

| Establishment Number | Establishment Name         | Inspection Date | NR Description   |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|
| M6590                | Randolph Packing Co., Inc. | 3/8/2022        | <p>At approximately 10:17 AM on 3/8/221 while performing routine observation of the stunning procedure in the area adjacent to the knocking box, I observed a missed knocking procedure. The establishment employee was using the pneumatic captive bolt device on a properly restrained Hereford mix bull that I initially mistook for a cow. The pneumatic device discharged into what appeared to be the correct site, but the sound created by the device was a louder than usually observed hiss and the device and the operators hands appeared to be driven upwards off the animal's head. The animal did not vocalize but remained standing and I repositioned myself to see the bull's head. The bull did not appear to be in distress but did respond to the operator touching his head. The operator proceeded immediately to apply the gunpowder driven captive bolt device to the occipital aspect of the head during which the bull did not struggle or vocalize noticeably but only moved its head slightly in response to the operator repositioning its head. The corrective action using a gunpowder-driven captive bolt device was successful and the bull dropped and was rendered insensible. I immediately informed a REDACTED who called the REDACTED and was joined by REDACTED within a minute. As I repositioned myself, I observed that the pressure gauge for the pneumatic captive indicated proper pressurization. Inspection of the head when still restrained showed that the placement of the pneumatic device had been correct as indicated by the skin defect created. Subsequent inspection of the skull revealed a bone defect considerably larger than the bolt diameter, but nonetheless, the bull was not rendered insensible by the procedure.</p> <p>Failure to properly stun an animal on the first attempt is a violation of 9 CFR313.15 (a)(1). I judged this to be a non-egregious missed knock that arose from the less than perfect restraint achieved with a small cow in the head restraint system.</p> <p>Per REDACTED, the pneumatic captive bolt device is designed to be effective for all animals and is in</p> |

|       |                            |            |  |
|-------|----------------------------|------------|--|
|       |                            |            | consultation with the manufacturer regarding this failure.   |
| M6590 | Randolph Packing Co., Inc. | 12/17/2021 | <p>At approximately 10:17 AM on 12/17/21 while performing routine observation of the stunning procedure in the area adjacent to the knocking box, I observed a missed knocking procedure. The establishment employee was using the pneumatic captive bolt device on a properly restrained, but smaller than average Angus cross cow with horns. The pneumatic device discharged into the poll of the cow which did not drop or move or vocalized noticeably. The employee observed the cow for a few seconds and then a second knock was applied in correct site using a gunpowder-driven captive bolt device successfully. The employee explained to me that he had primed the device to fire, according to correct operating procedure, and was moving toward the correct targeting site (subsequently used for the gunpowder-driven captive bolt device) when the cow moved the poll of its head forward, contacting the tip of the pneumatic captive bolt device and causing it to fire more dorsa[ly] on the head than intended. Failure to properly stun an animal on the first attempt is a violation of 9 CFR313.15 (a)(1). I judged this to be a non-egregious missed knock that arose from the less than perfect restraint achieved with a small cow in the head restraint system.</p> <p>I immediately informed REDACTED, the REDACTED of the missed stunning procedure and in discussions with him and plant manager Greg Dronen confirmed my understanding of the details of the incident. They suggested that the narrowness of cow's head contributed to this instance and suggested the preventative action of instructing their employees to use the gunpowder captive bolt device in any cow where the restraint obtained using the device seemed less than perfect.</p> |
| M6590 | Randolph Packing Co., Inc. | 11/1/2021  | <p>At approximately 10:00 AM while in the knocking area to perform routine observation of stunning procedures I observed a non-egregious stunning procedure non-compliance. The plant employee attempted to perform a stunning procedure using the pneumatically driven captive bolt device (P-CBD). Immediately prior to the incident I had observed the P-CBD function correctly. The</p>  |

