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CHAPTER III
REASONS
REASONS

Writing reasons for intercollegiate meat judging can be frustrating as well as rewarding. The ability to transfer your eyes to the pen is perhaps the biggest challenge in judging. You will find that the subjects discussed in this section will greatly improve your reasons writing skills and help you to overcome the confusion that can sometimes accompany reasons writing.

Note Taking
Accurate note taking is the most important part of writing reasons. If you don’t have adequate notes then you will have omissions, lies and unnecessary mistakes that will result in a poor score. Here are some pointers for good note taking:

1. Separate the card in half both ways (vertically and horizontally). Be sure to use both FRONT AND BACK in order to eliminate errors.
2. The card should have all of the areas listed for all three factors, which must be evaluated (trimness, muscling and quality). You won’t remember to evaluate them all if you do not write them down.
3. When evaluating beef carcasses and beef cuts, write down all yield and quality grades. This helps you visualize and remember each class later.

When evaluating each class, use the factors to completely evaluate each pair. For example, in the comparison of 1 over 2, a check mark distinguishes that 1 has an advantage over 2 in that specific area. If 2 has the advantage, mark out the area and place it on the right side.

NOTE: Many judges choose to circle, underline, use arrows, etc. to differentiate between areas – Develop your own method and stick with it.

On the next three pages you will find templates for a note taking system such as the one we have discussed. Feel free to use abbreviations, symbols, etc. to simplify your system. Each student should be familiar with every detail of these templates in order to eliminate any errors, which might result from sloppiness, inadequate time management, or sheer haste. In other words, Memorize Them
BEEF CARCASSES

T – opposite ribeye
   inside round
   outside round
   sirloin
   sirloin/loin juncture
   loin edge
   lower rib
   rib
   chuck
   KPH
   cod/udder
   brisket

M – ribeye
   round
   heel
   shank
   sirloin
   loin
   rib
   c.\:uck

\: – marbling
   color
   texture
   firmness
   ossification in the buttons

PORC CARCASSES (terms when ribbed)

T – first rib (opposite loin eye)
   last rib (lower rib)
   last lumbar vertebra
   clear plate
   center loin
   collar
   belly pocket
   navel edge
   sterneum
   jowl

M – ham (loin eye)
   heel
   shank
   sirloin
   exposed lumbar lean
   depth of chine
   shoulder

Q – feathering (marb., color, text., firm., exudation)
   reddish pink belly lean
   fat streaking in lumbar lean

LAMB CARCASSES (terms when ribbed)

T – leg (opposite ribeye)
   Dock
   sirloin
   leg/loin juncture
   loin edge
   loin
   rack
   shoulder
   crotch
   cod/udder
   flank
   kidney and pelvic
   elbow pocket
   breast

M – leg (ribeye)
   sirloin
   loin
   rack
   shoulder

Q – primary/secondary flank streakings
   flank color-pinkish red
   ribs
   break joints
   (marbling, color, texture, firmness)
### ROUNDS

**T** - round face  
- rump face  
- knuckle face  
seam fat  
flank side  
cod  
center section  
cushion

**M** - round face  
- rump face  
- knuckle face  
center section  
cushion  
heel  
shank

**Q** - rump  
| M | M |
| C | C |
| T | T |
| F | F |

### SHORT LOINS

**T** - opposite loin eye  
flank edge  
loin edge  
back  
sirloin face  
kidney fat  
seam fat

**M** - loin eye  
back  
sirloin face  
- psoas major  
- longissimus dorsi  
- gluteus medius

**Q** - loineye  
| M | M |
| C | C |
| T | T |
| F | F |

### FULL LOINS

**T** - opposite loineye  
Flank edge  
Loin edge  
Short loin  
Sirloin/short loin juncture  
Sirloin face  
- top sirloin face  
- bottom sirloin face  
seam fat  
pelvic fat

**M** - Loineye  
Short loin  
Sirloin  
Sirloin face  
- Top sirloin face  
- Bottom sirloin face

**Q** - loineye  
| M | M | M |
| C | C | C |
| T | T | T |
| F | F | F |

### RIBS

**T** - opposite ribeye  
lower rib  
back  
blade face  
- upper blade face  
- lower blade face  
rib ends  
seam fat

**M** - ribeye  
back  
blade face  
eye of the blade

**Q** - ribeye  
| M | M |
| C | C |
| T | T |
| F | F |

ossification of the buttons
PORK LOINS

T – blade face
- seam fat
- lip region
lower rib
back
rib ends
sirloin face
- tail region
- kidney fat
- seam fat

M – blade face
- loin eye
- secondary muscles
back
depth of chine
sirloin face
- longissimus dorsi
- psoas major
- iliopectineus medius

Q – fat, etc. sirloin / fat
M  M
C  C  C
T  T
F  F  F
MS MS

FRESH HAMS

T – beneath butt face
alongside butt face
forecushion
center section
cushion
seam fat

M – butt face
center section
forecushion
cushion
heel
shank

Q – marbling
color-reddish pink
firmness
muscle separation
exudation
Meats Judging Terminology

Framework Terminology

A. **Topic Sentence**: Select the one characteristic(s) – muscling, trimness, or quality – you used to place the carcass or wholesale cut over the other one. This sentence should indicate the major reason or reasons for placing that particular pair the way you did.

B. **Furthermore or Secondary Sentence**: This sentence should be used in support of the topic sentence and should indicate to the reader other reasons why the carcass or wholesale cut is placed over the other one.

C. **Grant Sentence**: This sentence should be used to point out the reader major areas or advantages that the carcass or cut placing second in that particular pair possessed.

D. **Summary Sentence**: This sentence should be used to explain the major reasons for placing a carcass or cut last in the class. This sentence should be very precise and accurate in the description of the carcass or cut. “Most”, “least”, and “-est” words used only.

**Synonyms Used With Format**

A. Synonyms for **EXHIBITED**:
   Displayed, revealed, indicated, evidenced by, produced, shown, presented, possessed, had, expressed, contained, exposed, disclosed, manifested (quality only)

B. Synonyms for **GRANT**:
   Concede, admit, realize, recognize, acknowledge (last paragraph only)

C. Synonyms for **HOWEVER**:
   Nevertheless, nonetheless, thus, therefore, consequently

D. Synonyms for **THUS**:
   Therefore, consequently

E. Synonyms for **ALSO**:
   Furthermore, moreover, in addition, additionally, finally

F. Synonyms for **MORE**:
   Greater amount or quantity, greater, more extensive, larger, higher degree (use only when differences represent a difference in grade)

G. **Power Words**
   Immediately, clearly, obviously, undoubtedly, without a doubt, without question, unquestionably, easily, much, most, significantly, certainly, definitely, substantially, especially, readily, positively, without hesitation
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H. Miscellaneous
Least, insufficient, sufficient, adequate, resulting, prominent, coupled, excess, acceptable (quality only), youthful, dispersed, distributed, desirable

Sample Topic Sentences
• I place 1 over 2 due to advantages in trimness, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to greater trimness, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to superior trimness, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to advantages in muscling, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to greater muscling, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to superior muscling, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to advantages in quality, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to greater quality, as evidenced by...
• I place 1 over 2 due to superior quality, as evidenced by...
• Due to advantages in cutability, I placed 1 over 2 because 1 was a more muscular, trimmer carcass. 1’s muscling was evidenced by...
• Due to greater cutability, I placed 1 over 2 because 1 was a more muscular, trimmer carcass. 1’s muscling was evidenced by...
• I placed 1 over 2 because 1 combined trimness and muscling to a higher degree. 1’s trimness was evidenced by...

Cut-out Statements
*Use when there are large differences between pairs and to conclude the last paragraph.

Beef Carcasses
1. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed* retail cuts (cutability)
2. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts for the round, loin, rib, and chuck (cutability)
3. Greater consumer appeal (color)
4. Higher merchandising value (quality grading)
5. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed steak and roast meat

Lamb Carcasses
1. Higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
2. Higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts from the leg, loin, rack, and shoulder (cutability)
3. Higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)

Pork Carcasses
1. Higher percentage of closely trimmed four lean cuts (cutability)
2. Higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)
3. Higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts from ham, loin, Boston and picnic shoulder (cutability)
Hams

1. Higher percentage of closely trimmed center cut slices (cutability)
2. Higher percentage of trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
3. Higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)

Beef Ribs and Short Loins

1. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
2. Greater consumer appeal (color)
3. Higher merchandising value (quality grading)
4. Ribs: Higher percentage of trimmed steak and roast meat
5. Short Loins: Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed steak meat

Beef Rounds

1. Higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
2. Higher percentage of closely trimmed steak and roast meat
3. Higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)

*Notice in every case the word "TRIMMED" must be included, otherwise the cut-out term is meaningless.

Reasons Style and Format

*Words in parenthesis can be interchanged with synonyms.

Format for Paragraph 1, 2, and 3:

- 1st Sentence – I placed 1 over 2 due to (advantages in) (muscling) as (evidenced) by...(use “er” comparative terminology for each pair)
- 2nd Sentence – (Furthermore,) 1 (exhibited)...
- Last Sentence – I (grant) that 2 (possessed)...

Format for Last Paragraph:

- 1st Sentence – I acknowledge 4 (revealed)…, I nonetheless placed 4 last because 4 was…in the class.
- 2nd Sentence – This was (evidenced) by...
- Last Sentence – Therefore, 4 would yield (the lowest percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts).
CHAPTER IV
JUDGING BEEF CARCASSES
BEEF CARCASSES

Production of heavy, fat cattle is a costly and unprofitable business because of recent national health concerns about total caloric intake and a trend by consumers to purchase lean product. However, since USDA "Choice" beef was first marketed in 1927, most consumers prefer to buy Choice grade beef. Therefore, in evaluation of beef carcasses it is essential to identify carcasses, which are, trim, muscular (high in cutability) and grade US Choice. Retail cuts must be fabricated from carcasses regardless of the amount of excess fat which must be trimmed to obtain an acceptable lean to fat ratio. Obviously, carcasses and wholesale cuts, which meet the minimum quality standards for Choice and have the highest yield of trimmed retail cuts are of the greatest value.

Cutability (or yield) is a term often used when carcasses (beef, pork and lamb) are evaluated. Cutability refers to the percentage of the carcass that is saleable as trimmed, boneless retail cuts. Cutability is influenced by two major factors; 1) amount of fat, and 2) muscling.

Excess trimmable fat over the round, sirloin, short loin, ribeye, rib and chuck greatly influence cutability of a carcass. The best indicator of fatness is fat thickness opposite the ribeye muscle. Also, internal fat and brisket fat should be evaluated. External fat in excess of .4 inches normally must be trimmed when retail cuts are fabricated. Thus, carcasses, which possess .25 to .35 inches of fat, are normally considered of ideal finish for maximizing cutability. Since much of the industry has adopted ¼ inch trim boxed beef programs.

A heavily muscled beef carcass will be somewhat irregular in shape because of the variation in the shape of individual muscles in various parts of the carcass. For example, the chuck and round will be of comparable width, but the middle meats (loin and rib) will be more narrow due to the natural shape and size of muscles in these locations. This, along with a slight depression at the junction of the sirloin and short loin, is especially noticeable. The best single factor of muscling is REA measured at the interface of the 12th rib. Other indicators include bulge and plumpness of the round, sirloin, short loin, rib, and chuck.

