CARCASS CONTEST PROCEDURES - A YEAR'S EXPERIENCE

E. A. KLINE

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Last year at our meeting at Knoxville, the carcass contest committee presented recommendations for quality beef, pork and lamb contests. After much discussion, the conference voted to accept the recommendations of the committee. My assignment has been to report on a year's experience with these recommendations. I wish to express my thanks to the committee members who made the surveys that make this report possible.

Needless to say, carcass contests have become very popular at county, state and interstate livestock shows. This is a very good sign that the producers of meat animals, the breeder, and feeder are more interested in marketing a desirable type of meat animal. It certainly behooves each of us here to assist in every way possible to evaluate this end product of livestock production in an educational and informative manner.

I would like to share with you the findings of this committee on this past year's carcass contest. Tables 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are the summary of lamb contests, conducted by Mr. Van Stavern.

Table 1 will show that this past year twenty states had lamb carcass contests and twenty-one did not have contests. Six states did not reply.

Table 2 will show that in 1962 or 1963 twenty-six states plan to have lamb carcass contests. Table 3, 4, and 5 will show methods used in conducting the contests at the various states. It will be noted that most states list methods other than the Reciprocal Meat Conference (R. M. C.) recommendations. The last few lines on Table 5 should be noted.

Mr. Van Stavern noted that there seemed to be a lot of interest in having "a system" for lamb carcass evaluation. Very few states mentioned R. M. C. procedures. This causes one to wonder how effective R. M. C. has been in making its recommendations known!!

On pages 41 through 46 of last years proceedings are listed the recommendations for a beef carcass contest.

Although I did not make an extensive survey, I did contact several Meats workers in various states as to the procedures for beef carcass contests. I would like to call your attention to Tables 6 and 7. In these tables you will note quite a lot of variation as to method of carcass appraisal. Some states list R. M. C., others Dual Grading, some list an Index, and others certain carcass values or live values. This certainly shows that a lot of variation exists in beef carcass evaluation.

I would like to mention the "Hormel formula" used at the Midwest Carcass Contest at Austin, Minnesota. Table 8. For this contest they have

established requirements for loin eye area and fat thickness. A carcass must have two square inches of loin eye per 100 pounds and not more than .12 inches of fat per 100 pounds. A carcass with these measurements would score 20. The decimal point on loin eye is moved one place to the right to correct 2.0 square inches to a score of 20. The decimal is moved two places to the right for fat thickness (12). 20 + 12 equals 32. The fat thickness is then subtracted from 32 giving a fat thickness score of 20. 20 + 20 equals 40 divided by 2 = 20 (carcass score). This final carcass score is the average of the rib eye score and fat thickness score. The example at the bottom of Table 8 is for a carcass with 1.9 square inches of loin eye and .14 inches fat. This carcass had a score of 18.5. A formula of this type will allow .1 square inch loin eye area to be equal to .01 inch of fat thickness and one will compensate for the other on an equal basis.

The recommendations for pork carcass contests are found on pages 131, 132, and 133 of last year's proceedings. In Table 9 is listed the results of a survey by B. C. Breidenstein. It will be noted that the R. M. C. recommendations are followed in only a few cases, but that the recommendations are partially followed in most cases. Unfortunately the survey did not show how these recommendations were partially followed.

Table 10 will show the Hormel Loin-Eye Area and Ham Per Cent that will be used at the National Barrow Show and the National Hampshire Type Contest. These new methods should be studied and may have some merit.

I think we need to keep our carcass evaluation simple, meaningful and understandable.

I think we, as Meats Workers, have an obligation to industry to guide the way and not follow. Therefore, we should make available our recommendations to the meat industry.

TABLE 1

LAMB CARCASS CONTEST FOR PRODUCERS

A survey of Emphasis and Procedures

compiled by: B. D. VanStavern
Extension Meat Specialist
Ohio State University

Extension Specialists in 46 states were contacted for this report. 40 states have responded at the time of this summary.

