




Livestock Welfare Issues






Kathy Finnerty
NYSCAP Coordinator



Nothing new...

- Upton Sinclair – *The Jungle*, written in 1906
 - Intended to expose "the inferno of exploitation [of the typical American factory worker at the turn of the 20th Century],"
 - Also highlighted animal treatment and food safety issues
 - Lead to Meat Inspection Act



28 Hour Law

- Passed in 1873
- Repealed and reenacted in **1906** in amended form with no substantial changes
- May not confine animals in a vehicle or vessel for more than 28 consecutive hours without unloading in a humane manner for feeding, water and rest for at least 5 consecutive hours



Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter Act

- ➔ Animals must be stunned into unconsciousness prior to slaughter, except for animals slaughtered in accordance with religious law.
- ➔ First enacted 1958 – Eisenhower states, 'If I went by mail, I'd think no one was interested in anything but humane slaughter.'
- ➔ Revised in 1978 to allow USDA inspectors to stop the line when cruelty is witnessed
- ➔ 2002 – mandatory enforcement after Washington Post article

4



OIE Welfare Standards (since May 2005)

- ➔ The transport of animals by land
- ➔ The transport of animals by sea
- ➔ The transport of animals by air
- ➔ The slaughter of animals for human consumption
- ➔ The killing of animals for disease control purposes
- ➔ The control of stray dog populations.

5



OIE New Initiatives 2009-2010

- ➔ *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare
- ➔ *ad hoc* Groups on Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems – first priorities
 - beef cattle
 - broiler chicken

6



As time goes on...



- Animal agriculture has changed
- People removed from livestock – misperceptions about animal agriculture and products from animals
- Attitudes towards animals have changed


7

Survey Research – Dr. Bailey Norwood, Oklahoma State University

1. Importance of farm animal welfare as a national issue

Issue	Relative importance
Human poverty	28.96
U.S. health care system	25.03
Food safety	21.75
Environment	13.91
Financial well-being of U.S. farmers	8.16
Food prices	5.06
Well-being of farm animals	4.15

Note: Each number shows the relative importance of each issue, where the numbers are scaled so they sum up to 100. If Issue A's importance rating is twice that of Issue B, then Issue A is deemed to be twice as important.

2. Importance of livestock production practices for promoting farm animal welfare

Farm animal welfare factor	Relative importance
It is important that farm animals ...	
Receive ample food and water	36.43
Receive treatment for injury and disease	29.05
Are allowed to exhibit normal behaviors	8.01
Are allowed to exercise outdoors	7.95
Are protected from being harmed by other animals	5.90
Are provided shelter at a comfortable temperature	4.43
Are allowed to socialize with other animals	2.76
Are raised in a way to keep prices low	1.75
Are provided comfortable bedding	1.72

8

3. Answers to select farm animal welfare questions

For each of the following statements, do you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree or don't know?

Statement	Strongly agree, %	Agree, %	Disagree, %	Strongly disagree, %
Until we learn to significantly reduce human suffering, we should not worry about the well-being of farm animals.	14	14	24	38
Farmers should be compensated if forced to comply with higher farm animal welfare standards.	37	33	12	10
Farmers and food companies put their own profits ahead of treating farm animals humanely.	30	28	12	9
If food companies improve animal welfare, the price of meat will rise.	38	36	10	7
Farm animals raised on small farms have a better life than those raised on corporate farms.	41	28	8	5
Animals raised under higher standards of care				
Decisions about animal welfare should be left to experts and should not be based on public opinion.	31	21	16	24

Note: Percentages will not total 100% as some respondents answered "neither agree nor disagree" or "don't know." These percentages have a margin of error of 1-3%.

9



Is that so??

- ➡ Agriculture Appropriations Act 2006
 - P.L. 109-97 (2005)
 - None of the funds made available by this act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to inspect horses
 - Intended to stop slaughter of horses for human consumption
 - USDA announces the agency will charge for inspection
 - Unintended consequences
- ➡ American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act
- ➡ 2009 – Government Accountability Office to examine outcome, including farm income and welfare of horses

10



State legislation

- ➡ Battery cages for hens, veal crates, and sow gestation crates
 - Florida - 2004
 - Arizona – 2006
 - Oregon – 2007
 - Colorado – 2008
- ➡ Gestation crates and veal crates – ME
- 2009 – note not battery cages

11



California Proposition 2

- ➡ Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty Act
- ➡ Prohibit confinement of certain farm animals in a manner that does not allow them to turn around freely, lie down, stand up and fully extend their wings
- ➡ Passed with 63% of the vote
- ➡ Divided CA veterinary community
- ➡ Proposed no imports of eggs from battery cages
- ➡ Where does this leave tiestall?