Certain lean quality indicators such as marbling degree, marbling distribution, marbling texture, lean color, lean texture, and lean firmness are related to eating quality of cooked steaks. For example, marbling is the only visual indicator in fresh meat, which is significantly related to the flavor, tenderness, and juiciness of the cooked product. Desirable marbling is fine in texture and uniformly distributed throughout the ribeye. Fine textured lean is characterized by few, if any, visible muscle bundles surrounded by connective tissue separating them from other muscle bundles. Coarse textured lean may have many visible bundles surrounded by heavy connective tissue. Beef fat should be firm and free from a greasy or oily appearance. Consumers prefer a white to creamy white fat in comparison to fat, which is yellow in color as found in cattle that are grass fed.

High quality beef is firm, fine textured and has a bright, youthful, cherry-red colored lean. It should have sufficient marbling (small degree) to grade at least low Choice, and the marbling should ideally be fine textured and uniformly distributed throughout the lean. Also, there should be no excessive surface moisture, which is evidence of soft, low quality beef.
With the advent of branded beef programs such as Certified Angus Beef and other "Top Choice Programs", which utilize carcasses that are Average Choice or better and have a Yield Grade 3.9 or better, there has been an added premium established in the industry for carcasses that meet such requirements. As a result these carcasses place higher in a meat judging class than Low Choice carcasses of similar or slightly higher cutability. Also, there are heavy discounts in the industry for Yield Grade 4 & 5 carcasses, consequently these carcasses are typically placed at the bottom of a beef carcass class. Therefore in summary, when evaluating beef carcasses, those ranked in the upper portion of the class should grade low Choice or higher. Ranking of beef carcasses is then based on cutability.

**MAJOR POINTS**

1. Beef carcasses are evaluated 60% on quality and 40% on cutability.
2. Quality grade all carcasses for adequate marbling to grade Choice or higher.
3. Cutability (trimness and muscling) should be evaluated second.
4. A difference of 1.5 or greater in yield grade can be used to place a carcass of a slightly lower quality grade above a choice carcass. Ex. Select vs. Low Choice or Low Choice vs. Top Choice
5. If a Prime carcass is a Yield Grade 3 or better it should typically be placed over a Choice carcass.
6. All USDA Standard carcasses are placed last.
7. All USDA Yield Grade 5 carcasses and most Yield Grade 4’s are placed last.

**TERMINOLOGY**

1. **Muscling**
   a. a thicker, more bulging round
   b. a plumper cushioned, heavier muscled, shorter-shanked round with a meatier heel
   c. a more prominent sirloin/short loin juncture or a more bulging sirloin
   d. a wider, meatier, fuller fleshed loin
   e. a fuller fleshed rib
   f. a heavier muscled rib
   g. a larger ribeye
   h. a thicker, more bulging, heavier muscled chuck (or clod)
2. **Trimness**
   a. less fat opposite the ribeye
   b. less fat over the inside and/or outside round
   c. less fat over the sirloin
   d. less fat over the sirloin/short loin juncture
   e. less fat over the loin edge
   f. less fat over the lower rib
   g. less fat over the rib
   h. less fat over the chuck
   i. less internal fat, or less kidney, pelvic and heart fat
   j. less fat in the cod/udder region
   k. less fat over the brisket

3. **Quality**
   a. a brighter or lighter red colored lean in the ribeye
   b. a finer textured lean in the ribeye
   c. a firmer lean in the ribeye
   d. a greater amount of marbling
   e. a higher degree of marbling
   f. a greater amount (or a higher degree) of more evenly dispersed (or distributed) marbling
   g. a more youthful colored lean
   h. whiter external fat covering
   i. less ossification in the thoracic buttons

4. **Criticisms** (used in the last paragraph only)
   a. a small, soft, dark colored, coarse textured ribeye that lacked adequate marbling to grade USDA Choice
   b. a thinly muscled, tapering round
   c. the fattest, wastiest, lightest muscled carcass in the class
   d. combined trimness and muscling to the lowest degree
   e. combined quality, trimness and muscling to the lowest degree
   g. lowest cutting or yielding carcass
   h. the most fat (or excess fat) over the round, loin, rib, ribeye and chuck

5. **Cut-out statements**
   a. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   b. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts for the round, loin, rib, and chuck (cutability)
   c. Greater consumer appeal (color)
   d. Higher merchandising value (quality grading)
   e. Higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed steak and roast meat
BEEF CARCASS TERMINOLOGY

Shank
Bulge or Plumpness
ROUND
Heel
Inside Round
Round Collar (Collar Fat)
SIRLOIN*
SIRLOIN-Short Loin Junction
SHORT LOIN*
Loin Edge
Lower Rib
RIBeye
Ribeye
RIB
Rib-Plate Junction
PLATE
FLANK
Cod/ Udder Fat

FORESHANK
WIDTH

*Sirloin plus Short Loin = Loin

THICKNESS
LENGTH

Outside Round
Bulge
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Reasons

Beef Carcasses

Placing: 2-4-1-3

2/4 I placed 2 over 4 due to greater quality (USDA Ch⁺ vs. Ch⁻), resulting in a higher merchandising value and qualifying for a Top Choice Box Beef Program. 2 manifested a higher degree of marbling, brighter cherry red color, and finer texture in the ribeye. In addition, 2 displayed a larger ribeye, plumper cushioned round, meatier heel, shorter shank, and wider loin. I admit 4 was a trimmer carcass evidenced by less fat opposite the ribeye, over the round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, lower rib, rib, chuck, brisket, and had less cod fat.

4/1 Due to greater trimness, I placed 4 over 1. 4 had less fat opposite the ribeye, over the round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, lower rib, rib, chuck, and had less cod fat. I concede 1 was a heavier muscled carcass. I displayed a larger ribeye, plumper cushioned round, meatier heel, shorter shank, thicker sirloin, wider loin, meatier rib, and heavier muscled chuck.

1/3 Due to greater quality (USDA Ch⁻ vs. Se) I placed 1 over 3. 1 revealed a higher degree of marbling in a finer textured firmer faced ribeye. In addition, 1 had less fat opposite the ribeye, over the round, over the sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin edge, lower rib, rib, brisket, and had less cod fat. Moreover, 1 displayed a much larger ribeye, plumper cushioned round, meatier heel, shorter shank, thicker sirloin, wider loin, fuller fleshed rib, and deeper clodded chuck.

3 I easily placed 3 last as it combined quality and cutability to the lowest degree. 3 lacked sufficient marbling to grade USDA Choice. 3 also revealed the most fat opposite the ribeye, over the round, sirloin, loin, loin edge, rib and the most cod fat. Furthermore, 3 displayed the smallest ribeye. There, 3 would merit the lowest merchandising value and the lowest percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts.

*Written by Justin Uhrig - Houston, 2006 – Score = 46
Reasons

Beef Carcasses

Placing: 1-2-3-4

1/2 I placed 1 over 2 due to much greater quality (USDA Prime vs. Choice), and advantages in trimness, thus yielding a higher merchandising value. 1’s quality was evidenced by a higher degree of marbling in a brighter cherry-red, firmer, finer textured ribeye. Moreover, 1 displayed less fat over the lower rib, less cod, kidney/pelvic/heart fat, and was trimmer over the brisket. Furthermore, 1 displayed a larger ribeye, shorter shank, and deeper cloodied chuck. I fully realize that 2 was trimmer opposite the ribeye, over the inside round, outside round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, rib and chuck. Also, 2 presented a more prominent sirloin, wider loin, and thicker rib.

2/3 I placed 2 over 3 due to much greater quality (USDA Choice vs. Select), qualifying 2 for a Top Choice Boxed Beef Program, and meriting a higher merchandising value. 2’s quality was evidenced by a higher degree of marbling in a brighter, more cherry red colored, firmer, finer textured ribeye. Moreover, 2 possessed less cod, kidney/pelvic/heart fat, and less fat over the brisket. Furthermore, 2 presented a shorter shank, and more prominent sirloin. I grant that 3 was a higher cutability carcass. 3 was much trimmer opposite the ribeye, over the inside round, outside round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, lower rib, rib and chuck. 3 also possessed a larger ribeye, plumper cushioned thicker, wider round, bulging heel, and thicker rib.

3/4 I easily placed 3 over 4 due to much greater trimness (USDA Yield Grad 1 vs. Yield Grade 4) and muscling, therefore yielding a higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts. 3 was trimmer opposite the ribeye, inside round, outside round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, lower rib, rib, chuck, and less kidney/pelvic/heart fat. Moreover, 3 presented a larger ribeye, plumper cushioned, wider, thicker round, bulging heel, shorter shank, prominent sirloin, and deeper cloodied chuck. I fully realize that 4 was a higher quality carcass (USDA Choice vs. Select), as evidenced by a higher degree of marbling in a brighter, firmer, finer textured ribeye. Also, 4 presented a thicker loin (partially due to fat).

4 I acknowledge that 4 possessed sufficient marbling to grade USDA Choice. However, I placed 4 last as it was the fattest, lowest yielding (USDA Yield Grade 4), lightest muscled carcass in the class. 4 was the fattest from end to end, especially opposite the ribeye, over the round, sirloin, loin, rib and chuck. Furthermore, 4 presented the smallest ribeye, lightest muscled round, shallowest sirloin, and narrowest chuck. Therefore, 4 would yield the lowest percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts.

*Written by Kaylee Reed – National Western, 2006 – Score = 49
Reasons

Beef Carcasses

Placing
Placing: 2-4-1-3

2/4  Due to greater quality resulting in a higher merchandising value and qualifying for a Top Choice Program, I placed 2 over 4. 2 exhibited a higher degree of marbling in a firmer finer textured ribeye. 2 also had a larger ribeye, thicker round, and a meatier heel. I grant that 4 was trimmer end to end, especially opposite the ribeye, over the round, sirloin, loin, loin edge, and rib. 4 also had a lighter, more youthful colored ribeye. 4 also had a thicker sirloin and chuck.

4/1  I placed 4 over 1 due to much greater trimness. 4’s trimness was evidenced by less fat opposite the ribeye, over the inside and outside round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, lower rib, rib and chuck. 4 also had a lighter, more youthful colored ribeye. I admit that 1 was heavier muscled, with a larger ribeye, thicker round, meatier heel, thicker sirloin, wider loin, meatier rib, and a deeper clothed chuck.

1/3  Due to greater quality (USDA Choice vs. Select) resulting in a higher merchandising value, and greater cutability, I easily placed 1 over 3. 1 manifested a higher degree of marbling in the ribeye. 1 was also trimmer opposite the ribeye, over the round, sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin edge, lower rib, rib chuck, cod, and brisket. 1 also had a larger ribeye, thicker, plumper cushioned round, thicker sirloin, meatier loin, fuller fleshed rib, and thicker chuck. I realize that 3 was firmer and finer textured in the ribeye.

3  I easily placed 3 last, as it was the lowest quality, lowest cutability carcass in the class. 3 lacked sufficient marbling to grade USDA Choice. Additionally, 3 had the most fat opposite the ribeye, over the sirloin, sirloin/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, and rib. 3 also had the smallest ribeye and the lightest muscled rib and chuck. Thus, 3 would yield the lowest percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts with the lowest merchandising value.