1. DO YOU HAVE A LAMB CARCASS CONTEST FOR PRODUCERS IN YOUR STATE?

YES	NO
California	Alabama
Colorado	Arkansas
Connecticut	Delaware
Illinois	Florida
Indiana	Georgia
Iowa	Idaho
Kansas	Kentucky
Maryland	Louisiana
Massachusetts	Maine
Michigan	Missouri
Nevada	Montana
New Mexico	Nebraska
New York	New Hampshire
Ohio	North Carolina
Oklahoma	North Dakota
Oregon	South Dakota
Pennsylvania	Tennessee
Texas	Vermont
Utah	Virginia
Wyoming	Washington
	West Virginia

No response by summary time:

Arizona
Minnesota
Mississippi
New Jersey
South Carolina
Wisconsin

TABLE 2

2. DO YOU PLAN TO HAVE A LAMB CARCASS CONTEST IN 1962 or 1963?

YES

California	Louisiana	New Mexico
Colorado	Maine	New York
Connecticut	Maryland	Ohio
Illinois	Massachusetts	Oklahoma
Indiana	Michigan	Oregon
Iowa	Missouri	Pennsylvania
Kansas	Nebraska	South Dakota
Kentucky	Nevada	Texas
		Utah
		Wyoming

TABLE 3

3. METHOD OF CONDUCTING CONTEST:

STATE	LIVE EVALUATION	CARCASS EVALUATION	SUGGESTIONS
California	live appraisal	modified R. M. C. plus fore and hind saddle	each producer have several lambs evaluated - all sired by same ram
Colorado	individual type score	backfat, loin-eye, percent hind saddle and visual appraisal	
Connecticut	live placing	dressing percentage, loin-eye & backfat	
Illinois	live placing	quality minimum cut-out with standard trim	more objective criteria of cut-out
Indiana	graded on foot	value per 100 lbs.	need simple evaluation loin-eye, out-side fat, weight and value of loin-leg and kidney
Iowa	live placing	Rath system	prefer R. M. C.
Kansas	none	federal grades	
Maine	graded on foot	judged by retail and wholesale meat men	

TABLE 4

STATE	LIVE EVALUATION	CARCASS EVALUATION	SUGGESTIONS
Maryland	live placing	dollar and cents evaluation	need a simple, good way to evaluate lamb
Massachusetts	graded on foot	conformation, finish quality, size rib-eye	
Michigan	graded and placed	R. M. C.	more time for chilling tighten restrictions both live and carcass
Nevada	Danish system	grade and yield	yield should be deleted and replaced by evaluation of conformati or muscle size and yield of trim retail cuts
New Mexico	live placing	degree of finish, dressing percent and rib covering	rib-eye measurements
New York	placed by committee	R. M. C.	
Ohio	committee evaluation of meatiness	R. M. C.	
Oklahoma	graded on foot	R. M. C., plus dollar and cents evaluation on top lambs	more education for exhibitors and public

TABLE 5

STATE	LIVE EVALUATION	CARCASS EVALUATION	SUGGESTIONS
Oregon	committee estimates cut-out value	fat thickness, weight of fore and hind saddle loin-eye size	educate a new crop of judges to get away from finish only
Pennsylvania	carcass judge and on foot judge place lambs	quality and conformation, modified R. M. C.	
Texas	graded on foot	carcass dollar and cents value, including fat thickness	
Utah	judged by three judges	eye-ball judgement	need of more definite scoring card

There seemed to be a lot of interest in having "a system" for lamb carcass evaluation. Very few states mentioned R. M. C. procedures. This causes one to wonder how effective R. M. C. has been in making its recommendation known!!

TABLE 6

	LIVE	CARCASS
MICHIGAN		Loin eye and Fat Quality Cutability
NORTH CAROLINA	no contest	
NEW YORK	on foot placing	Loin eye and fat 2.0 - .15 high % desired cuts choice quality
ARKANSAS (4-H & FFA)	on foot pen of 5	USDA Dual Grade Carcass value $ / cut
TEXAS A & M (10 years)		dollar and cents value of retail cuts + or - tenderness (shear)
State Fair	on foot	1961 R. M. C.
Sweetwater	on foot	1961 R. M. C.
Ft. Worth	on foot	1961 R. M. C.
San Antonio	on foot	1961 R. M. C.
FLORIDA State Fair (93 cattle)	on foot	R. M. C. Establish yield % plus panel and shear tenderness
NEBRASKA (4-H)	on foot	Index = % cutability + .7 grade - 11.5
MONTANA	no contest	
INDIANA		wholesale cuts priced to calculate on foot value

