



Audit Report

Beef Animal Welfare

Upper Iowa Beef, LLC
4614 Highway 63
Lime Springs, Iowa 52155

Audit Date: June 24, 2025
Auditor: Danielle Massukado

Audit criteria are based on the January 2021, NAMI Recommended Animal Handling Guidelines - Please refer to Guidelines for further explanation of criteria requirements



Audit Summary

Company Name:	Upper Iowa Beef, LLC	Company ID:	AUUPPLIM
Address:	4614 Highway 63 Lime Springs, Iowa 52155		

Contact Name:	Annette Kime
Contact Phone Number:	563-566-2202
Contact Email Address:	akime@upperiowabeef.com

Audit ID:	AO-011275
Audit Date:	June 24, 2025
Audit Type:	Unannounced
Audit Result:	Passed

Auditor Name:	Danielle Massukado
Auditor Phone Number:	
Auditor Email Address:	danielle.massukado@fsns.com



Beef Animal Welfare

Category	# Points Received	# Possible Points	Percentage (%)
Livestock Receiving	225	225	100.00
Non-Ambulatory	50	50	100.00
Holding and Handling	350	350	100.00
Lead-up and Stunning Area	455	475	95.79
Management Commitment	50	50	100.00
Employee Training	75	75	100.00
Overall Score	1,205	1,225	98.37

** Denotes a Core Criteria.

A failure of a Core Criteria or a cumulative score below 90% results in an Automatic Audit Failure.

An Audit Failure requires a re-audit in 60 days.

Beef Animal Welfare

** Denotes a Core Criteria. A failure of a Core Criteria or a cumulative score below 90% results in an Automatic Audit Failure. An Audit Failure requires a re-audit in 60 days.

Score Summary

	# Cattle in Question	Total Cattle Observed	Percent Acceptable
Electric Prodding (prodded) - crowd pen to restrainer	6	50	88%
Vocalization (vocalized)	1	50	98%
Slips (slipped) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	50	100%
Falls (fell) - Unloading	0	78	100%
Falls (fell) - crowd pen to restrainer	0	50	100%
Stunning Accuracy (double stun)	0	50	100%
Insensibility (sensible)	0	50	100%

Audit Outcome

Pass

Comments

The site harvested approximately 2,300 to 2,500 head of fed cattle per week at a chain speed of 55 to 58 head per hour, five days a week.

1 Livestock Receiving

1	Livestock Receiving	
1.1	Must have written expectations & humane guidelines for transporters.	25
Comment:	Transporter guidelines were posted in the unloading areas for live haulers. Drivers were required to handle cattle in a manner compliant with BQAT standards. Plant personnel were present during unloading activities. Transporter observed during this assessment had a valid BQAT on file.	
1.2	Animals must be loaded at the proper industry recommended level.	25
Comment:	One livestock trailer (double-deck) and three gooseneck trailers were observed loaded with 33, 6, 23, and 16 head, respectively. Signs of overcrowding were not observed.	
1.3	Trailers must be cleaned at least once each week to prevent heavy accumulation of feces. Trailers must have slip resistant floors, and no potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, etc.).	25

Comment: Trailers were cleaned at least weekly. Excessive manure and injury points were not observed. Trailers had stamped tread steel floors.

1.4 Ramps, unloading area, and scales should be slip resistant, $\leq 20^\circ$ slope, with no significant accumulated manure. Record all potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, etc.) in unloading area. 25

Comment: Livestock trailer unloading ramps and the gooseneck unloading area had slip-resistant flooring (grooved concrete) and were of appropriate slope. Injury points and excessive manure were not observed.

1.5 Determine number of falls for all animals on trailers observed at unloading. Evaluate at the most probable area and observe multiple unloading chutes if possible. Fall is determined if brisket, belly, rump or other part of torso touches floor. Note number of slips, limb other than hoof touches floor, but do not score. 100
 Excellent: No falls = 100 pts
 Acceptable: < or =1% falls = 90 pts
 Unacceptable: >1% falls = 0 pts

Comment: Falls and slips were not observed on the 78 head assessed.

1.6 Use of electric prods at unloading should be discouraged by plant. < or = 5% of animals should be electrically prodded. Record what other handling tools are in use. 25

Comment: Electric prod use at unloading was not observed. Rattle paddles were the only tools observed in use in the area of unloading.

2 Non-Ambulatory

2 Non-Ambulatory

2.1 A written policy for immobile and fatigued animals must be in place. The facility must also have the tools available for handling immobile and/or fatigued animals on trailers and in unloading area; unless the animal is euthanized prior to movement. 25
 Canadian plants are not allowed to move non-ambulatory animals that arrive at the plant or become non-ambulatory during unloading. The animal must be euthanized where it is found.

Comment: The Humane Handling Cattle Receiving and Knocking Program outlined the handling methods o euthanasia forf non-ambulatory cattle in the unloading area, on trailers, and in pens. Fatigued animals were allowed to rest in a designated pen. Non-ambulatory animals were not observed during this assessment.