*Written by Merritt Carpenter - Houston, 2006 – Score = 49
CHAPTER V
JUDGING BEEF RIBS
BEEF RIBS

Since a large portion of the rib is cut into steaks and roast, quality is of the utmost importance in placing beef rib classes. All beef quality factors should be carefully evaluated and discussed in written reasons. Sufficient marbling to grade low Choice or higher is necessary in ranking beef ribs. As in beef carcasses Quality Grade priority is given in the following order: Prime, Top Choice, Choice, Select then Standard. Marbling degree, in addition to other quality factors, should be observed in both the ribeye and the blade face. Thus, a youthful, bright colored, firm, fine textured, extensively marbled lean is desired in both cut surfaces of the beef rib. Generally, an extensive difference exists in the value of a Choice rib vs. Select or Standard rib. Thus, a rib with less than a Small degree of marbling should be severely penalized in judging.

Beef ribs are placed on cutability after a determination of quality has been made. Appraisal of a rib's trimness can be made by observing the fat over the ribeye, lower rib, back, rib ends, lower blade, blade face, and seam fat. Muscling is observed from evaluation of the size of the ribeye, length, width, and plumpness of the back, width, and depth of the blade face and the size of the eye in the blade end. Therefore, a meat judge should determine which ribs in a given class possess Choice quality or higher and then rank these ribs according to cutability or yield grade. It is important to discuss all quality factors observed in both the rib and blade ends in beef ribs reasons.

MAJOR POINTS

1. Beef ribs are evaluated 70% on quality and 30% on cutability
2. Quality grade all ribs for low Choice or better
3. Rank according to cutability or yield grades
4. Prime typically place over Choice ribs if they are within a full yield grade
5. USDA Quality Grade Standard ribs place bottom
6. USDA Yield Grade 5 ribs place bottom
7. Evaluate ossification in the thoracic buttons for reasons
TERMINOLOGY

1. **Muscling**
   a. a larger ribeye
   b. a wider, longer, heavier muscled back
   c. a greater area of exposed lean in the blade face
   d. a larger eye of the blade face

2. **Trimness**
   a. less fat opposite the ribeye
   b. less fat over the lower rib
   c. less fat along the rib ends
   d. less fat over the back
   e. less seam fat in the blade face
   f. less fat over the blade face
   g. less fat over the upper or lower blade face

3. **Quality**
   a. a greater amount (or a higher degree) of marbling in the ribeye
   b. a firmer, finer textured lean in the ribeye or blade face
   c. a lighter red, more desirably colored ribeye or blade face
   d. less ossification in the thoracic buttons
   e. whiter fat

4. **Cut-out Statements**
   a. higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   b. higher cutout value
   c. higher percentage of steak and roast meat
   d. greater consumer appeal (color)
   e. higher merchandising value (quality grading)
Reasons

Beef Ribs

Placing
1-4-3-2

1/4 In a close pair, I placed 1 over 4 due to superior quality. 1's quality was clearly displayed by a substantially higher degree of marbling manifested in a firmer, finer textured lean in both the ribeye and blade face. Also, 1 had less fat over the lower rib. I readily admit 4 was a heavier muscled rib as revealed by a larger ribeye, a fuller fleshted back and a meatier blade face. Furthermore, 4 disclosed a brighter red, more desirable lean color in the cut surface of the ribeye.

4/3 I easily placed 4 over 3 due to obviously superior muscling resulting in a higher muscle to bone ratio. 4's muscling was clearly indicated by a substantially larger ribeye, a fuller fleshted, more bulging back and an obviously greater area of exposed lean in the blade face with an especially larger eye of the blade face. Moreover, 4 presented a brighter red color of lean in the ribeye. I concede 3 had less fat over the lower rib extending across the rib ends to the lower blade face. Additionally, 3 disclosed a finer textured lean in both cut surfaces and a greater amount of marbling in the eye of the blade.

3/2 I easily placed 3 over 2 due to superior quality and trimness. 3 clearly revealed a higher degree of marbling and a finer textured lean in both the ribeye and blade face, in addition to a brighter red, more desirable color of lean in the ribeye. Furthermore, 3 obviously had less fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, back, rib ends and the upper and lower blade face. I grant 2 presented a larger ribeye and a substantially meatier blade face.

2/ I easily placed 2 last because it was, without a doubt, the lowest quality, fattest rib in the class. 2 lacked adequate marbling to grade USDA Choice, as well as possessing the darkest, least desirable lean color in the ribeye. Moreover, 2 was obviously the fattest rib in the class with substantially more fat opposite the ribeye and lower rib. Consequently, 2 would easily yield the lowest percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts with the lowest merchandising value.

*Written by Leah Patterson – High Plains EXCEL, 1991 – Score = 44.
Reasons

Beef Ribs

Placing
1-4-3-2

1/4 I easily placed 1 over 4 due to greater cutability resulting from greater trimness and muscling. I had less fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, over the back, along the rib ends and extending over the blade face, coupled with obviously less seam fat. Moreover, I revealed a larger ribeye, a fuller fleshed back and a greater area of exposed lean in a deeper, meatier, heavier muscled blade face containing a substantially larger eye of blade. I grant 4 was a more youthful rib as evidenced by less ossification in the thoracic buttons and a brighter cherry red colored, finer textured ribeye. 4 also contained a greater amount of marbling in the eye of the blade.

4/3 I easily placed 4 over 3 due to superior quality (USDA Choice vs Select) resulting in a much higher merchandising value in a Top Choice program. 4 possessed a much higher degree of marbling in a brighter cherry red colored, finer textured ribeye. I immediately realize 3 was clearly a trimmer, heavier muscled, higher yielding rib. 3 had less fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, back, along the rib ends and over the blade face containing especially less seam fat. Additionally, 3 had a larger ribeye, a more bulging, heavier muscled back, and a meatier blade face. Finally, 3 had a firmer, finer textured blade face.

3/2 I easily placed 3 over 2 due to superior cutability resulting from superior trimness and greater muscling. 3 obviously had much less fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, along the rib ends, over the back and blade face, as well as less seam fat in the blade face. Furthermore, 3 had a larger ribeye, a more bulging back, and a greater area of exposed lean in a meatier blade face. Lastly, 3 revealed a firmer blade face. I grant 2 had a larger eye of the blade in the blade face. Also, 2 was obviously a much higher quality rib (USDA Choice vs Select) as it manifested a higher degree of marbling in the ribeye.

2/ I acknowledge 2 manifested a sufficient degree of marbling in the ribeye and graded USDA Choice. However, 2 easily placed last as it was, without a doubt, the fattest, wastiest, lightest muscled, lowest yielding rib in the class. 2 obviously had the most fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, back, along the ribends and over the blade face as well as excess seam fat. Additionally, 2 presented the smallest ribeye, the lightest muscled back and the least area of exposed lean in the blade face. Thus, 2 would easily yield the cut-out value.

Reasons

Beef Ribs

Placing
3-2-4-1

3/2  Due to clearly greater trimness, I placed 3 over 2. 3's trimness was shown by obviously less fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, less fat over the back, blade face, and ribends, and less seam fat in the blade face. Also, 3 had a greater area of exposed lean in the blade face. Lastly, 3 had a greater amount of marbling in the blade face. I immediately realize 2 was a heavier muscled rib and with a substantially larger ribeye. Also, 2 was a higher quality rib with a higher degree of marbling (USDA High vs Average Choice) in a firmer, brighter red colored ribeye.

2/4  Due to a superior quality (USDA High Choice vs Select) resulting in a much higher merchandising value, and advantages in muscling, I unhesitantly placed 2 over 4. 2's superior quality was shown by a clearly higher degree of marbling in a brighter red, finer textured ribeye and blade face, and would be ideal for use in a Top Choice Program. Also, 2 had a substantially larger ribeye and a larger eye in the blade face. I immediately concede 4 was a much trimmer rib as shown by substantially less fat from end to end, especially opposite the ribeye and less seam fat in the blade face. Lastly, 4 had a meatier blade face.

4/1  Due to superior trimness and greater muscling resulting in a substantially higher cutout value, I placed 4 over 1. 4's trimness was shown by obviously less fat opposite the ribeye and over the back, and would be ideal for use in a quarter-inch trimmed boxed beef program. Also, 4 had a larger ribeye, a more muscular back, and a meatier blade face. Lastly, 4 had a greater amount of marbling in the blade face. I readily realize 1 was a higher quality rib with a higher degree of marbling in the ribeye, and a much firmer, finer textured, brighter red blade face 9USDA Low Choice vs Select).

1  I immediately acknowledge 1 was a USDA Choice rib with a bright red, firm, fine textured ribeye and blade face. However, I placed 1 last as it was without question the fattest, wastiest, lightest muscled, lowest yielding (USDA Yield Grade 4) rib in the class. I had substantially the most fat from end to end especially opposite the ribeye and over the lower rib and back. Additionally, I had clearly the smallest ribeye and the least area of exposed lean in the blade face. Thus, I would undoubtedly yield the lowest percentage of USDA Choice boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts.

Reasons

Beef Ribs

Placing
3-4-2-1

3/4 I easily without hesitation placed 3 over 4 due to superior quality (USDA Prime vs. Choice) coupled with much greater trimness and muscling, thus merit high merchandising value, and a higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts. 3 manifested a much higher degree of marbling in a lighter, more youthful ribeye with a firmer blade face. Moreover, 3 was trimmer opposite the ribeye, over the rib, back, and lower blade face. Furthermore, 3 possessed a much larger ribeye, a more bulging back, and a larger eye of the blade. I grant, 4 possessed less ossification in the thoracic buttons.

4/2 In a close pair, I paced 4 over 2 due to advantages in trimness. 4 was trimmer opposite the ribeye and over the lower rib. Moreover, 4 possessed a more cherry-red colored ribeye. I concede, 2 possessed less fat over the back. Furthermore, 2 possessed a more bulging back. Finally, 2 exhibited a brighter, more cherry-red colored, firmer blade face.

2/1 Due to greater quality, I paced 2 over 1, thus yielding a higher merchandising value. 2 manifested a higher degree of marbling contained in a firmer, finer-textured ribeye, coupled with a greater amount of marbling in a firmer, finer-textured blade face. I immediately admit, I was higher cutability as evidenced by less fat opposite the ribeye, over the lower rib, back, along the rib ends, over the blade face, and less seam fat. Moreover, 1 possessed a much larger ribeye, more bulging back, and larger eye of the blade.

1 I immediately acknowledge, 1 was a high cutability rib. 1 was acceptably trim from end to end with the least amount of trimmable fat over the back, blade face, and the least amount of seam fat in the blade face. Moreover, 1 possessed a large ribeye and the most bulging back. However, I placed 1 last as it was the lowest quality in the class. 1 possessed the lowest degree of marbling making it insufficient to grade USDA Choice, coupled with a course texture, soft ribeye. Therefore, 1 would yield the absolute lowest merchandising value.

Shane Thompson, Houston Livestock Show, 2002, Score 46.
CHAPTER VI
JUDGING
BEEF FULL LOINS
BEEF LOINS

Beef loins are evaluated similarly to beef ribs. Quality is given first and utmost importance, and once the judge has determined which loins grade Choice or better, he/she generally ranks them according to expected cutability. Some preference is also given to loins, which grade Prime; therefore, if cutability was about equal for two loins, a judge would rank the loin with the highest quality first. Special consideration is also given to lean color and lean texture.

The beef loin has two areas of exposed lean, the loineye and the sirloin face. As one evaluates a loin from the loin end, muscling can be determined primarily by observing the size of the loineye muscle. External trimness over the loineye, loin edge, and along the flank edge also can be evaluated. Quality factors (marbling, color, texture and firmness of lean should be evaluated in the loineye muscle.

The amount of exposed lean in the sirloin face is important. This evaluation should include width and depth of the sirloin face and the size of the top and bottom sirloin faces. Trimness factors to consider are the amount of fat over the sirloin face and seam fat in the sirloin face. Quality factors also must be observed in the sirloin face.