12



Movement of Proposition 2

➡ Ohio – second largest egg producing state

➤ Competitive industries in neighboring states (PA, IN)

➤ Estimated loss of job 7,000

➡ Michigan

➤ Bill passed 2009

As of July 2009 top egg producing states:

1. Iowa
2. Ohio
3. Pennsylvania
4. Indiana
5. California

13



Fighting back MI and OH

➡ Ohio

➤ Ballot issue 2

➤ "Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board"

➤ standards determined by Ohio farmers, food safety specialists, veterinarians, consumers and county humane societies

➡ Michigan – HR 5128

➤ voluntary industry guidelines for farm animals' care

➤ require audits of livestock farms

➤ a 12-member council would review and possibly recommend updated animal care standards at least every five years.

➡ Should this occur in NY prior to a welfare legislative initiative?

14

May 7, 2009

Bill's Introduction Follows Calif's Landslide Approval of Similar Measure Last Fall

ALBANY, N.Y. — The Humane Society of the United States and Farm Sanctuary, headquartered in New York, announced enthusiastic support for legislation introduced in the New York State Assembly to provide more room for farm animals.

The bill, [S. 1000](#), introduced Tuesday by Assembly member Linda Rosenthal, D-Manhattan, prohibits confining breeding pigs, calves raised for veal, and egg-laying hens in cages that prevent them from turning around or extending their limbs.

"This modest measure would make a world of difference to animals subjected to the terrible pain, discomfort and abuse of extreme confinement for months on end. Common sense and an abundance of scientific evidence clearly demonstrates that animals suffer when forced to remain immobile nearly all of their lives," said Patrick Kwan, New York state director for The HSUS.

Californians overwhelmingly passed a similar measure, [The Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty Act](#), by ballot initiative last fall.

"It's simply inhumane to confine animals in cages so small they can't turn around or extend their limbs," said Gene Baur, president and co-founder of Farm Sanctuary. "We've rescued enough animals from these cruel confinement systems to know how debilitating they are, and we urge swift passage of this humane legislation to end this abuse on factory farms in New York."

The bill has been referred to the Agriculture Committee, where it awaits a vote.

Facts

The measure would phase out extreme confinement systems such as battery cages for hens, veal crates for calves, and gestation crates for pigs.

The HSUS and Farm Sanctuary were the main backers of the California proposition, which was endorsed by groups including the Center for Food Safety, the California Veterinary Medical Association, Union of Concerned Scientists and the Consumer Federation of America.

In addition to California, four other states have passed similar reforms, including [Colorado](#), [Florida](#), [Arizona](#) and [Oregon](#).


The bill is co-sponsored by the following legislators: Nelson Castro, D-Bronx, Amy Paulin, D-Westchester,

Alan Maisel, D-Brooklyn, John McEneny, D-Kings, Micah Kellner, D-New York, Brian

Kavanagh, D-Manhattan, Joan Millman, D-Brooklyn, Patricia Eddington, D-Suffolk,

Annette Robinson, D-Brooklyn and Richard Gottfried, D-Manhattan.

15



The Dairy Site Latest News


California Bans Dairy Cow Tail Docking

California has passed a bill to ban "docking" the tails of dairy cows. The bill, which passed by a 60-32 vote in the Assembly, is expected to become law by the end of the year.

The bill, Assembly Bill 1000, is a landmark piece of legislation for the dairy industry. It is the first time that a state has passed a law to ban the practice of docking the tails of dairy cows.

The bill is expected to become law by the end of the year. It is a landmark piece of legislation for the dairy industry. It is the first time that a state has passed a law to ban the practice of docking the tails of dairy cows.

No statewide ban on docking tails in dogs 16



Positions on tail docking

AVMA - The AVMA opposes routine tail docking of cattle. Current scientific literature indicates that routine tail docking provides no benefit to the animal, and that tail docking can lead to distress during fly seasons. When medically necessary, amputation of tails must be performed by a licensed veterinarian.

AABP - is not aware of sufficient scientific evidence in the literature to support tail docking. However, if tail docking is deemed as necessary for proper care and management of production animals in certain conditions, veterinarians should counsel clients on proper procedures, benefits and risks.

17




Business Initiatives

- McDonald's – instituted slaughter audits for stunning and vocalization
- Smithfield – no gestation crates by 2017, concerns by McD
- Will this be like bST?
- Will welfare be regulatory or market driven?

18




19



National Dairy Animal Well-Being Initiative

- ➡ Numerous dairy organizations involved
 - NMPF, PDPW, PDP Pennsylvania, NEDPA, etc.
- ➡ Umbrella guidelines and principles for care of dairy animals
- ➡ Contracts with Professional Animal Auditors Certification Organization (PAACO) – certify program meets guidelines

20



National Dairy FARM Program Farmers Assuring Responsible ManagementSM

FACT SHEET

The Mission
The National Dairy FARM Program (Farmers Assuring Responsible ManagementSM) was created by the National Milk Producers Federation (NMPF) and Dairy Stewards Inc. (DSI) to improve animal welfare for U.S. dairy producers by providing the highest standards of animal care and welfare.

