Baseline: 6.5
- Trained Antelope: 0

Ngl/ml
Cattle perceive a man on a horse and a man on foot as two different things. They need to be habituated to both.
You Manage What You Measure

- Maintaining high standards requires **continuous measurement**

- Handling quality can be maintained by **regular audits** of your handling practices with an objective **numerical scoring system**

PREVENTS BAD FROM BECOMING NORMAL
A Good Auditing System
Must Not be Vague

Ban the words “properly”, “adequate” and “sufficient”. What is “proper” to one auditor might be considered “terrible” by another.

A guideline must have clearly written standards which are not subject to different interpretations by different people.
Example of a Clearly Worded Guideline

All pigs must have enough space to lie down without being on top of each other.
American Meat Institute
Basic Critical Control Points
(Core Criteria)

1. Percentage of animals **stunned correctly** on the first attempt
2. Percentage of animals rendered **insensible**
3. Percentage of animals **prodded** with an electric prod
4. Percentage of animals that **vocalize**
5. Percentage of animals that **slip or fall**

**All scores are on a per animal basis**
Objective Scoring Reduces Subjectivity and Improves Agreement Between Different Auditors from Different Customers

% of Plants That Passed the Stunning Audit. Twenty or more plants were scored by each auditing system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditing System 1</th>
<th>Auditing System 2</th>
<th>Auditing System 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of Beef Plants That Stunned 95% or More Cattle with the First Shot

USDA survey prior to industry wide auditing

McDonald’s Audits started

Continued auditing by major customers

Continuous auditing maintains good performance
Comparison of Beef Plants: Audited for 4 Years vs. First Audit for New Plants (Did not know what to expect)

% of Plants That Passed the Stunning Audit

3 out of 4 new plants failed to stun 95% of the cattle with a single shot
2 out of 4 failed insensibility

50 out of 51 plants passed
1 plant failed on insensibility

% of Plants That Passed the Stunning Audit

New Plants: 25
Previously Audited Plants: 98
Easily Attainable Scores for the AMI
Critical Control Points for Beef
(Based on Customer Audit Data)

| Percentage of cattle stunned with one shot | 97–98% |
| Percentage insensible (100 animal audit)    | 100%   |
| Percentage of cattle vocalizing             | 3%     |
| Percentage of cattle falling down           | < 1%   |
| Percentage of cattle electric prodded       | 15%    |

The AMI minimum acceptable scores are stunning 95% and electric prod use 25%

Breaking of tails or other abusive methods must never be used as a substitute for electric prod
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage insensible (100 animal audit)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pigs correct wand placement</td>
<td>99-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pigs “hot wanded”</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pigs electric prodded</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pigs falling down</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pigs squealing in restrainer</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AMI minimum acceptable scores for electric prod use is 25%, wand placement 99%, hot wands 1%
American Meat Institute
Objective Scoring System

It measures a small number of critical control points that will objectively locate many different problems affecting welfare. Scoring is based on performance.

When CCPs are being chosen, a good CCP will be a point that monitors a variety of problems.
- HACCP Principles same as food safety

- Directly observable things that are outcomes of bad practices or bad facilities

- Not a paperwork audit
1996 USDA Survey Data on Vocalization
Prior to Implementation of Regular Auditing by Both Plant Management and Major Customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rough Beef Plants</th>
<th>Quiet Handling Beef Plants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average % Of Cattle Vocalizing</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive electric prod use; over crowding of cattle</td>
<td>Well-trained handlers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use Scoring to Show How Changes Made in Your Operation Improved Handling

Effect of Air Blowing into the Faces of Cattle at the Restrainer Entrance on Vocalization Score

% Cattle Vocalizing Due to Balkng & Increased Electric Prod Use

Air Blowing Out Through Restrainer Entrance Towards Approaching Cattle

No Air Movement Towards the Cattle

4.5

0
Electric Prod Use on Pigs Was Reduced By Adding Lighting at the Restrainer Entrance

All handlers were well trained and only pigs that balked or backed up were prodded.

- 38% of pigs were prodded at the Dark Entrance.
- Only 4% of pigs were prodded at the Well Lit Entrance.
Reduction in Cattle Vocalizations After Equipment Modifications

Before Modification | After Modification
--- | ---
Install Light on Restrainer Entrance | 8 | 0
Install False Floor to Reduce Balking | 9 | 0
Reduce Pressure of Neck Restraint | 23 | 0
Animals Are Afraid of Dark Places

Adding a light at the restrainer entrance or making other lighting changes that eliminate shiny reflections will improve animal movement.
Comparison of Electric Prod Use and Squealing Between Easy-to-Drive Pigs and Hard-to-Drive Pigs
Comparison of Electric Prod Use Between Normal Feedlot Cattle and Hard to Handle Steers

![Bar graph showing comparison between Normal Feedlot Steers and Hard to Drive/Agitated Feedlot Steers. The graph indicates that 8% of Normal Feedlot Steers were electrically prodded into the restrainer compared to 32% of Hard to Drive/Agitated Feedlot Steers.]
## Comparison of USDA Survey Cattle Vocalization Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before Customer Auditing (8 plants)</th>
<th>After 4 Yrs of Customer Auditing (52 plants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg Score</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worst Plant Score</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use Scoring as a Trouble Shooting Tool

“Do I have a facility problem or a people problem?”

Use balk scoring to determine if you have a facility problem
### Balking Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Cattle Backing Up in the Chute</th>
<th>% Vocalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Balking Plant</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(well-trained handlers)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Balking Plant</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(facility problem)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocalization Score increase due to increased electric prod use.
Critical Control Points for Handling

- Percentage of animals **prodded** with an electric prod
- Percentage of animals that **fall** down
- Percentage of animals that **run into fences** or attempt to **jump** over a fence
- Percentage of animals that exit from a squeeze chute **faster than a trot** (cattle only) – speeders or nonspeeders
- Percentage of animals that **vocalize** (moo, bellow, squeal)

All scores are on a “per animal” basis
Each animal either passes or fails
Two Types of Variables When Auditing Animal Welfare

- Yes/No things not allowed
- Continuous variables where perfection is impossible
Examples of Yes/No Variables in a Welfare Standard

- No sow gestation stalls
- No tail docking
- Specific stocking densities
- Untreated sick animals (organic)
- Specific housing requirements
- No hoisting of live animals
- No tendon cutting or blinding (developing countries)
Major continuous variables are outcomes that are directly observable caused by either bad management or poor facilities.
Major Continuous Variables Where Poor Performance on any **ONE** of These Variables Should be a Failed Audit

- Body Condition Score
- Lameness
- Dirty Animals
- Injuries, Sores, Swellings, Cancer Eye
- Coat Condition (Organic)
- Ammonia Levels (Indoor facilities)
- Abnormal Behaviors
Lameness Is a Good Example of a Major Critical Control Point

Many Different Problems Can Contribute to Lameness

- Poor leg conformation
- Rough concrete
- Improper hoof trimming
- Nutritional mistakes
- Rough handling
- Growing heifers too rapidly
- Poorly designed stalls
How to Set the Initial Levels for a Failed Audit

- Collect baseline data
- Initially set the limit so 25% of the farms in a country will pass
- Provide time for farms to get up to standard
- Decisions to make limits more strict must be based on audit data from many farms