Several more observations need to be made while viewing the loin from above. Length and width of the short loin is important. External trimness in the sirloin-short loin region needs to be evaluated in addition to muscle development and expression throughout the sirloin area.

MAJOR POINTS

1. Beef loins are judged 80% on quality and 20% on cutability
2. Prime loins of high cutability usually place top in a class
3. USDA Standard loins and Yield Grade 5 loins are always placed last
TERMINOLOGY

1. Muscling
   a. a larger loineye
   b. a fuller fleshed, meatier back or short loin
   c. a more bulging sirloin
   d. a greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face
   e. a larger top or bottom sirloin face
   f. a more prominent sirloin/short loin juncture

2. Trimness
   a. less fat opposite the loineye
   b. less fat over the back or short loin
   c. less fat along the loin edge
   d. less fat over the lower rib
   e. less fat over the sirloin face
   f. less fat over the top or bottom sirloin face
   g. less seam fat in the sirloin face (top or bottom)

3. Quality
   a. a firmer, finer textured lean in the loineye and/or sirloin face
   b. a brighter red, more youthful colored lean in the loineye or sirloin face
   c. a greater amount (or a higher degree) of marbling in the loineye or sirloin face
Reasons

Beef Loins

Placing
1-4-2-3

1/4 I easily placed 1 over 4 due to greater trimness and muscling resulting in a higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts. 1's trimness was shown by less fat opposite the loineye, over the short loin, along the flank side, over the bottom sirloin face and less seam fat. Additionally, 1 displayed a greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face with an especially larger bottom sirloin and a larger loineye. I concede 4 displayed a greater amount of marbling in a lighter red colored, firmer loineye.

4/2 I easily placed 4 over 2 due to greater quality. 4's quality was shown by a higher degree of marbling contained in a lighter red colored, finer textured lean in both cut surfaces. I immediately realize 2 was a higher cutting loin, as shown by greater trimness from end to end, especially opposite the loineye. Furthermore, 2 displayed a heavier muscled sirloin, a larger loineye and a greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face.

2/3 I placed 2 over 3 due to greater trimness and muscling. Therefore, 2 would yield a higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed steak meat. 2's trimness was shown by less fat over the short loin, along the flank side, opposite the loineye and over the sirloin face. Furthermore, 2 displayed a firmer, finer textured, lighter red colored loineye with a greater amount of marbling in both the loineye and the sirloin face.

3/ I easily placed 3 last as it combined quality, muscling and trimness to the lowest degree. 3 displayed a dark colored, coarse textured loineye with inadequate marbling to grade USDA choice. 3 also displayed the smallest loineye in the class. Finally, 3 exhibited excess fat over the loineye and sirloin face. Finally, 3 exhibited excess fat over the loineye and sirloin face. Therefore, 3 would yield a low percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts with the lowest merchandising value.

*Written by Micah Butler – Southwestern, 1991 – Score = 48
Reasons

Beef Loins

Placing

4-1-3-2

4/1 I placed 4 over 1 due to greater quality (USDA High Choice vs Low Choice) resulting in a higher merchandising value being more ideal for a Top Choice boxed beef program. 4 was clearly a higher quality loin evidenced by a higher degree of marbling in a brighter, more youthful colored, firmer textured, firmer lean in both cut surfaces. Moreover, 4 displayed a larger bottom sirloin face. I readily admit 1 was a trimmer loin evidenced by less fat opposite the loin eye, along the flank edge, over the sirloin, sirloin/shortloin juncture, and less seam at. 1 also possessed a larger top sirloin face.

1/3 I placed 1 over 3 due to superior trimness, resulting in a substantially higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts being much more ideal for a quarter-inch trimmed boxed beef program. 1 was a much trimmer loin with less fat from cut surface to cut surface especially opposite the loin eye, over the short loin, sirloin, and both sirloin faces. 1 also displayed a larger top sirloin face. I immediately realize 3 was a higher quality loin (USDA High Choice vs. Low Choice) being much more ideal for a Top Choice Beef program. 3 clearly displayed a higher degree of marbling in a finer textured, firmer lean in both cut surfaces. 3 also displayed a larger loin eye.

3/2 I easily placed 3 over 2 due to superior quality (USDA Choice vs. Standard) resulting in an undoubtedly higher merchandising value. 3 was undeniably a higher quality loin evidenced by a much higher degree of marbling in a much finer textured, brighter colored, firmer loin eye and sirloin face. I immediately realize 2 was a much higher cutability loin. 2 was without a doubt trimmer evidenced by especially less fat opposite the loin eye, a heavier muscled sirloin, and larger sirloin face with an especially larger bottom sirloin face.

2/ I acknowledge 2 was without a doubt the highest cutability loin in the class. 2 was the trimmest loin with the least fat from cut surface to cut surface especially opposite the loin eye, over the short loin, sirloin, and sirloin face. Moreover, 2 was a heavily muscled loin with the largest loin eye and the meatiest sirloin face. Nonetheless, I readily placed 2 last as it was the lowest quality (USDA Standard) loin. 2 clearly displayed the least marbling in the darkest colored, coarsest textured loin eye. Thus 2 would yield the highest percentage of USDA Standard boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts with the lowest merchandising value.

Tim Tatsch, Houston Stock Show, 1996. Score: 47.
Reasons

Beef Loin

Placing
1-3-2-4

1/3 Due to much greater quality (USDA Prime vs. Choice) which would attribute to a higher merchandising value, I placed 1 over 3. I had a higher degree of marbling in the loin eye. Furthermore, I was also trimer with less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, short loin, sirloin and top and bottom sirloin face. I also had a meatier short loin and a more bulging sirloin. I grant 3 had less seam fat in the sirloin face.

3/2 I placed 3 over 2 due to greater quality (USDA Choice vs. Select) as 3 would have a higher merchandising value. 3 was higher quality as revealed by a higher degree of marbling in a firmer, finer textured loin eye. 3 also had a greater amount of marbling in the sirloin face. I admit 2 was a higher cutability loin as it was trimmer and heavier muscled. 2 was trimmer with less fat opposite the loin eye, over the loin edge, short loin, sirloin, and sirloin face. 2 was heavier muscled with a larger loin eye, more bulging short loin and a larger sirloin face.

2/4 Due to much greater trimness that would lead to greater cutability, I placed 2 over 4. 2 was much trimmer opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, short loin, sirloin-short loin juncture, and sirloin face. 2 was also heavier muscled with a larger loin eye, fuller fleshed short loin, more bulging sirloin, and a meatier bottom sirloin face. I realize 4 was a higher quality loin as it contained adequate marbling to quality grade USDA Choice. 4 also had a finer textured, firmer lean 1 the loin eye.

4 I acknowledge 4 had adequate marbling to quality grade USDA Choice. However, 4 was the fattest, wastiest loin in the class and would yield the lowest percentage of boneless closely trimmed retail cuts. 4 had the most fat opposite the loin eye, over the loin edge, short loin, sirloin-short loin juncture, sirloin, and sirloin face. Furthermore, 4 had the smallest sirloin face with the most seam fat.

Chris Louthan, Houston Livestock Show, 1999, Score 46
Reasons

Beef Loins

Placing
1-3-2-4

1/3 I placed 1 over 2 due to much greater quality which will be more useful in a top choice program resulting in an increase of merchandising value. 1 manifested an especially higher degree of marbling in a firmer lean in the loin eye. Additionally, 1 was trimmer as seen opposite the loin eye, over the loin edge, short loin, sirloin/shortloin juncture, sirloin, and top sirloin face, along with less pelvic fat. 1 also presented a meatier shortloin, and a wider sirloin. I grant 3 had a larger loineye and meatier bottom sirloin face, along with less seam fat and also a brighter cherry red color of lean in the sirloin face.

3/2 I placed 3 over 2 due to much greater quality resulting in an increase of merchandising value. 3 contained a higher degree of marbling in a firmer lean in the loin eye, along with a more desirable cherry-red color of lean in the sirloin face. 3 was also trimmer over the loin edge. I readily admit 2 was a trimmer heavier muscled loin as evidenced by less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, sirloin, top sirloin face, having less seam fat, and less pelvic fat in conjunction with a larger loin eye, longer shortloin, wider sirloin, and a greater area of lean in the top sirloin. 2 also revealed a brighter color of lean in the loineye.

2/4 I placed 2 over 4 due to much greater trimness and muscling, thus 2 will yield a higher percent of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts. 2 was substantially trimmer opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, short loin, sirloin face, had less pelvic fat, and less seam fat. Furthermore, 2 possessed a larger loineye, thicker shortloin, and a greater area of lean in the sirloin face. I immediately realized 4 manifested a higher degree of marbling in the loineye in a firmer, more cherry-red color of lean.

4 I acknowledge that 4 had sufficient marbling to grade USDA choice. However, 4 was the fattest, wastiest, lowest yielding loin in the class. 4 obviously presented the most fat opposite the loineye, over the flank edge, loin edge, short loin, sirloin/shortloin juncture, sirloin face, and had the most seam fat. Moreover, 4 exhibited the flattest sirloin, and smallest area of lean in the sirloin face. Consequently, 4 will yield the lowest percent of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts.

Martha Evans, Houston Livestock Show, 1999, Score 45
CHAPTER VII
JUDGING BEEF
SHORT LOINS
BEEF SHORT LOINS

Beef short loins are judged on the same criteria as beef full loins. A judge should put strong emphasis on quality and rank pairs on predicted cutability.

MAJOR POINTS

1. Beef short loins are placed 80% on quality and 20% on cutability
2. Prime short loins of high cutability are placed top
3. USDA Standard short loins are placed last
4. USDA Yield Grade 5 short loins are placed last

TERMINOLOGY

1. Muscling
   a. a larger loin eye
   b. a fuller fleshed, heavier muscled back or strip loin
   c. a greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face
   d. a larger longissimus dorsi, psoas major or gluteus medius in the sirloin face

2. Trimness
   a. less fat opposite the loin eye
   b. less fat over the flank edge
   c. less fat over the loin edge
   d. less fat over the back or strip loin
   e. less fat over the sirloin face
   f. less kidney fat
   g. less seam fat

3. Quality
   a. a greater amount or a higher degree of marbling in the loin eye
   b. a greater amount of marbling in the sirloin face
   c. a firmer, finer textured lean in the loin eye and sirloin face
   d. a lighter red, more desirable colored loin eye or sirloin face

4. Criticisms
   a. the lowest quality short loin in the class with an insufficient amount of marbling to grade USDA Choice
   b. the darkest, coarsest textured lean in both cut surfaces
   c. combined quality and cutability to the lowest degree
   d. the fattest, wastiest short loin in the class with the lowest cutout value

5. Cut-out statements
   a. higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   b. greater consumer appeal (color)
   c. higher merchandising value (quality grading)
   d. higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed steak meat
Reasons

Beef Short Loins

Placing
1-3-2-4

1/3 Due to greater quality I placed 1 over 3. 1 manifested a higher degree of marbling in the loin eye and was a USDA Prime, as well as a greater amount of marbling in a brighter red colored, firmer, finer textured sirloin face. Furthermore, 1 had a larger gluteus medius in the sirloin face and less fat over the loin edge. I concede 3 was a trimmer loin as it had less fat opposite the loin eye and extending over the strip loin to the sirloin face. Moreover, 3 had a meatier loin eye and a larger psoas major. Finally, 3 had a brighter red colored, firmer, finer textured loin eye.