The Program
There are two main objectives: to ensure that dairy producers are safe, comfortable, and healthy, and that animals receive the highest level of care. The National Dairy FARM ProgramSM provides to all producers a certification as to their animal welfare program and that their facilities meet the standards that consumers expect. Their goal is to ensure the safety and the quality of the products they produce and consume. The program has an official track record of successful implementation and has been a model for other animal care and welfare programs.

Key Features

- **Animal Care Standards** – The National Dairy FARM Program is a model of caring for dairy animals. Animal care is a central part of the National Dairy FARM Program. Animal care is a central part of the National Dairy FARM Program. Animal care is a central part of the National Dairy FARM Program.
- **Supplemental Training Materials** – Training materials will include 120 and 200 lbs for animal care and welfare, and a 120 lbs supplement. The 120 lbs supplement will be a 120 lbs supplement. The 120 lbs supplement will be a 120 lbs supplement.
- **Third Party Certification** – The program provides certification to all dairy producers and provides a third party certification to all dairy producers and provides a third party certification to all dairy producers.
- **Additional Standards** – The FARM program is designed to ensure the quality, safety and health of dairy products and to ensure the safety and health of dairy products and to ensure the safety and health of dairy products.
- **Management** – The FARM program is designed to ensure the quality, safety and health of dairy products and to ensure the safety and health of dairy products and to ensure the safety and health of dairy products.
- **Program Launch** – The National Dairy FARM program will be launched in 2019.

The program is a model of caring for dairy animals. Animal care is a central part of the National Dairy FARM Program. Animal care is a central part of the National Dairy FARM Program. Animal care is a central part of the National Dairy FARM Program.

For more information on the National Dairy FARM Program contact DSI at the National Milk Producers Federation at (703) 711-1111 or info@nmpf.org.

For complete information on the program visit www.dairyfarm.org.

21



Welfare Audits for Dairy

- ➡ American Humane Certified
- ➡ Animal Welfare Institute
- ➡ Certified Humane
- ➡ Validus
- ➡ Others?

- ➡ NYSCAP

22



Where are we headed?

- ➡ HSUS and PETA pressure
 - HSUS is not related to local humane societies
 - <http://www.vidoosh.tv/play.php?vid=4360>
 - Google – vidoosh wsb hsus video
- ➡ Big funding
- ➡ Recent undercover videos
 - dairy cull cow plant (CA)
 - sale barns (MD, NM, PA, NY)
 - dairy farm (PA)
 - veal slaughter plant (VT)

23

The poster features the 'Farms Keep NY Green' logo at the top. Below it, on the left, is a sidebar with links: 'About the Farming in New York', 'Preserving the Environment', 'Farms and Forests', 'Livestock Care', 'New York's Agriculture', 'Animal Agriculture Coalition', 'New York's Agriculture', 'Animal Agriculture Coalition', 'New York's Agriculture', 'Animal Agriculture Coalition'. The main body of the poster has a blue header with 'Dairy Farmers' and 'Feeding Families' flanking a red heart with 'NY' inside. Below this, it says 'We are dedicated to providing you with fresh, healthy milk.' and 'We Take For The Quality of Your Milk'. There is a small photo of a cow at the bottom right.

24



NYSCHAP Welfare Certification Advantages

- ➔ Annual herd health plan created through a team approach
- ➔ Voluntary and confidential
- ➔ Funded by NYS DAM – no fee to producer
- ➔ Herd veterinarian involvement – partial reimbursement
- ➔ Third party verification through state field veterinarian or university extension veterinarian
- ➔ Applicable to all sizes, management styles and facilities

25



Unique to NYSCHAP

- ➔ One time pre-certification visit to determine any deficiencies
- ➔ GOAL – no one fails a certification visit
- ➔ Have identified challenges



26

Animal Welfare Module References, Resources and Links

Body Condition

Wilkinson, EE, Jovan, GM, Wagner, PE, Brunen, RL, Tatum, RF, Leach, TH. A Dairy Cow Body Condition Scoring System and its Relationship to Lactational Production Variables in High Producing Holstein Cattle. *J Dairy Science* (1982) 65:495.

Ferguson, JD, Gelligan, DT, Thomson, H. Principal Descriptors of Body Condition Scores in Holstein Cows. *J Dairy Science* (1984) 77:2887-2703.

Body Condition Scoring For Dairy Replacement Heifers: Ranks Animal Nutrition and Health. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingwood St, Nutley, NJ 07110-1199. Attn: Agriles. (original source: Edmonson, H, Al.). *J of Dairy Science* 72 (1):1985.