2.2 Staging of dead carcasses should be out of public view. DOAs, animals euthanized in pens, and animals that died after arrival must be tracked. 25

Comment: DOAs and euthanized animals were documented in a log. Carcasses were stored on a trailer out of public view. Records from YTD25 were reviewed and evidenced in compliance with the facility's programs and procedures.

3 Holding and Handling

3 Holding and Handling

3.1 An emergency livestock management plan must be in place for short term and long term breakdowns. Short term disruptions may include minor plant breakdowns, minor weather events, or scheduling errors. 25

Long term disruptions may include extended plant downtime, snow storm, motor vehicle accident, natural disaster, building damage, fire, tornado, etc. Procedures should include:

- How feed and water will be provided during long term shutdowns
- How electricity can be provided through back up generators in the event power is lost
- How housing will be provided to animals should housing become uninhabitable due to fire or weather conditions such as snow or flood
- How animals will be evacuated in an emergency such as fire or flood
- For animals that cannot be returned to the farm of origin, there should be a designated place where animals can be unloaded and provided adequate facilities

Comment: The Humane Handling Cattle Receiving and Knocking Program outlined the communication during an emergency to divert cattle based on circumstances, contracted feedlots, transportation methods, feeding and watering requirements, electricity, etc. The site had contracted feed lots where cattle could be offloaded, transferred, and receive feed and water if they could not stay at the site. Feed was present at the site if cattle were held for more than 24 hours.

3.2 Note air temperature, and heat stress index or wind chill index. Observe animals for comfort. Temperature mitigation strategies at the plant should be established when needed for hot and cold conditions. 25

Comment: The temperature was 73°F, and the skies were cloudy during this assessment. Signs of animal stress were not observed. Holding pens had solid sides and a roof. Indoor pens were equipped with ducted heat, fans, and misters.

3.3 Pens, drive alley, circle pens, and other areas where animals walk must have slip resistant floors to minimize the risk of falls. 25

Record potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, broken concrete, etc.) and potential animal distractions in alleys and pens (poor design, poor lighting / shadows, out of place objects, noises, debris, etc.)

Comment: Grooved concrete flooring was slip-resistant. Potential injury points, distractions, and manure buildup were not observed.

3.4 Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 100
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production
 Evaluate at the most probable area.
 Fall is determined if brisket, belly, rump or other part of torso touches floor.
 Note number of slips, limb other than hoof touches floor, but do not score.
 Excellent: No falls = 100 pts
 Acceptable: < or = 1% falls = 90 pts
 Unacceptable: >1% falls = 0 pts

Comment: Slips and falls were not observed.

3.5 Driving tools used to move animals must be used in a manner that allows sound or visual cues for movement. Tools should not be used to strike or jab an animal. 25
 Vibrating prods, if used, must have the pointed end worn down and smoothed prior to use on animals. Vibrating prods should be used on the back, rump, or shoulders of the animal and should not be applied to sensitive parts of the animal or used to jab the animal.

Comment: Driving tools included rattle paddles and, as a last resort, a single electric prod. Such was used appropriately.

3.6 If mounting behaviors are observed the animals that chronically mount are removed from the pen. 25

Comment: Mounting behaviors were not observed.

3.7 Holding pens should not appear overcrowded. 25
 Crowd pen should be under ¾ full and crowd gate should not be used to forcibly push animals.

Comment: Overcrowding and improper use of gates were not observed.

3.8 Animals must have unrestricted access to potable water in pens. Water cannot be frozen. Establishments should include provisions for providing water to animals waiting in drive alleys in their emergency management plan. 100
 Animals must have access to feed if held over 24 hours.

Comment: Pens and the crowd pen were equipped with water troughs. Troughs had a continuous, hard-pipe water supply and heaters to prevent freezing. Cattle held over 24 hours were provided with feed.

4 Lead-up and Stunning Area

4 Lead-up and Stunning Area

4.1 Floors must be slip resistant and cleaned to minimize the risk of falls. Manure should not be excessive. Record potential injury points (broken gates, sharp metal edges, etc.) and potential animal distractions (poor design, poor lighting / shadows, out of place objects, noises, debris, etc.) in crowd pen, chute, restrainer, knock box area. Rearing or struggling should be minimal. 25

Comment: The flooring consisted of grooved concrete with rubber mats and was cleaned at least daily. Excessive manure, injury points, and potential distractions were not observed. Animals moved freely. Rearing or struggling was not observed.

4.2 Documented records are available for the maintenance and cleaning of euthanasia tools. Captive bolt guns must be cleaned each day of use and documented. 50
 Cleaning and preventative maintenance must be performed in accordance with manufacturer recommendations and documented.
 Equipment and ammunition must be stored in a dry place when not in use. Plant must have a back-up stunner. Record type and brand of stunner and type of restrainer or knock box.
 Air injected stunners are prohibited.