3/2 Due to greater trimness I placed 3 over 2. 3 had obviously less fat opposite the loin eye, over the strip loin, loin edge and sirloin face. Additionally, 3 had a meatier loin eye, a more muscular strip loin, and a greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face with an especially larger psoas major and gluteus medius. Finally, 3 had a greater amount of marbling and a brighter red colored lean in both cut surfaces and a finer textured, firmer lean in the loin eye. I grant, 2 had a larger loin eye and less fat beneath the sirloin face.

2/4 I easily placed 2 over 4 due to superior quality. 2's superior quality was evidenced by an obviously higher degree of marbling in both cut surfaces as well as a brighter red colored, finer textured, firmer loin eye. In addition, 2 had a larger loin eye and a fuller fleshed strip loin. I recognize 4 was a trimmer loin as it had much less fat opposite the loin eye, over the strip loin and along the loin edge. Also, 4 had a larger psoas major in the sirloin face.

4/ I acknowledge 4 displayed acceptable trimness for the class. I, nevertheless, easily placed it last as it was undoubtedly the lowest quality short loin in the class. 4 was a USDA Select short loin and revealed the darkest, softest, coarsest textured lean in the loin eye as well as the least marbling in the sirloin face. Moreover, 4 had the smallest loin eye in the class. Thus, 4 would yield a product extremely low in consumer appeal and merchandising value.

*Written by Brian Owen – American Royal, 1991 – Score = 45.
Reasons

Beef Short Loins

Placing
2-3-1-4

2/3 Due to much greater quality (USDA Prime vs. Choice) and advantages in trimness resulting in an obviously higher merchandising value, I placed 2 over 3. 2 undoubtedly manifested a much higher degree of more evenly dispersed marbling in the loineye and longissimus dorsi. 2 was also trimmer as evidenced by less fat opposite the loineye, over the loin edge and less fat over the sirloin face, especially the top sirloin face. I immediately concede 3 was heavier muscled as expressed by a larger loineye continuing through a fuller fleshed striploin into a meatier top sirloin face. Also, 3 had less seam fat in the sirloin face.

3/1 I readily placed 3 over 1 due to substantially greater cutability resulting from clearly greater trimness and muscling. 3 was trimmer as characterized by clearly less fat over the loin edge, striploin, and sirloin face, especially the bottom sirloin face. In addition, 3 was heavier muscled as demonstrated by a larger, meatier loineye, a fuller fleshed striploin extending into a meatier sirloin face complemented by a larger longissimus dorsi. Lastly, 3 contained a brighter colored loineye and a firmer, finer textured sirloin face. I admit 1 possessed less pelvic fat.

1/4 Due to significantly greater quality (USDA Average Choice vs. Select) resulting in an obviously higher merchandising value, I placed 1 over 4. 1 presented an undoubtedly higher degree of finer marbling in a firmer, finer textured, more youthful colored loineye and sirloin face. I immediately grant 4 was higher cutting. 4 was, without a doubt, trimmer as revealed by less fat opposite the loineye, over the loin edge, striploin, sirloin face with obviously less seam fat in the sirloin face. Also, 4 was heavier muscled as indicated by a much larger loineye, a meatier striploin and a greater area of exposed leasn in the sirloin face.

4/ I fully acknowledge 4 was a high cutting (Yield Grade 1) loin. 4 displayed little excess trimmable fat from cut surface to cut surface with especially little fat opposite the loineye, over the striploin and sirloin face. Moreover, 4 was heavily muscled as shown by a large loineye, a meaty sirloin face with the largest psoas major. However, I placed 4 last as it was the lowest quality loin in the class. 4 obviously lacked sufficient marbling to grade USDA Choice as revealed by the least marbling in the darkest colored, softest, coarsest textured loineye. Consequently, 4 would yield the highest percentage of Select boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts with the lowest merchandising value.

Reasons

Beef Short Loins

Placing
1-3-4-2

1/3 Due to much greater quality, being suitable for a Top Choice Program and meritng a higher merchandising value, I placed 1 over 3. 1’s quality was expressed by a higher degree of marbling manifested in a finer textured loin eye with a lighter, more youthful colored lean with greater consumer appeal. Also, 1 had a larger psoas major. I realize that 3 was trimmer with much less fat opposite the loin eye over the flank edge, loin edge, back and sirloin face. Lastly, 3 had a larger loin eye and gluteus medius.

3/4 Due to much greater trimness and yielding a higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts, I placed 3 over 4. 3’s trimness was clearly expressed by much less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back, sirloin face and less seam fat. Moreover, 3 had a larger loin eye. Lastly, 3 had a greater amount of marbling in the sirloin face that was brighter cherry-red. I admit that 4 had a greater amount of marbling in a lighter more youthful colored loin eye. Also, 4 had a wider back..

4/2 Due to much greater muscling, yielding a higher muscle to bone ratio, I placed 4 over 2. 4 was heavier muscled as evidenced by a much larger loin eye, wider, more bulging back, and a much meatier sirloin face with an especially larger longissimus dorsi and psoas major. Moreover, 4 had a lighter, more youthful colored lean in the loin eye. I realize that 2 was trimmer with less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back and sirloin face. Also, 2 had a greater amount of marbling in the loin eye.

2 I acknowledge that 2 had sufficient marbling to grade USDA Choice. However, I placed 2 last as 2 was clearly the lightest muscled loin. 2 possessed the smallest loin eye, flattest, lightest muscled back as well as the least area of exposed lean in the sirloin face. Consequently, 2 would yield the lowest muscle to bone ratio.

Reasons

Beef Short Loins

Placing
3-2-4-1

3/2 Due to much greater trimness, resulting in a higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts, I placed 3 over 2. 3’s trimness was evidenced by less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back, over the sirloin face, with less kidney fat and seam fat in the sirloin face. Additionally, 3 had a larger gluteus medius in the exposed sirloin face. Also, 3 had a greater amount of marbling in the exposed sirloin face lean. I admit that 2 had a greater amount of marbling in a more cherry-red, finer textured, and firmer loin eye. Also, 2 had a fuller fleshed back.

2/4 Due to much greater quality, qualifying for a Top Choice Program, resulting in a higher merchandising value, I place 2 over 4. 2’s quality was evidenced by a higher degree of marbling in a more cherry-red colored, finer textured, and firmer loin eye. Additionally, 2 had a fuller fleshed back. I grant that 4 had less fat over the flank edge, back and over the sirloin face. Additionally, 4 had a larger psoas major in the sirloin face. Also, 4 had a higher degree of marbling in the exposed sirloin face lean.

4/1 Due to greater quality, I placed 4 over 1. 4’s quality was evidenced by a higher degree of marbling in the loin eye. Additionally, 4 was heavier muscled with a larger loin eye, a fuller fleshed back, and a larger longissimus dorsi in the sirloin face. I admit that 1 was trimmer with less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back, over the sirloin face, with less kidney fat and seam fat in the sirloin face. Additionally, 1 had a greater amount of marbling in the exposed sirloin face lean.

1 I acknowledge that 1 was the trimmest in the class with the least fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back, and over the sirloin face, with the least kidney fat in the sirloin face. However, 1 combined quality and muscling to the lowest degree. 1 lacked sufficient marbling to grade USDA Choice. Additionally, I had the smallest loin eye, the lightest muscled back, and the smallest longissimus dorsi in the sirloin face. Therefore, I placed 1 last as it would have the lowest muscle to bone ratio, and would have the lowest merchandising value.

Reasons

Beef Short Loin

Placing
3-2-4-1

3/2 I placed 3 over 2 due to much greater trimness and greater muscling resulting in a higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts. 3 was trimmer as evidenced by less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back, sirloin face and less kidney fat. Furthermore, 3 was heavier muscled as revealed by a larger loin eye, psoas major, and gluteus medius. Also, 3 had a greater amount of marbling in the sirloin face. I grant 2 had a deeper back (partially due to fat). Also, 2 had a lighter, more youthful colored loin eye.

2/4 Due to greater quality, I placed 2 over 4 as 2 possessed sufficient marbling to qualify for a Top Choice Program, thus resulting in a higher merchandising value. 2 was higher in quality as evidenced by a greater amount of marbling in a lighter, more youthful colored loin eye. Also, 2 had a greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face containing a larger psoas major, longissimus dorsi and gluteus medius. Finally, 2 had less kidney fat. I grant 4 was trimmer as revealed by less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back and sirloin face.

4/1 I easily placed 4 over 1 due to much greater quality and muscling resulting in a higher merchandising value. 4 was higher in quality as revealed by a higher degree of marbling in a firmer, finer textured, more cherry-red loin eye. Also, 4 was heavier muscled as evidenced by a larger loin eye, fuller back, larger psoas major and longissimus dorsi in the sirloin face. I realize 1 was trimmer as revealed by less fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loinedge, back, sirloin face and less kidney and seam fat.

1 I acknowledge that 1 was the trimmest, highest yielding short loin in the class. 1 had the least fat opposite the loin eye, over the flank edge, loin edge, back, sirloin face, the least kidney fat and seam fat. However, 1 was the lowest quality short loin in the class. I was the lowest quality as revealed by the least marbling in the loin eye, insufficient to grade USDA Choice, as well as the darkest loin eye lean. Therefore 1 would have the lowest merchandising value.

CHAPTER VIII
JUDGING
BEEF ROUNDS
BEEF ROUNDS

As an individual views a round from the cut lean surface (sirloin end), he/she can observe the size of the knuckle and rump face as well as evaluate the overall width and depth of the round face. The amount of cod fat, external fat over the knuckle and rump and seam fat also can be determined. Additionally, a beef round should be observed from the side and from the rear for evaluation of external fat over the center section, cushion, heel and along the flank edge. A bright cherry-red, firm, fine textured lean with a high degree of marbling and white external fat indicates desirable quality in beef rounds.

Beef rounds are ranked primarily on cutability. Trimness and muscling are the important factors to consider, while quality traits are of secondary importance and only used in writing reasons. Muscle development in the round face, combined with an evaluation of the length, width, and depth of center section, plumpness or depth of the cushion and meatiness of the heel, should be observed.

In summary, rounds should be ranked based on trimness and muscling. Quality should be observed and discussed in reasons, but not used as criteria for placing rounds except in very close pairs of extreme circumstances (almost never).

MAJOR POINTS

1. Beef rounds are placed 90% on cutability and 10% on quality
2. The round face should be evaluated for cutability first
3. The back view of the cushion and center section should also be evaluated and used as an important point for placing the class
TERMINOLOGY

1. Muscling
   a. a greater area of exposed lean in the round face
   b. a larger knuckle face
   c. a larger, meatier rump face
   d. a deeper, longer, wider, heavier muscled center section
   e. a plumper, heavier muscled cushion
   f. a meatier heel and a shorter shank

2. Trimness
   a. less fat over the round face
   b. less fat over the knuckle or rump face
   c. less fat over the center section
   d. less fat along the flank side
   e. less fat over the cushion
   f. less cod fat (do not use udder fat)
   g. less seam fat
   h. less fat over the heel

3. Quality
   a. a greater amount (do not use degree) of marbling in the round face
   b. a greater amount of marbling in the knuckle or rump face
   c. a firmer, finer textured lean in the round face
   d. a brighter red, more youthful colored lean in the round face

4. Cut-out Statements
   a. higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   b. higher percentage of closely trimmed steak and roast meat
   c. higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)
Reasons

Beef Rounds

Placing
1-3-4-2

1/3 I without a doubt, placed 1 over 3 due to superior muscling. Thus, 1 would clearly produce a much higher muscle to bone ratio. I clearly displayed a greater area of exposed lean in the round face, a longer, wider, deeper cushion, a more muscular center section, a meatier heel and a shorter shank. In addition, 1 had less fat over the rump face, cushion, center section and less seam fat. Finally, 1 had more marbling in the rump face. I concede 3 possessed a greater amount of marbling in a brighter red knuckle face and a firmer, finer textured rump face.