Peters, RA, Buckholz HF, Schmidt, MC, Hall, FM. How to score body condition of dairy cows. *Topics in Veterinary Medicine* (Autumn 1991): 33-34.

Edmonson, AJ, Lusa, H, Weaver, LD, Farver, T, Wolcott, G. Body Condition Scoring Chart for Holstein Dairy Cows. *J Dairy Sci* (1989) 72 (2):68-78.

Calf Husbandry

Quasler, JD, Strickshahn, RE, Kent, CJ, O'Brien, MM. 2001. Foundations of colostrum management: colostrum replacement and acquisition of passive immunity in neonatal calves. *J Dairy Sci* 84:2075-2083.

Stout, GH, Marx, DB, Measles, BE, Nisbet, GT. 1979. Colostral immunoglobulin transfer in calves: I. Period of absorption. *J Dairy Sci* 62:1432-1438.

Stout, GH, Faribak, A. 1983. Colostral immunoglobulin absorption intensity related to concentrations in calves. *J Dairy Sci* 66:1218-1228.

Watts, SJ, Duggett, DA, Orr, SL. 1996. Factors associated with mortality in 21 days of life in dairy heifers in the United States. *Prevent. Vet. Med.* 29:9-19.

Moore, M, Tyler, JW, Chiparwa, M, Dawes, M, Middlemiss, RR. Effect of delayed colostrum collection on colostrum IgG concentration in dairy cows. *JAVMA* (April 15, 2003) 226, 8:1375-1377.

Memoli, FP, Meira, DE, Courtable, PD, Butler, WL, McCoy, GC. 1999. Use of mammary gland and colostrum characteristics for prediction of colostrum IgG1 concentrations and subsequent infection in Holstein cows. *JAVMA* 216(12):1817-1823.

27



Requirements

- Enrollment in NYSCAP core module
- SOPs
- Training of employees
- Veterinary involvement
 - Assist and/or review SOPs
 - Review culling & mortality records
- Facility and animal assessment
 - Specific areas
 - Locomotion, hygiene, BCS
 - All animals each time as groups can change
 - Three groups - lactating cows, dry cows, heifers
- Third party veterinary verification



29

SOP Development Worksheet

SOP Name: Euthanasia Protocol with Gunshot	
SOP Number:	Date Written: 3/30/05
Written by:	Date Implemented:
Dr. Belinda Thompson	Date Last Revised:

Task Description: Euthanize animal

Location work is done: Number of people required: 2

All location of animal: Skill level: 1 worker trained in euthanasia with gun
1 worker with animal restraint skills

Equipment & supplies required:

- Appropriate caliber gun and bullet for size of animal (see euthanasia chart)
- Restraint appropriate for size of animal
- Hayforks - only available designated individuals
- Sheathes, sharp knife in some circumstances

Personal protective & safety equipment required:

- Safety glasses
- Hearing protection
- Gun trigger lock


Objective, finished product or result expected:

Humanely destroyed animals

Scope of this SOP: euthanize any age animal

Operations covered:	Workers covered:	Locations covered:
Restraint & euthanasia	Designated & trained workers Names _____ Animal handlers for restraint only	All animals facilities on this farm

30



SOPs required

- Non-ambulatory cattle
- Hospital/Sick Animals
- Euthanasia
- Lameness
- Cattle Movement and Handling

- Facilities & Environment
- Newborn Calves
- Routine/Elective Surgical Procedures
- Emergency management plan

31



got questions?



31

NYSCHAP Cattle Welfare Certification Module Outline:

Participation – Farms enrolled in the core module of NYSCHAP will be able to participate in the Cattle Welfare Certification Module when they meet the standards for the issues addressed below.

Enrollment – Farms must meet all standards for the issues addressed for enrollment into the cattle welfare module. Prior to the certification visit producers may request one pre-certification visit to determine areas of deficiencies.

Prior to a certification or re-certification visit all SOPs will be reviewed and edited by the certifying veterinarian. A clear plan should be created prior to a visit with farm personnel that will allow assessors to adequately move and evaluate all animals for body condition, hygiene and locomotion. Routine farm tasks, such as milking, footbaths, sorting and cleaning, that require moving animals should be considered. It is not acceptable for assessors to score animals for locomotion in lockups, tie-ups or by walking through crowded pens. On the day of the visit the herd veterinarian will need to be in attendance to discuss the SOPs and culling and mortality records, which must be examined for the 12 months prior to the visit.

Location of SOPs will be inspected to insure that all employees have access to them. Copies of employee training of SOPs will be collected at any certification or re-certification visit.