Comment: Jarvis handheld captive bolt guns and the pneumatic stunner were cleaned and inspected daily. The facility utilized a head hold-down type knocking box. Maintenance task completion was recorded in a log. Ammunition for the Jarvis captive bolt backup guns was stored in a sealable plastic container. Records were available for review. Air injection stunning was not utilized. A knocking box was utilized.

4.3 Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 90
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production Record percentage of animals electrically prodded. Electric prods should only be used when necessary and not on the facial, anal, or genital regions. Other primary handling tools should be in use.
 Excellent = ≤ 5% prodded 100 pts
 Acceptable = ≤ 25% prodded 90 pts
 Not acceptable = > 25% prodded 0 pts
 Knock box with head restrainer:

Comment: The following non-conformity was identified: The electric prod was used on six animals at the entrance to the knocking box. Animals were balking at the entrance of the knocking box. 6/50 = 12% (90 points)

4.4 Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 90
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production

 Record percentage of animals that vocalized from the crowd pen to and including the restrainer
 Excellent ≤ 1% vocalize 100 pts
 Acceptable ≤ 3% vocalize 90 pts
 Unacceptable > 3% vocalize 0 pts

 Knock boxes with head restraint:
 Excellent < or = 1% vocalize 100 pts
 Head Restraint < or = 5% vocalize 90 pts
 Unacceptable > 5% vocalize 0 pts

Comment: The following non-conformity was identified: One animal vocalized at the entrance to the knock box. The facility had a knocking box with a head restraint. 1/50 = 2% (90 points)

4.5 Chain speed > or =100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 100
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production

 Record percentage of animals that were stunned more than once to render the animal insensible.
 If animals are to have a planned security knock, auditor must assess sensibility prior to the second knock.
 Excellent ≤ 1% double stunned 100 pts
 Acceptable ≤ 4% double stunned 90 pts
 Unacceptable > 4% double stunned 0 pts



Comment: A security knock was applied after rendering the animal insensible. Animals were assessed after the first knock. Each animal was knocked properly and insensible after a single shot. 0/50=0%

4.6 Chain speed >100/hr., evaluate 100 animals 100
 Chain speed >50-99/hr., evaluate 50 animals
 Chain speed < 50/hr., evaluate one hour of production

An animal exhibiting characteristics of sensibility on the rail (i.e., immediately after shackling or hanging) will be an automatic audit failure if observed during any part of the audit. Insensibility is characterized by floppy head, straight tongue hanging out, no righting reflex, eyes in blank stare (no eye tracking), no natural blinks. If an auditor sees an animal that has returned to full consciousness on the bleed rail or table at any time during the audit, it should be noted and the audit failed, even if the animal observed was not part of the 100 animals scored when auditing bleed rail insensibility.
 Excellent 100% insensible 100 pts
 Unacceptable < 100% insensible 0 pts

Comment: Sensible animals were not observed on the rail. 0/50=0%

5 Management Commitment

5 Management Commitment

5.1 An animal welfare mission statement is in place and posted or circulated within the facility. 25

Comment: The Humane Handling Commitment and Mission outlined the company's commitment to animal welfare. The statement was posted in the receiving area and common areas of the facility.

5.2 A program of ongoing monitoring and measurement of animal handling, stunning practices, and outcomes is in place. Each of the seven core criteria should be included. Animal handling and stunning must be audited a (minimum weekly). 25

Comment: Trained site personnel performed internal audits of each of the seven core criteria each production day. Records from the week of 03/03/25 demonstrated compliance with the facility's procedure.

6 Employee Training

6 Employee Training

6.1 The company's training program must reflect company procedures and policies for livestock receiving, condition of livestock, holding and handling, lead-up and stunning area. Training for personnel performing euthanasia must be documented. A written procedure for handling a sensible animal on the bleed rail and is included in training provided. Retraining should be at least annual. 75



Comment: The training program included the site's robust humane program in full, including a written procedure for handling of sensible animals on the bleed rail. Those responsible for euthanasia received training specific to the task. Training was performed upon hire, annually, and more frequently if needed. Training records for personnel observed during this assessment were current as of 2025 and demonstrated compliance.

7 Acts of Abuse

7 Acts of Abuse

7.1 A willful act of abuse is automatic grounds for an audit failure. No
These offenses include, but are not limited to, dragging a conscious, non-ambulatory animal, intentionally applying prods to sensitive parts of the animal like the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, rectum, vulva, testicles, or belly; deliberate slamming of gates on livestock; intentionally driving livestock on top of one another or hitting or beating an animal, purposefully driving livestock off high ledges, platforms or off a truck without a ramp, or animals frozen to the floor or sides of trailer.

Comment: Willful acts of abuse were not observed.

8 Conflict of Interest Declaration

8 Conflict of Interest Declaration

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

Comment: I, Danielle Massukado, do not have a conflict of interest with this auditee.