3/4 In a close pair, I placed 3 over 4 due to greater muscling. 3's muscling was shown by a larger, meatier round face a longer, wider center section and a plumper cushion. Moreover, 3 possessed a greater amount of marbling in the round face. I immediately realize 4 had less fat over the cushion, center section, less seam fat and less fat over the rump and cod. Finally, 4 had finer textured lean in the rump face.

4/2 Due to greater muscling, I placed 4 over 2. 4's muscling was clearly evidenced by a greater area of exposed lean in the round face, a deeper center section and cushion, and a meatier heel with a shorter shank. Moreover, 4 had less fat over the cushion, flank edge, in the cod region and less seam fat. I admit 2 was a higher quality round as shown by a greater amount of marbling in a lighter red colored lean in the round face. 2 also had a longer, wider center section.

2/ I acknowledge 2 was the highest quality round in the class as indicated by the highest degree of marbling. Nonetheless, I placed 2 last as it was the least muscular round, with the least area of exposed lean in the round face and the shallowest center section and cushion. 2 also had the most cod fat. Consequently, 2 would yield the lowest percentage of boneless, closely trimmed roast and steak meat.

Reasons

Beef Rounds

Placing
1-3-4-2

1/3 Greater muscling and advantages in trimness combined to easily place 1 over 3. Thus, 1 would yield a higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts. 1's muscling was evidenced by an obviously much greater area of exposed lean in the round face, a substantially deeper, heavier muscled center section, and a plumper, meatier cushion. Moreover, 1 displayed less fat over the rump face, along the flank side, and over the center section, cushion and heel, as well as less seam fat. I concede 3 revealed a greater amount of marbling in a firmer lean in the round face.

3/4 In a close pair, I placed 3 over 4 due to advantages in muscling. 3 possessed a greater area of exposed lean in the knuckle face, a longer center section, and a plumper cushion. Additionally, 3 disclosed a more desirable color of lean throughout the round face, as well as a greater amount of marbling and a firmer lean, especially within the knuckle face. I grant 4 exhibited advantages in trimness as it had less fat over the center section, cushion and heel, and in the cod region. Also, 4 presented a meatier heel.

4/2 Due to advantages in muscling and trimness, I placed 4 over 2. 4's muscling was shown by a greater area of exposed lean the round face, especially in the rump face, and a meatier cushion. In addition, 4 had much less fat in the cod region, as well as along the flank side and over the cushion. I readily admit 2 was a higher quality round with a greater amount of marbling manifested in a firmer lean with a more desirable color in the cut surface of the round face. Furthermore, 2 presented a fuller fleshed center section.

2/ I immediately acknowledge 2 was the highest quality round in the class with the most marbling and the firmest lean throughout the round face. Also, 2 was acceptable in trimness for the class. Nonetheless, I placed 2 last because it combined muscling and trimness to the lowest degree. 2 presented the least area of exposed lean in the round face and a short center section, coupled with the most fat along the flank side and in the cod region. Thus, 2 would yield the lowest percentage of boneless, closely trimmed steak and roast meat.

*Written by Leah Patterson – International, 1991 – Score = 45
CHAPTER IX
JUDGING PORK CARCASSES
PORK CARCASSES

Pork carcasses are primarily placed on cutability (the percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts from the ham, loin, Boston shoulder and picnic shoulder). Factors, which affect cutability, include trimness and muscling.

Average backfat thickness (the average of measurements taken opposite the first rib, last rib and last lumbar vertebra) should be the primary evaluation factor for trimness. Fat thickness should also be evaluated over the collar, in the belly pocket, along the navel edge, and over the sternum. Ribbed carcasses should be evaluated for fat opposite the loineye and over the lower rib.

Muscle development should be evaluated in the ham, loin, Boston shoulder and picnic shoulder, collectively known as the "four lean cuts". Less important indicators of muscling include the stifles, sirloin, exposed lumbar lean, and heel. Strong emphasis should be placed on size of the loineye in ribbed pork carcasses.

Quality is a factor, which should only have an impact on the placing of a class in extreme cases. Quality factors should be evaluated between every pair and written in reasons. These factors include feathering between the ribs, color of the belly lean and exposed lumbar lean and fat streakings in the lumbar lean. Ribbed carcasses should additionally be evaluated for marbling, color, texture, firmness of lean, and exudation in the exposed loineye. When Pale, Soft, and Exudative (PSE) lean is visible in the loineye of a ribbed carcass that carcass should be typically placed in the bottom pair.

In conclusion, pork carcasses are placed 90% on cutability with the most emphasis on trimness. Remember that a degree and a half difference in muscling is required to place one carcass over another with only 0.1" difference in average backfat. The remaining 10% of the placing should be based on quality.

TERMINOLOGY

1. Trimmness
   a. less fat opposite the first rib, last rib and last lumbar vertebra
   b. less fat:
      over the collar
      in the belly pocket
      along the navel edge
      over the sternum
      along the ventral side
      in the clear plate
      over the center loin
   c. less fat opposite the loin eye and over the lower rib
   d. less jowl fat
   e. a trimmer carcass from end to end
2. **Muscling**
   a. plumper cushioned, heavier muscled ham
   b. heavier muscled (or more muscular) ham, sirloin, loin and shoulder
   c. more muscular ham with a meatier heel and shorter shank
   e. fuller fleshed, deeper chined loin
   f. fuller fleshed, more bulging sirloin
   g. wider, more bulging shoulder
   h. plumper cushioned, wider stifled ham
   i. larger loin eye
   j. longer carcass
   k. a more prominent sirloin/loin juncture
   l. greater area of exposed lumbar lean

3. **Quality**
   a. greater amount or higher degree of feathering between the ribs
   b. greater amount or higher degree of fat streakings in the exposed lumbar lean
   c. more desirable reddish-pink color of belly lean or lumbar lean
   d. higher degree of marbling coupled with a firmer, finer textured, more grayish-pink color of lean in the loin eye

4. **Cut-out Statements**
   a. higher percentage of closely trimmed four lean cuts (cutability)
   b. higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts from the ham, loin, Boston shoulder and picnic shoulder (cutability)
   c. higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)
   d. higher cutout value

5. **Criticisms**
   a. fattest, wastiest, lowest yielding carcass
   b. lowest muscle to bone ratio
   c. lightest muscled
   d. thinly muscled
   e. excess trimmable fat
   f. combined muscling and trimness to the lowest degree
Reasons

Pork Carcasses

Placing
2-4-1-3

2/4 I placed 2 over 4 due to greater trimness, resulting in a higher lean to fat ratio. 2 revealed less fat opposite the first rib and last lumbar vertebra, as well as less fat over the collar, in the belly pocket, along the navel edge and over the sternum. Moreover, 2 exhibited a greater area of exposed lumbar lean coupled with a deeper chined loin. I grant 4 was a heavier muscled carcass as shown by a wider, plumper ham coupled with a heavier muscled sirloin and shoulder. 4 also showed less fat opposite the last rib. Finally, 4 displayed more feathering between the ribs along with more fat streakings in the lumbar lean.

4/1 I placed 4 over 1 due to advantages in trimness and muscling. 4 revealed less fat over the first and last ribs and last lumbar vertebra as well as less fat over the collar. Furthermore, 4 presented a heavier muscled sirloin and shoulder coupled with a deeper chined loin. Finally, 4 displayed a greater amount of feathering between the ribs. I grant 1 presented a wider, plumper, more muscular ham. 1 also revealed less fat along the navel edge.

1/3 I placed 1 over 3 due to muscling and advantages in trimness. 1 presented a wider, plumper, more muscular ham, a heavier muscled sirloin and a more muscular shoulder coupled with a deeper chined loin. Moreover, revealed less fat over the collar, in the belly pocket, along the navel edge and over the sternum. Finally, 1 displayed a more desirable grayish-pink colored lumbar lean. I concede 3 revealed less fat opposite the first rib and last lumbar vertebra. 3 also presented a greater area of exposed lumbar lean. Finally, 3 displayed a greater amount of feathering between the ribs.

3/ I acknowledge 3 displayed the most feathering between the ribs; however, I placed 3 last as it combined trimness and muscling to a low degree. 3 revealed excess fat over the collar, in the belly pocket, along the navel edge and over the sternum. 3 also presented a thinly muscled sirloin and shoulder. Therefore, 3 would yield a low percent of closely trimmed lean cuts from the ham, loin, Boston and picnic shoulders.

*Written by Eddie Behrends – Southwestern, 1990 – Score = 45
Reasons

Pork Carcasses

Placing
1-2-4-3

1/2 I immediately placed 1 over 2 due to clearly greater muscling. 1 was heavier muscled shown by a thicker stifled, plumper cushioned, heavier muscled ham extending to a thicker, more bulging sirloin, a much thicker, fuller fleshed loin and a more bulging, heavier muscled shoulder. Finally, I revealed a much higher degree of fat streakings manifested in the exposed lumbar lean. I immediately realize 2 revealed less fat over the clear plate with less fat opposite the last lumbar vertebra, and less fat along the navel edge. Lastly, 2 presented a meatier heel coupled with a shorter shank.

2/4 In a close pair, I placed 2 over 4 due to greater muscling. 2 revealed a much thicker stifled, plumper cushioned, heavier muscled ham with a meatier heel extending to an especially more bulging, heavier muscled sirloin and a thicker, more bulging, heavier muscled shoulder. Furthermore, 2 revealed less fat especially over the clear plate and along the navel edge. Finally, 2 presented a greater amount of feathering between the ribs. I immediately realize 4 displayed much less fat opposite the last rib. Also, 4 displayed a much greater area of exposed lumbar lean. Finally, 4 presented a more reddish-pink lean in the exposed lumbar lean.

4/3 I easily, without hesitation, placed 4 over 3 due to superior trimness resulting in a higher percentage on bone-in, closely trimmed retail cuts from the ham, loin, Boston and picnic shoulder. 4 was much trimmer shown by clearly less fat over the clear plate extending especially over the center loin with much less fat opposite the last lumbar vertebra and especially less fat in the belly pocket. Furthermore, 4 revealed a thicker stifled, plumper cushioned, heavier muscled ham with an obviously meatier heel and a shorter shank as well as a greater area of exposed lumbar lean. I grant 3 presented a thicker, more bulging shoulder as well as a more bulging sirloin (partially due to fat).

3/ I immediately acknowledge 3 was a US Number 1 carcass shown by little fat opposite the last rib. However, I nonetheless placed 3 last as it was the fattest, lightest muscled, lowest cutting carcass of the class shown by the most trimmable fat over the clear plate, over the center loin and opposite the last lumbar vertebra as well as obviously the most fat in the belly pocket. Furthermore, 3 was the lightest muscled shown by the most tapering cushioned, thinnest, lightest muscled ham of the class with easily the lightest muscled heel and longest shank. Therefore, 3 would unquestionably yield the lowest percent of bone-in, closely trimmed retail cuts.