Annual Recertification – Upon recertification farms must meet all standards for the issues addressed in the cattle welfare module. Recertification must occur within 10-14 months of enrollment anniversary date to remain active. For farms that can not meet standards upon annual recertification due to extenuating circumstances the recertification period can be extended up to 60 days; a second 60 day extension can be granted if initial problem has been addressed and improvement is in progress. Any extension for recertification must be documented and submitted to the NYSCHAP coordinator.

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) – Farm specific SOPs that are reviewed by the herd veterinarian will be in place for specified cattle welfare contingencies (see categories to follow). These SOPs will be posted or filed where they will be accessible to employees. Employees will review SOPs at least once per year. Generalized SOPs for many of the issue areas are available in MS Word format on the NYSCHAP website at <http://www.nyschap.vet.cornell.edu/module/welfare/welfare.asp>. These may be edited to meet operation specifics. Contact Kathy Finnerty for a CD of the SOPs (607-253-3910).

Farms participating in the welfare module will have a clear understanding of basic cattle husbandry and care outlined in their NYSCHAP herd plan. The veterinarian-client-patient-relationship (VCPR) is established to allow certain decisions to be made under veterinary guidance and supervision; other decisions should be made only by the veterinarian. It is recommended that written SOPs (e.g. fresh cow monitoring, mastitis treatment flow-chart, disaster preparedness, proper disposal of dead animals) be established for employee training and implementation of standard practices. Adherence to these protocols should help to promote animal health and avoid many potential breaches in cattle welfare. The herd veterinarian and SOPs must be available during the certification visit.

SOPs are required for identification of sick/injured cattle; care of non-ambulatory cattle; AABP Practical Euthanasia (provided by NYSCHAP certifier); euthanasia action plan for all ages of cattle; hospital animals; newborn calves; lameness; routine/elective surgical procedures; and emergency management. Any farm using a heifer raiser must have a Heifer Raiser Contract signed and available at the certification visit.

Employee Training – Employees involved in cattle care and handling will be trained in SOPs specific to their job duties at the time of employment. New employees must be evaluated at least twice during the first year of employment (Garry, 2004). Training records must be available at the certification visit.

Identification of Sick or Injured Cattle – Designated employees are trained in the assessment of cattle for identification of sick and/or injured animals. Cattle are assessed on a daily basis and sick or injured cattle are separated/segregated to an appropriate area for effective, prompt treatment or euthanasia decision. SOPs for assessment should include but not be limited to change in behavior, change in activity, change in appetite, change in appearance (eg body fill, udder fill, droopy ears, hair coat, breathing rate or effort), change in attitude (eg lethargy), presence of abnormal discharge, change in manure consistency, change in gait, and other monitoring efforts such as change in production, body temperature, ketosis strip, and change in milk consistency.

Non-ambulatory cattle – The SOP must include provision for prompt removal, no longer than 2 hours after discovery, from concrete to a safe, well-bedded area that provides adequate footing, provision of feed and water without competition from other cattle; protection from self injury and injury from other cattle; and protection from environmental elements. (Cox, McGrath, Jorgensen, Am J Vet Res, Vol 43, 1982; Garry, 2004; Smith 2002)

A timeframe must be specified in the SOP for providing medical intervention, veterinary consultation when necessary, and timely euthanasia decisions.

Transporting or moving cattle that are non-ambulatory:

1. For distances over 10 feet – cattle are moved by use of appropriate sledding device, sling or bucket. Cattle are moved onto these devices with as little discomfort as possible. If necessary, cattle should be humanely euthanized before transport.
2. Dragging is acceptable ONLY when unavoidable and for distances less than 10 feet. Plenty of bedding must be used.

Culling:

A culling plan will decrease the occurrence of non-ambulatory cattle. The culling plan will have a drug residue avoidance plan to include assessment of realistic likelihood of recovery prior to administering drugs with withdrawal times.

Euthanasia

1. Decision making to be based upon:
 - a. Pain and distress of the cattle
 - b. Likelihood of recovery
 - c. Ability to get to feed and water
 - d. Medications used on the cattle
 - e. Drug withdrawal time
 - f. Diagnostic information
 - g. Condemnation potential
 - h. Economics
2. Approved methods and protocols should be adhered to as outlined in 'Practical Euthanasia of Cattle' produced by AABP (American Association of Bovine Practitioners), www.aabp.org.

Hospital Cattle – to include all production groups

1. Treatment or euthanasia decisions should be based on monitoring for:
 - a. Recovery potential

- b. Deterioration
 - c. Uncontrollable pain
 - d. Locomotion
 - e. BCS
2. Written protocols should be developed for assessment and routine treatments under supervision and training of a veterinarian. The protocol should include guidelines for when a veterinarian should be called for individual cow care and criteria for culling vs. euthanasia.
 3. Access to feed and water without competition from healthy cows must be provided.
 4. Criteria are in place for supportive care for cull cattle when shipment is necessarily delayed.
 5. It is recommended that hospital cattle be segregated from healthy cattle, including maternity cattle.