|       |                            |           |   |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|---|
|       |                            |           | <p>noncompliance involved a Charolais cow for which the P-CBD was appropriate but the firing of the device produced an atypical sound. The cow continued standing and then started to shift her weight and vocalize. The establishment employee within 10 seconds applied a gunpowder driven captive bolt device (G-CBD) to the occipital region of the cow's head which effectively stunned the animal. I observed that the P-CBD had been applied to the correct site on the head and confirmed the errant operation of the P-CBD. Failure to properly stun an animal on the first attempt is a violation of 9 CFR313.15 (a)(1). I immediately informed floor manager, REDACTED of the noncompliance and he took the P-CBD in use offline and replaced it with a backup device. I also informed REDACTED of the incident. Subsequent investigation by maintenance personnel found normal system pressure but possible malfunctioning of in-service lubrication system. During attempts to verify proper functioning of the lubrication system all stunning was performed using the G-CBD.</p>   |
| M6590 | Randolph Packing Co., Inc. | 10/6/2021 | <p>At approximately 2:00 PM on 10/6/2021 in the knocking box area while observing stunning as part of a routine Humane Handling task, I observed an ineffective stunning procedure on a bull. The plant employee was using the gunpowder captive bolt device and applied it to the properly restrained bull. He immediately after the first attempt initiated reloading the device for a second attempt that he performed effectively at the occipital portion of the skull within 15 seconds. Failure to effectively render an animal insensible is a violation of 9 CFR 313.15 (a)(1). Subsequent examination of the bull's skull showed the device had been applied at the correct site. The site of the first attempt had a depression but incomplete disruption of the soft tissue covering the bone suggest that the bolt did not penetrate the bone. The captive bolt operator remarked that the sound of the firing was quieter and different in character than usual, possibly because the gunpowder charge was defective. The animal did not collapse but remained standing and was breathing, blinking, and moving its head. I informed REDACTED of the irregular stunning procedure and</p> |

|       |                            |           |   |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|---|
|       |                            |           | <p>my intention to issue a non-compliance record. The knocking box was rejected using tag no. B30902931. I also informed REDACTED of the incident who instructed me that regulatory control of the knocking box can be lifted as appropriate corrective actions had been applied. In subsequent discussions with REDACTED, it was suggested to me that another source of cartridges for the gunpowder driven knocking device would be sought.</p> <p>Subsequent discussions with the plant manager, Greg Dronen, revealed that their investigation of the captive bolt device in use during the incident showed wear on the tip of the firing pin that may have affected performance. I suggested that given his findings and given the apparent proper decision making and actions on the part of the plant employee performing the stunning procedure I observed during the execution of the procedure and subsequent examination of the stunning sites on the skull, corrective actions focused on proper maintenance of the device and selection, handling, and storage of the loads used to power the device would be in order and that this is a feature covered in a robust humane handling program. I reemphasized that the stunning procedure must be executed properly the first time every time.</p> |
| M6590 | Randolph Packing Co., Inc. | 8/16/2021 | <p>At approximately 10:00 AM on 8/16/21 in the knocking box area while observing stunning as part of a routine Humane Handling task, I observed an ineffective stunning procedure on a cow. The REDACTED was using the pneumatic captive bolt device and applied it to the properly restrained cow. The size, sex, and physical characteristics of the cow were not inappropriate to the use of the pneumatic captive bolt device and subsequent examination of the cow's skull showed the device had been applied at the correct site. I observed that when the device was applied the employee's hands were rapidly away from the animal's head indicating partial or no penetration of the skull by the bolt. The animal did not collapse, as is typical, but shifted its weight and remained standing. Within a few seconds the REDACTED applied a second stunning procedure to the occipital area of the cow's head with a gunpowder-driven captive bolt device. This procedure appeared</p>   |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | <p>to be effective. I informed REDACTED, REDACTED of the irregular stunning procedure and my intention to issue a non-compliance record. I also informed REDACTED of the incident and the plant management's plans to address the issue. I indicated to REDACTED, REDACTED during discussions about the incident, that the incident more likely arose from a malfunction of the pneumatic captive bolt device than operator error. REDACTED. REDACTED said that they intended to raise the pressure in the pneumatic captive bolt device and add a means of lubricating the device in or near the knocking box to reliable function. He also said that they plan to place a pressure gauge in the knocking box area to allow continual monitoring of the air pressure supplied to the device.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|