Reasons
Ribbed Pork Carcasses
Placing
1-2-4-3

1/2 Due to advantages in trimness, I placed 1 over 2. 1’s trimness was evidenced by less fat in the clear plate, over the center loin, over the collar, and over the sternum, as well as less fat opposite the loineye. Also, 1 had a larger loineye and a thicker, heavier muscled loin and shoulder. Lastly, 1 had a greater amount of marbling in a firmer, finer textured loineye, as well as a greater amount of fat streakings in the lumbar lean and feathering between the ribs. I grant 2 had a longer, thicker, heavier muscled ham with a meatier heel and shorter shank, and a much greater area of exposed lumbar lean. Also, 2 had less fat over the lower rib, opposite the last lumbar vertebra, in the belly pocket, and along the navel edge.

2/4 Due to clearly greater muscling, I placed 2 over 4. 2’s muscling was shown by a larger loineye, a much thicker, heavier muscled ham with a meatier heel and shorter shank, a thicker, more muscular shoulder and a much greater area of exposed lumbar lean. Also, 2 had much less fat opposite the loineye, and less fat over the lower rib and opposite the last lumbar vertebra. Lastly, 2 had a greater amount of feathering between the ribs. I concede 4 had much less fat in the clear plate, and less fat in the belly pocket, along the navel edge and over the sternum. Finally, 4 had a clearly greater amount of marbling in a more reddish-pink, much firmer, finer textured loineye.

4/3 Due to advantages in trimness and muscling, I placed 4 over 3. 4 had less fat in the clear plate, over the center loin, opposite the last lumbar vertebra, over the collar, much less fat in the belly pocket, and less jowl fat. Also, 4 had a larger loineye and a thicker, more muscular sirloin. Lastly, 4 had a much greater amount of marbling in a more reddish-pink, firmer loineye, and a greater amount of fat streakings in the lumbar lean. I grant 3 had less fat opposite the loineye and along the navel edge. Also, 3 had a thicker ham, heel and shoulder (partially due to fat) and a greater area of exposed lumbar lean. Lastly, 3 had a greater amount of feathering between the ribs and a more reddish-pink colored belly lean.

3/ I acknowledge 3 was a US #2 carcass with a thick, muscular ham and shoulder. However, I placed 3 last as it was the fattest, lowest yielding carcass in the class. 3 had the most fat in the clear plate, over the center loin, and opposite the last lumbar vertebra, as well as clearly the most fat in the belly pocket, and the most jowl fat. Moreover, 3 had the smallest loineye. Lastly, 3 had the least amount of marbling in a soft, light reddish-pink colored loineye. Consequently, 3 would yield the lowest percentage of bone-in, closely trimmed retail cuts.

Laura Locke Behrends, American Royal, 1995. Score: 46.
Reasons

Pork Carcasses

Placing
1-2-3-4

1/2  Due to much greater trimness, I placed 1 over 2. I revealed much greater trimness, resulting in a higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts, as evidenced by less fat over the last lumbar vertebrae, center loin, collar, and sternum. Moreover, 1 exhibited a more prominent, bulging sirloin extending into a more prominent sirloin/loin juncture, as well as a greater area of exposed lumbar lean, and a shorter shank. I concede 2 revealed a wider, meatier ham extending into a plumper heel (partially due to fat).

2/3  In a close pair, due to advantages in muscling and trimness, I placed 2 over 3. 2 expressed advantages in muscling as evidenced by a wider ham, extending into a plumper, more bulging heel, much more prominent sirloin, more prominent sirloin/loin juncture, a fuller fleshed shoulder, and a greater area of exposed lumbar lean. Furthermore, 2 was trimmer over the first rib, last lumbar vertebra, center loin, collar, belly pocket, navel edge, sternum, and jowl. I admit 3 exhibited a greater amount of feathering over the ribs.

3/4  Due to greater trimness, I placed 3 over 4. 3 displayed greater trimness as evidenced by less fat over the first rib, last rib, and last lumbar vertebra. In addition, 3 exhibited a longer ham, a more prominent sirloin/loin juncture, a greater amount of feathering over the ribs, and a greater amount of streakings in the exposed lumbar lean. I realize 4 exhibited less fat over the belly pocket and navel edge; also, 4 exhibited a plumper heel (partially due to fat).

4  Finding no obvious acknowledgments, I placed 4 last as it was a fat, wasted, low yielding carcass. 4 was the fattest over the last lumbar vertebra, clear plate, and center loin. Therefore, 4 would yield a low percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts from the ham, loin, Boston, and picnic shoulders.

Julie Wilkerson, National Western (Denver), 2000. Score: 45.
CHAPTER X
JUDGING
FRESH HAMS
FRESH HAMS

Fresh hams are placed with 80% of the emphasis on cutability (percentage of bone-in, closely trimmed retail product) and the remaining 20% on quality. Consequently, fat should be evaluated first because it has the biggest impact on cutability.

The amount of external fat beneath the butt face, alongside the butt face, over the rump and collar coupled with seam fat (fat between the muscle in the butt face) are all indicators of fat. Muscle development, the other important influence on cutability, is noted by the amount of exposed lean in the butt face, the width, length, and forecushion and cushion, along with the fullness of the heel and the length of the shank. Quality is evidenced by the degree of marbling, the color and firmness of the exposed lean, and the degree of muscle separation. In high quality hams, the exposed surface is firm and uniformly pinkish-red in color with a high degree of evenly distributed marbling. In some cases, a severe two-toned condition may exist among the colors of the different muscles. Although not a significant factor normally, extreme cases may be criticized as many hams today are eventually restructured. Also, hams in which the lean is pale in color, very soft and watery or exudative (PSE) should be severely criticized and placed in the bottom pair. In summary, fat covering and muscle development should be carefully analyzed to determine cutability. It is often necessary to kneel down in order to get an accurate picture of the class from every angle. After placing a class on cutability, determine the ranking of close pairs by analyzing quality. Written reasons should contain detailed descriptions of quality differences between each pair.
TERMINOLOGY

1. **Trimness**
   a. less fat: beneath the butt face
      alongside the butt face
      over the collar
      over the forecushion
      over the center section
      over the cushion
   b. less seam fat
   c. less fat extending from the butt face to the cushion, over the collar and forecushion, coupled with less seam fat in the butt face

2. **Muscling**
   a. longer, wider, deeper center section
   b. more bulging cushion and meatier forecushion
   c. greater area of exposed lean in the butt face
   d. fuller fleshed heel and a shorter shank
   e. deeper, wider butt face
   f. a plumper cushion

3. **Quality**
   a. firmer, more uniformly colored lean
   b. more reddish-pink color of lean in the butt face
   c. higher degree of marbling in the butt face
   d. firmer lean with less muscle separation

4. **Cut-out Statements**
   a. higher percentage of closely trimmed center-cut slices (cutability)
   b. higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   c. higher cutout value
   d. higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)

5. **Criticisms**
   a. fattest
   b. wastiest
   c. lowest yielding
   d. lightest muscled
   e. lowest quality ham with the palest, softest, most watery lean
Reasons

Hams

Placing: 1-3-2-4

1/3 I place 1 over 3 due to greater muscling. Thus, 1 would yield a higher muscle to bone ration. 1’s muscling was exhibited by a deeper butt face, a deeper, plumper, more muscular cushion with a thicker heel. Also, 1 had less fat over the cushion and collar. I grant 3 had a firmer, more desirably colored butt face with less muscle separation.

3/2 In an extremely close pair, I place 3 over 2 due to greater muscling. 3 revealed a greater area of exposed butt face, a fuller, more muscular forecushion and a thicker plumper cushion. In addition, 3 had a firmer butt face. I grant 2 had less fat over the collar, cushion and alongside the rump. Also, 2 had a more desirable grayish-pink lean color.

2/4 I easily place 2 over 4 due to superior trimness. Thus, 2 would produce a higher percent of bone-in, closely trimmed center-cut slices. 2’s trimness was obviously shown by less fat beneath the butt face, alongside the rump, over the cushion and in the forecushion. Also, 2 had a greater area of exposed lean in the butt face. I grant 4 was a higher quality of ham as shown by a greater amount of marbling in a firmer butt face.

4 I acknowledge 4 was the highest quality ham in the class as shown by the greatest amount of marbling in a firm, grayish-pink colored butt face. However, I easily placed 4 last as it was the fattest, waviest, lowest yielding ham in the class. 4 had the most fat beneath the butt face, over the forecushion, and alongside the butt face. Thus, 4 would yield the lowest percent of bone-in, closely trimmed center-cut slices.

Reasons

Pork Fresh Ham

Placing
1-4-2-3

1/4 I easily placed 1 over 4 due to clearly greater trimness and muscling resulting in a higher percentage of bone-in, closely trimmed center cut slices. 1 was much trimmer from end to end with especially less fat beneath the butt face, alongside the butt face, and over the forecushion. Furthermore, 1 possessed a greater area of exposed lean in the butt face with a meatier forecushion, and a heavier muscled center section. Also, 1 had a greater amount of marbling in a more reddish-pink colored butt face. I concede 4 possessed a shorter shank.

4/2 In a close pair, I placed 4 over 2 due to greater muscling. 4 was heavier muscled as evidenced by a greater area of exposed lean in the butt face, a clearly larger forecushion, a deeper center section, a plumper cushion, and shorter shank. Also 4 was trimmer over the forecushion. I immediately grant 2 was trimmer as shown by less fat beneath the butt face, alongside the butt face, over the center section and cushion, as well as less seam fat. Lastly, 2 had a greater amount of marbling in a more uniform reddish-pink colored, firmer butt face.

2/3 I easily place 2 over 3 due to superior trimness and greater muscling resulting in a higher cutout value. 2 was especially trimmer from cut surface to cut surface with obviously less fat beneath and alongside the butt face and over the forecushion. Moreover, 2 was heavier muscled as evidenced by a much greater area of exposed lean in the butt face with a larger forecushion, and a longer center section. Finally, 2 had a greater amount of marbling in a lighter, more reddish-pink colored, firmer butt face. I concede 3 possessed a shorter shank and a deeper center section (partially due to fat).

3 I readily acknowledge 3 possessed the shortest shank in the class. However, I nonetheless easily placed 3 last as it clearly combined trimness, muscling, and quality to the absolute lowest degree. 3 was the fattest, waistiest ham as shown by the most excess trimmable fat especially beneath the butt face, alongside the butt face, and over the forecushion. Moreover, 3 was the lightest muscled as evidenced by obviously the smallest butt face and forecushion. Lastly, 3 possessed the darkest colored, most dried out butt face. Therefore, 3 would undoubtedly yield the lowest percentage of bone-in, closely trimmed center cut slices.

CHAPTER XI
JUDGING
PORK LOINS
CENTER CUT PORK LOINS

In attempts to keep meat judging current with the industry, the Intercollegiate Meat Judging Coaches Association made several revisions to the contest format in 1999 to be effective for January of 2000. One of these such revisions was the addition of a pork loin class. As a result, little terminology preference has been developed. However, this chapter covers the basics of judging pork loins.

Pork loins are placed primarily on cutability, thus, trimness and muscling are the two main factors evaluated. Since, pork loins are a middle meat and with increasing selection based on quality by Asian exporters, minimum quality standards should be met. For example, a pork loin that is pale, soft, and exudative would be placed in the bottom pair regardless of cutability. Quality can be evaluated in either the blade face or the sirloin face in pork loins, however, marbling is predominantly evaluated in the blade face. Color, texture, firmness, muscle separation and exudation are also quality factors that can be evaluated in either cut surface.