Care of Newborn Calves (Garry 2004; Grandin, 2002)

1. Neglect of market calves is unacceptable
2. Heifer and bull calves must be fed appropriate colostrum within 6 hours of birth
3. Provide all calves a clean and dry environment.
4. Provide shelter that is appropriate to environmental conditions (moisture, temperature, wind and sun).
5. Meet the following conditions when transporting calves:
 - a. Ensure that calves are dry.
 - b. Calves will not be transported until they are able to walk and easily stand without assistance, except when transporting to on-site calf housing facilities.
 - c. Protect from extreme temperatures; use a clean and disinfected vehicle in good repair; handle calves gently when loading and unloading; drive to avoid cattle injury
 - d. Ensure that market calves are fed at least every 12 hours prior to transport.

Lameness - A management system for early detection and effective, prompt treatment of lameness should be developed. (Berry, Zinpro, 2001)

1. Assess potential problems including employee training, facilities, nutrition, and infectious disease.
2. Implement management practices to minimize new occurrences (nutrition, trimming, hoof care, environment, etc).
3. No more than 15% of each animal management group has a locomotion score of 3, 4 or 5.

Hygiene

1. Cattle should be maintained in facilities which contribute to clean and dry hair coats and udders.
2. Hygiene scoring can be used to evaluate facility design, stocking rate and maintenance (Cook, 2002, Reneau, 2005).
3. Goal is to minimize the occurrence of hygiene scores greater than 3. Lower leg hygiene scores will be more variable in loose housing depending upon the type of bedding and the means of cleaning the pens.

Cows must meet the following standards:

Score all cows in each cow management group.			
Tie stall:		Loose housing:	
○ Lower leg	75% <3	○ Lower leg	40% <3
○ Udder	80% <3	○ Udder	80% <3
○ Flank & upper leg	70% <3	○ Flank & upper leg	80% <3

Cows in loose housing that have less than 40% lower leg scores of 1 and 2 must have an average SCC of 250,000 for the previous 12 months to be certified

Heifers must meet the following requirements;

Score all heifers in each heifer management group.			
Tie stall:		Loose housing:	
○ Flank & upper leg	70% <3	○ Flank & upper leg	80% <3
○ Ventral abdomen	95% <4	○ Ventral abdomen	95% <4

Hygiene scoring heifers for abdomen and flank scores will reflect stocking rates, amount of manure splash occurring during heifer movement through the facility and cleanliness of the stalls. Although there are no published percentages for ventral abdomen scoring, a paper published by Reneau (2005) reported 9 dairy herds with average abdomen scoring below 3. Until published percentages for scoring abdomen over 3 the 5% mark will be used to reflect those heifers that may choose to lie in the alley even though stalls might be available.

Body Condition Score-(Braun, et. al, The Bovine Proceedings, April 1987; Robert Patton, Topics in Veterinary Medicine, Autumn 1991; Temple Grandin – www.grandin.com

1. All cattle must receive a wholesome daily diet which is nutritionally adequate
2. All cattle must have continual access to adequate supply of clean water
3. Upon certification each animal management group of animals over 12 months of age must have 90% of the group with body condition scores >1.

Facilities and Environment

1. Maintain all facilities in good repair to avoid discomfort, distress and injury
2. Housing circumstances, including overcrowding, that affects cattle welfare will be captured by/increased lameness scores, poor hygiene scores, and wide ranges of BCS due to inadequate access to feed and water.
3. Provide shelter from elements appropriate to weather conditions.
4. Provide and maintain non-slip flooring in cow traffic areas that prevent cows from falling.
5. Use handling and restraint facilities appropriate for management procedures.

Cattle Movement and Handling

1. Management will not tolerate any acts of abuse or mistreatment. Consequences for such action are clearly described to all farm personnel. Written documentation of consequences is recommended.
2. SOPs are recommended for farms that have employees routinely trained in cattle movement and handling.
3. Employees should have training regarding cattle behavior, flight zones and proper use of all cattle handling equipment (Grandin, 2002). Employees should be regularly evaluated when moving cattle.
4. Cattle should be moved in a calm, quiet and careful manner.
5. Facilities should be appropriate for handling. Lighting, shadows, non-slip floors, gates and corrals can affect movement of cattle. Evaluate facilities for objects that can create hazards to cattle moving throughout the farm.
6. Prods, canes and other extreme methods are rarely necessary for routine movement. These devices should be used only when the situation is critical to the cattle's health and well-being and/or human safety.
7. When present, crowd gates should be designed and used to allow for normal cow response and movement. Employees should be trained to properly use crowd gates.

