

Establishment Number	Establishment Name	Inspection Date	Description
M969G	Swift Beef Company	2/21/2022	<p>On February 21, 2022, at approximately 1930 hours, while performing HATS Categories VI, I, REDACTED, observed the following. I observed pens employees moving cattle in the main drive alley towards the stunning box. A group of approximately REDACTED were circling continuously in the drive alley and not making much forward progress. Four pens employees were standing on the sides and behind the group of cattle waving rattle paddles. I observe one employee standing at the very back of the group of cattle raise his paddle above his head and make contact with the animal's rump. I observed the employee raise his paddle above his head and make contact with the same animal approximately 5 times. As I walked down the catwalk to be closer to the animals in the drive alley, I observed the employee move to the other side of the drive alley, raise his paddle above his head and makes contact with another animal approximately 5-6 times. I tried yelling at the employee to stop using the paddle to strike the same animal, but considering how hard the wind was blowing it appeared the employee couldn't hear me. I walked to the ground and told the employee he was not allowed to use his rattle paddle for the remainder of the shift. I spoke with his supervisor and the REDACTED about the what I observed and I verbally notified REDACTED that I would be issuing a noncompliance record. There have been no noncompliance records issued within the past 90 days for the same root cause. The observed behavior by the employee is in noncompliance with 313.2.</p> <p>Part (a) says cattle should be moved with a minimum of excitement and discomfort. Part (b) says other implements used to move cattle should be used as little as possible to minimize excitement and injury to the animals. Furthermore, any use of implements which, in the opinion of the inspector, is excessive is prohibited.</p>
M969G	Swift Beef Company	1/3/2022	<p>On Monday, January 3, 2022, at approximately 2130 hours, while performing a Livestock Humane Handling review and observation task accompanied by REDACTED REDACTED the following noncompliance was observed on holding pens 5B and 6B. I, REDACTED REDACTED, observed approximately REDACTED that have passed ante-mortem inspection with no access to water. The water trough between both pens was observed with solid ice and no available water to the livestock. I notified Animal Handling personnel of this noncompliance and proceeded to take regulatory control action by placing US Reject tags B36803501 and B36803502 on both holding pens. This is noncompliant with 9 CFR 313.2(e), REDACTED, REDACTED was verbally notified of the noncompliance. At approximately 2300 hours appropriate corrective actions were implemented and upon verification the water trough between pens 5B and 6B was filled with water. At this time regulatory control action was relinquished.</p>
M969G	Swift Beef Company	11/11/2021	HATS Category VIII: Stunning Effectiveness

			<p>On 11/11/2021, at approximately 1735 hours, while observing stunning effectiveness, I observed the following noncompliance. A black angus bovine upon entering the stun box was vocalizing repeatedly and using controlled movements in an to attempt to escape the belly belt and stun box. The stun operator applied the first stun attempt with the handheld captive bolt (HHCB) device, which was ineffective. I observed the bovine continue to vocalize numerous times and continue to use controlled movements to lift its legs and head in an attempt to escape the stun box. The stun operator immediately retrieved the backup HHCB device, which was readily available at the stun box, to deliver the second stun attempt, which rendered the bovine unconscious.</p> <p>I inspected the dressed head and verified three separate penetrating stun holes and retained the head using U.S. Retained tag number B38605321. I observed two penetrating stun holes in the forehead and a third penetrating stun hole in the top of the poll. REDACTED informed me that the designated plant employee monitoring consciousness on the rail applied a security stun to the bovine while it was hanging in the stack.</p> <p>This is a regulatory noncompliance with 9 CFR 313.15(a). The Denver District Office was contacted via supervisory channels and I verbally informed REDACTED, that an NR was forthcoming.</p> <p>This noncompliance is being associated with NR# NDH5500112709N-1 issued on 11/6/21 for same root cause.</p>
M969G	Swift Beef Company	11/6/2021	<p>HATS Category VIII: Stunning Effectiveness</p> <p>On 11/6/2021, at approximately 2135 hours, while observing stunning effectiveness, I observed the following noncompliance. The primary stun operator applied an ineffective stun with the pneumatic captive bolt device. I observed the red Hereford bovine immediately lift its head and move its head with a controlled movement from side to side, as well as blink multiple times. The primary stun operator motioned to the secondary stun operator, and the secondary stun operator immediately used the backup handheld captive bolt device to deliver the second stun, which</p>

			<p>rendered the bovine unconscious.</p> <p>I inspected the dressed head and verified two separate penetrating stun holes.</p> <p>This is a regulatory noncompliance with 9 CFR 313.15(a). The Denver District Office was contacted via supervisory channels and I verbally informed REDACTED that an NR was forthcoming.</p> <p>There have been no Humane Handling NR's or MOI's documented for this same root cause within the past 90 days.</p>
M969G	Swift Beef Company	8/26/2021	<p>At 2030 while in the antemortem pen area to perform antemortem inspection, I (REDACTED) observed the following noncompliance under HAT category III, Water and Feed Availability. Pens 1A through 6A and pens 8A through 14A all held cattle awaiting antemortem inspection, but the water troughs for those pens were empty of water. According to the employees in the pens, the water had gone off at approximately 1900, and maintenance had been notified of the problem. As the cattle received antemortem inspection, they were moved into other pens which had full water troughs (1B through 6B and 8B through 14B). Pens 1 through 14 share water troughs which are situated between the pens so one trough serves two pens. According to the pen cards, each of the pens held between 34 and 40 head of cattle so each trough would have served between 68 and 80 head of cattle if operational. At 2320, I visited the pens again and found all troughs full of water. All animals on premise had access to water at that time. This finding represents a noncompliance with 9 CFR 313.2(e). The water supply issue has been recurring this week as the sprinklers in the pens had been observed by inspection personnel to be operating intermittently on previous days on both shifts during conditions of high heat and humidity. This issue of providing water for the pens to prevent heat stress in the cattle was discussed and documented at the weekly meeting with management held earlier today. According to management, the issue was being addressed, and a hose was run from an alternate source to provide constant flow to the pens. During the observation tonight, the hose appeared to be delivering water as intended, but the system was not operating the sprinklers or filling the water troughs. REDACTED, Day Shift REDACTED, and REDACTED, Evening Shift REDACTED, were both notified of this finding and the forthcoming noncompliance record. This noncompliance record is not associated with a previous noncompliance.</p>