TABLE 7

	LIVE	CARCASS
ILLINOIS (International)	on foot	R. M. C.
KANSAS	several clinics	no contest
MINNESOTA (Hormel)		
WYOMING	no contest	
WISCONSIN (at 4 Jr. Livestock Shows)		R. M. C.
TENNESSEE (Bristol)	V.D.I. & U.T.	U.S.D.A. cutability
OKLAHOMA	no contest	
GEORGIA		Dual grading
MISSOURI	on foot	Retail cuts Retail value
IOWA State Fair	on foot	R. M. C. Loin eye 2.0 Fat .13
Waterloo Meat Animal	on foot	adjust for fill wholesale cuts on foot value
4-H contest All Iowa Fair	on foot	R. M. C.
BALTIMORE - Eastern National		
PENNSYLVANIA, Harrisburg		
OREGON, Portland		
CALIFORNIA		

TABLE 8

MIDWEST STEER CARCASS CONTEST
(Hormel Austin, Minn.)

2.0 square inches loin / 100# carcass

.12 inches of fat / 100# carcass

2.0	=	20	rib eye score
.12	=	12	fat thickness
		32	

	32	
minus fat -	12	
	20	fat thickness score

	20	
plus	20	(rib eye)
	40	divided by 2 = 20 score

Example 2

1.9 sq. in. loin / 100#

1.4 in. fat / 100#

	32	
-	14	
	18	fat thickness score

	18	fat thickness score
plus	19	rib eye score
	37	divided by 2 = 18.5 score

TABLE 9

QUALITY PORK CONTESTS

YES	NO	Are R. M. C. recommendations followed?
ILLINOIS (15)*		Complete cut out if possible
KENTUCKY (4)		Partially complete cut out
CANADA (1)		Not followed
NEW YORK		R. M. C.
	WEST VIRGINIA	
FLORIDA (1)		R. M. C.
WISCONSIN (10)		R. M. C.
NORTH CAROLINA		Partially
ARKANSAS		Partially
TENNESSEE (2)		Partially
LOUISIANA		Partially
	VIRGINIA	
	NORTH DAKOTA	
TEXAS (15)		Partially
KANSAS (6)		R. M. C.
OHIO (20)		Partially
MINNESOTA (15)		Partially
MICHIGAN (4)		Partially
INDIANA (2)		R. M. C.
NEBRASKA (4)		Partially
IOWA (25)		Partially
	OKLAHOMA	
	CONNECTICUT	
OREGON (3)		Partially
MONTANA (2)		Partially
MISSOURI (6)		Partially

* Number of contests in each state

TABLE 10

LOIN-EYE AREA AND HAM PERCENT
National Barrow Show
Austin, Minn.

This formula combines a score for each ham and loin.

The loin eye area is converted from a measurement to a score and the ham from a percent of live weight to a score. Ten scores are awarded for each square inch of loin-eye. A four inch loin-eye would earn a score of 40, a five inch loin eye a score of 50, and a six inch loin eye a score of 60. Likewise, a score of 10 is awarded for each percent of skinned ham in excess of 10 (live weight). A 14% ham would earn a score of 40, a 15% ham a score of 50 and a 16% ham a score of 60.

4.6 sq. in. in loin

14.4% ham (live weight)

4.6 = 46

14.4 = 44

90 score.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

(Applause)

MR. KLINE: Now, I wasn't aware that I was supposed to conduct the discussion here, but since I have been saddled with the responsibility, I will open the floor for discussion. You may have questions you want to direct to Burdette Breidenstein or VanStavern, the other two members of this Committee who are here at this time.

MR. KEMP: (University of Kentucky) I would like to make one or two comments. One is that I don't think we need to criticize this too much yet because the proceedings didn't come out until November or December and most of the lamb carcass contests for last year were already over with, and some of the other contests. We ought to give this a fair shake for another year before we criticize this too much.