Routine/Elective Surgical Procedures – including dehorning, castration, teat removal and tail docking

1. Elective surgical procedures should only be performed by appropriately trained personnel, under acceptable sanitary conditions, in consultation with a veterinarian. Procedures should be done with appropriate use of anesthetic and/or analgesic.
2. In all cases, these procedures should be performed on appropriately aged cattle:
 - a. Castration
 - i. Closed castration of bull calves should be performed before two months of age
 - ii. Older bulls or open castration procedures should be performed with the use of anesthetic/analgesic in consultation with a veterinarian.
 - b. Dehorning
 - i. Procedure for dairy calves should be performed before two months of age.
 - ii. Beef calves should be dehorned at the earliest time of detection, no later than weaning.
 - iii. The use of anesthesia/sedation/analgesia is recommended for all ages.
 - c. Teat Removal – perform removal at youngest age that supernumerary teats can be identified
 - d. Tail docking may be a routine management decision and must be appropriately done in consultation with a veterinarian.

Emergency Management Plan

1. Emergency phone contact list – farm must post by each phone at the facility, or program into cell phones used by farm workers, an emergency phone contact list including phone numbers for the herd veterinarian, renderer, cattle hauler, fire department, police, and ambulance.
2. Farm emergency phone contact list must be posted or programmed with the emergency phone contact list and must include the phone numbers for farm owners, managers, etc. to be contacted in an emergency
3. SOP – must include provisions for providing basic needs for animals including, water, feed, manure removal, bedding, ventilation and milking in case of power outage. The SOP should include a schedule for maintaining and testing alternate power source. SOPs should include provisions for dealing with fires, human medical emergencies and emergencies due to severe weather conditions. In preparation for emergency situations which may threaten human health or safety, such as mandatory evacuations due to severe weather or environmental hazards, it may be necessary to provide access to extra feed, water, or pasture and then evacuate animal care personnel. In such cases, the emergency plan should include how workers will communicate to determine safe return to the facility to care for animal needs.

Heifer Raiser Contract – if a farm uses an off-site heifer raiser a contract must be in signed and available at the certification visit.

NYSCHAP Cattle Welfare Certification Form

Certification Date _____

Recertification Date _____

Farm Name:	
Contact Name:	Phone:
Premise ID & Address:	
Herd ID:	
Certifier:	

Herd Veterinarian

- ☐ I have a valid veterinarian-client-patient-relationship with the above producer.
- ☐ I have reviewed and accepted all cattle welfare SOPs in place on this farm.
- ☐ I have reviewed and understand the mortality rate and cull rate on this farm for the previous 12 months and have determined that there are not welfare issues.

Print name _____ Date _____

Signature _____

Written SOPs	YES	NO	
1. Identification of sick/injured cattle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Non-ambulatory cattle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. AABP Practical Euthanasia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Euthanasia action plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Hospital cattle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Newborn calves	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Lameness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Routine/ Elective Surgical Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Heifer Raiser Contract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
10. Emergency Management Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Employee SOP Training: Signed and dated by owner and/or herd manager. SOPs are available at all times for employee review. Available at visit: Yes _____ No _____

This cattle facility is committed to cattle welfare. Our commitment is demonstrated through the:

- ☐ establishment and implementation of written cattle welfare SOPs,
- ☐ training of farm personnel in the implementation of written cattle welfare SOPs,
- ☐ annual review of written cattle welfare SOPs with farm personnel.

Owner/Manager Signature: _____ Date: _____

Print name: _____

Cattle Welfare Categories

Identification of Sick/Injured Cattle	Yes	No
Are all cattle assessed daily for identification of sick and/or injured individuals according to SOP?		

Non-ambulatory cattle	Yes	No
Describe the equipment/procedure used for moving non-ambulatory cattle.		
Is this acceptable?		
When necessary, is animal euthanized before being moved to place of disposal?		
Does the SOP for proper care of non-ambulatory cattle specify the following are provided within two hours:		
○ Provision for prompt removal from concrete to a safe, well-bedded area		
○ provide adequate footing		
○ provision of feed and water without competition from other animals		
○ protection from self injury and injury from other animals		
○ Protection from environmental elements?		
Does SOP include a timeframe for providing medical intervention, veterinary consultation when necessary, and timely euthanasia decisions?		

Euthanasia	Yes	No
Does euthanasia action plan include all ages of cattle and method to be used?		
Does the euthanasia decision plan (SOP) follow AABP Decision Making guidelines? AABP pamphlet can be obtained from the certifying veterinarian and/or the following web site: http://aabp.org/resources/euth.pdf		

Hospital Animals	Yes	No
Do animals have access to feed and water without competition?		
Do written SOPs include animal assessment and early decisions regarding treatment versus culling to minimize occurrence of non-ambulatory cattle?		
Do written SOPs include routine treatment protocols and procedures?		
Are there criteria for culling versus euthanasia?		
Do written SOPs include criteria for supportive care for cull cattle when shipment is necessarily delayed?		
Do written SOPs include guidelines for when a veterinarian should be called to the farm?		

Care of Newborn Calves	Yes	No
Does SOP require heifer and bull calves receive colostrum within 6 hours of birth?		
Are market calves fed adequately at least every 12 hours prior to transport?		
Are calves housed in a clean and dry environment?		
Is shelter sufficient to seasonal environmental conditions (including moisture, temperature, wind, and sun)?		
Are the following conditions met when transporting calves to market or off-site calf rearing facility:		
a. Are calves dry?		
b. Can calves walk without assistance if transported off-site?		
c. Is transport vehicle clean, and does it protect calves from environmental extremes and injury?		

Lameness*	Yes	No
Is there a lameness SOP for the farm?		
Are lame cows detected and managed accordingly?		
Upon certification, are no more than 15% of each animal management group locomotion score 3, 4 or 5?		

Hygiene - Cows**	Yes	No
Score all cows in each cow management group. Are minimum scores as follows? Tie stall: ○ Lower leg 75% <3 ○ Udder 80% <3 ○ Flank & upper leg 70% <3 Loose housing: ○ Lower leg 40% <3 ○ Udder 80% <3 ○ Flank & upper leg 80% <3 If lower leg scoring in loose housing is not at least 40% <3, is the yearly SCC of the herd ≤250,000?		
Hygiene - Heifers**	Yes	No
Score all heifers in each heifer management group. Are minimum scores as follows? Tie stall: ○ Flank & upper leg 70% <3 ○ Ventral abdomen 95% <4 Loose housing: ○ Flank & upper leg 80% <3 ○ Ventral abdomen 95% <4		

Body Condition Score***	Yes	No
Upon annual certification, does 90% of the each animal management group (12 months and older) have BCS >1?		

Facilities and Environment	Yes	No
Do BCS, lameness scores and hygiene scores suggest that there are well maintained, sufficient stalls, and adequate feed bunk and water space?		
Are facilities in good repair so as to prevent injury?		
Does shelter provide sufficient seasonal protection from wind, temperature extremes, moisture and sun?		
Is non-slip flooring maintained in cattle traffic areas to prevent cows falling when moved?		
Are handling and restraint facilities appropriate for management procedures?		

Emergency Management	Yes	No
Are emergency phone contact(s) posted by land phones in the facility or programmed into cell phones used by on-farm workers, including phone numbers for herd veterinarian, renderer, cattle hauler, fire department, police, and ambulance?		
Is a farm personnel emergency phone list available at all phones in the facility?		
Does SOP provide provisions for feed, water, milking, manure removal, bedding and ventilations during power outages?		
Does SOP include maintenance and monitoring for alternate power supplies?		
Does SOP have provisions for emergencies due to extreme weather and fire?		

Cattle Behavior and Handling	Yes	No
Are consequences for acts of mistreatment or abuse of animals included in employee training?		
Are employees trained and regularly evaluated regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o cattle behavior and proper handling; o proper use of handling equipment? 		
Are prods, canes and other extreme methods used for routine movement of cattle?		
Are employees trained in the proper use of crowd gates?		

Routine/Elective Procedures	Yes	No
Are designated personnel appropriately trained in consultation with a veterinarian for all routine/elective surgical procedures?		
Are procedures performed under acceptable sanitary conditions?		
Do designated farm personnel adhere to veterinarian reviewed SOPs?		

Resources to be used for assessment included in folder materials:

* Lameness – Berry, SL, Locomotion Scoring of Dairy Cattle, Zinpro Corporation
www.availa4.com/locomotion/pdf/ZAN%20DCLS.pdf

** Hygiene - Cook, Nigel B., Hygiene assessment on dairy farms, U. of Wisconsin
<http://www.vetmed.wisc.edu/dms/fapm/fapmtools/4hygiene/hygiene.pdf>
Reneau, et. al., Association between hygiene scores and somatic cell counts in dairy cows, JAVMA, Vol. 227, No. 8 (2005)

*** Body Condition Score
Body Condition Scoring Guide for Dairy Replacement Heifers, Elanco Animal Health
www.elancous.com/species/dairy/resources/rumensin_heifer_bcs_guide.pdf

Body Condition Scoring in Dairy Cattle, Elanco Animal Health

Farm Name: _____	Herd number: _____
Date: _____	This farm passed certification: YES NO (circle one)
Digital photographs were recorded during the certification visit: YES NO (circle one)	
NYSCHAP Certifier Signature: _____	
NYSCHAP Certifier Print Name: _____	

Explanatory Notes:

Summary of Animal Assessment:

GROUP	HYGIENE SCORE - %				LOCOMOTION % >2	BCS % <2	TIME SPENT SCORING PEN
	Legs >2	Flank >2	Udder >2	Belly >3			