When evaluating muscling in the pork loin, primary consideration is given to the exposed loin eye (longissimus dorsi) in both the blade and sirloin face. Muscling is also evaluated by the bulge of the back, depth of chime, spinalis dorsi in the blade face and the psoas major in the sirloin face. Width and depth of either face can be evaluated for muscling.

Trimness is predominantly evaluated over the blade face and sirloin face. Other areas that should be noted include the lower rib, back, rib ends, tail region, kidney fat, and seam fat in either cut surface.

MAJOR POINTS

1. Pork loins are judged 70% on cutability and 30% on quality.
2. PSE pork loins are placed in the bottom pair and sometimes last based on severity.
3. Other quality factors should be noted for reasons, but do not have a large influence on placing.
TERMINOLOGY

1. Trimness
   a. less fat: over the blade face
      over the back
      over the loin edge
      over the rib ends
      over the sirloin face
      in the tail region
   b. less seam fat in the blade face and/or sirloin face
   c. less kidney fat

2. Muscling
   a. Larger loin eye exposed in the blade face or larger eye of blade
   b. Larger loin eye exposed in the sirloin face or larger longissimus dorsi
   c. A longer, wider, heavier muscled back
   d. Greater area of exposed lean in the sirloin face
   e. Larger psoas major or tenderloin
   f. Greater depth of chine

3. Quality
   a. Greater amount of marbling in the blade face and/or sirloin face
   b. Firmer lean exposed in the blade face and/or sirloin face
   c. Finer textured lean exposed in the blade face and/or sirloin face
   d. More reddish-pink colored lean exposed in the blade face and/or sirloin face
   e. Less muscle separation in the blade face and/or sirloin face
   f. Less exudative lean exposed in the blade face and/or sirloin face

4. Cut-out Statements
   a. higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   b. higher cutout value

5. Criticisms
   a. fattest
   b. wastiest
   c. lowest yielding
   d. lightest muscled
   e. lowest quality loin with the palest, softest, most watery lean
CENTER CUT PORK LOIN (412) TERMINOLOGY

Top Loin
(Loin Eye plus Gluteus Medius)

Blade Face (End)

Sirloin Face (End)
Reasons

Pork Loins

Placing 4-3-2-1

4/3 Due to greater muscling, I placed 4 over 3. 4 was heavier muscled, as evidenced by a meatier blade face with a larger loin eye, and a larger longissimus dorsi and psoas major in the sirloin face. I grant, 3 had less fat over the blade face, less seam fat I the blade face, over the tail region and back. Also, 3 had less exudation in the blade face.

3/2 I easily placed 3 over 2 due to much greater trimness, resulting in a much higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts. 3 was trimmer as evidenced by less fat over the blade face, less seam fat in the blade face, over the tail region, back, sirloin face, and less kidney fat. Furthermore, 3 had a larger longissimus dorsi in the sirloin face. I admit, 2 had a greater amount of marbling in the blade and sirloin faces and a firmer sirloin face lean.

2/1 I placed 2 over 1 due to much greater quality. 2 was higher quality, as evidenced by a greater amount of marbling in a more reddish-pink colored, much firmer, and less exudative blade and sirloin faces. I realize, 1 was higher cutability, as shown by less fat over the blade face, less seam fat in the blade face over the back, sirloin face, tail region, and less kidney fat. Also, 1 had a meatier blade face with a larger loin eye, a fuller fleshed back and a larger longissimus dorsi and psoas major in the sirloin face.

1 I acknowledge, 1 was a high cutability loin with little fat over the blade face, little seam fat in the blade face, over the back, sirloin face and tail region. Furthermore, 1 had a large blade face, a large loin eye, a full fleshed back, and large longissimus dorsi and psoas major in the sirloin face. However, 1 was the absolute lowest quality with the palest, softest, most exudative lean, making it the least suitable for an export market.

Reasons

Pork Loins

Placing

4-3-1-2

Due to greater muscling I placed 4 over 3. 3 was heavier muscled as evidenced by a meatier blade face, with a larger loineye, more bulging, thicker back, and a meatier sirloin face, with a larger longissimus dorsi and psoas major. Moreover, 4 manifested a greater amount of marbling, in a more uniform reddish-pink lean in both cut surfaces. Also, 4 exhibited less fat over the lower rib. I grant 3 displayed less fat over the blade face, less seam fat in the blade face, less fat over the rib ends, back and over the tail region.

I placed 3 over 1 due to greater trimness and quality. 3 was trimmer as indicated by less fat over the blade face, lower rib, back, and sirloin face, especially over the tail region. Furthermore, 3 was higher quality as evidenced by a greater amount of marbling in a firmer, blade face with less muscle separation, coupled with a greater amount of marbling in a firmer, finer textured, more reddish-pink lean in the sirloin face with less muscle separation. Also, 3 revealed a bore bulging back. I concede 1 revealed a meatier blade face with a larger loineye as well as a meatier sirloin face with a larger longissimus dorsi. Finally, 1 displayed less seam fat in the blade face.

I placed 1 over 2 due to greater muscling and trimness, yielding a higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts. 1 was heavier muscled as revealed by a meatier blade face with a larger loineye, fuller fleshed back, and meatier sirloin face with a larger longissimus dorsi and psoas major. In addition 1 was trimmer as indicated by less fat over the blade face with much less seam fat, less fat over the ribends, back and sirloin face, especially over the tail region, as well as less kidney and seam fat. I immediately realize 2 was higher quality with a much greater amount of marbling in a more uniform reddish-pink, firmer, finer textured lean with less muscle separation in both cut surfaces.

I acknowledge 2 was the highest quality loin in the class, with the most marbling in the firmest, most uniform, reddish-pink lean in both cut surfaces, as well as the least muscle separation. However, 2 was the lightest muscled, fattest, lowest yielding loin in the class. 2 exhibited the least muscular blade face with the smallest loineye, and least muscular sirloin face. Moreover, 2 had the most fat over the blade face, ribends, back, and sirloin face. Consequently, 2 would yield the lowest percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts.

CHAPTER XII
JUDGING
RETAIL CUTS
RETAIL CUTS

The possibility of judging retail cuts in Intercollegiate Meat Judging was also added to be effective January of 2000. At this time, retail cuts are strictly a placing class in the afternoon and reasons will not be written for this class.

Dependent upon which specie and which wholesale cut the retail cuts come from will largely influence how emphasis of quality or cutability is used to place the class. For example, a beef rib steak would place more emphasis on quality than cutability when compared to a pork loin chop. If quality of all the retail cuts is adequate, then place the class on percentage of edible portion.

MAJOR POINTS

1. Fat:
   a. external fat around the retail cut
   b. seam fat in the retail cut

2. Muscle:
   a. surface area of lean
   b. size of primary muscles
   c. most meat

3. Quality:
   a. marbling
   b. color of lean
   c. firmness of lean
   d. texture of lean
   e. amount of exudation (if pork)

4. Bone:
   a. high muscle to bone ratio is desired
   b. discriminate against cuts with excess bone and other non-edible waste
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beef</th>
<th>Retail Cut Name</th>
<th>Cookery Method</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cookery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisket</td>
<td>Corned</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B B</td>
<td>89 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat Half, Bns</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B B</td>
<td>15 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole, Bns</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B B</td>
<td>10 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>7-bone Pot Roast</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>26 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arm Pot-Roast</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>03 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arm Pot-Roast, Bns</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>04 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blade Roast</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>06 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Roast, Bns</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>13 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Steak, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>45 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mock Tender Toast</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>20 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mock Tender Steak</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>48 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petite Tender</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>21 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder Pot Roast (Bns)</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>29 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Blade Steak (Flat iron)</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>58 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flank</td>
<td>Flank Steak</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B D</td>
<td>47 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loin</td>
<td>Porterhouse Steak</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>49 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenderloin Roast</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>34 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenderloin Steak</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>56 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Loin Steak</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>59 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Loin Steak, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>60 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Sirloin Cap Steak, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>64 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Sirloin Steak, Bns Cap Off</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>63 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Sirloin Steak, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>62 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri Tip Roast</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B F</td>
<td>40 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Short Ribs</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B G</td>
<td>28 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skirt Steak, Bns</td>
<td>D/M</td>
<td>B G</td>
<td>54 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Rib Roast</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B H</td>
<td>22 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribeye Roast, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B H</td>
<td>13 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribeye Steak, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B H</td>
<td>45 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ribeye Steak, Tip-On</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B H</td>
<td>50 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>Bottom Round Roast</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>08 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom Round Rump Roast</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>09 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom Round Steak</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>43 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Roast</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>14 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Round Steak</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>46 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round Steak</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>51 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round Steak, Bns</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>52 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tip Roast - Cap Off</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>36 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tip Roast - Cap Off</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>57 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Round Roast</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>39 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Round Steak</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B I</td>
<td>61 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Beef for Stew</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B N</td>
<td>82 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cubed Steak</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>B N</td>
<td>83 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Beef</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>B N</td>
<td>84 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lamb</th>
<th>Retail Cut Name</th>
<th>Cookery Method</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cookery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>76 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>L M</td>
<td>76 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>76 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>77 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>L M</td>
<td>77 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>77 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>78 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>L M</td>
<td>78 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>78 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxtail</td>
<td>Oxtail</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>79 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>80 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>L M</td>
<td>80 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Moist</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>80 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pork</th>
<th>Retail Cut Name</th>
<th>Cookery Method</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cookery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ham/Leg</td>
<td>Porc Fresh Ham Center Slice</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>44 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pork Fresh Ham Rump Portion</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>25 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pork Fresh Ham Shank Portion</td>
<td>Dry/Moist</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>27 D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoked Ham, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>91 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoked Ham, Center Slice</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>90 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoked Ham, Rump Portion</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>96 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoked Ham, Shank Portion</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>97 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trip Roast, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>35 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Roast, Bns</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>P E</td>
<td>38 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Various | | | | | | |
LAMB CARCASSES

Lamb carcasses generally are ranked according to differences in cutability with more emphasis on trimness than muscling. Evaluation of quality is of little importance in placing lambs due to the fact that most lambs receive the same quality grade, “US Choice”. A desirable carcass has a high percentage of its weight in trim, heavily muscled retail cuts from the leg, loin, rack, and shoulder. The thickness and distribution of external fat and the amount of internal kidney and pelvic fat are primary factors in determining the cutability of a given carcass. External fat is evaluated primarily over the leg, dock, sirloin, leg/loin juncture, loin, ribeye, lower rib, rack, and shoulder. Secondary locations for external fat include the crotch, cod (or udder), flank, breast, and elbow pocket regions. Lamb carcasses generally possess about 2-4% internal fat (Note that lambs contain only kidney, and pelvic fat, no heart fat as in beef carcasses). However, it is not uncommon to find a carcass with 8-10% or more. Consequently, at one time excess internal fat was severely criticized in ranking lamb carcasses. Today many lamb plants remove much of the kidney-pelvic fat on the kill floor so the differences between carcasses are less noticeable, but still notable.

The best indicator of muscling in a lamb carcass is thickness, depth, and plumpness in the leg; thus, any evaluation of muscling should begin with the leg. In addition, thickness of muscling is observed in the sirloin, loin, rack, and shoulder. When placing a class and preparing for reasons, one must be sure not to overlook any of these areas. The most important indicator of muscling in a ribbed lamb carcass is the size of the ribeye. A collegiate meat judge must be very careful to fully evaluate and rank the ribeye, leg, sirloin, loin, rack, and shoulder in order of importance.

Although not important to the placing of the lamb carcass class, quality should be evaluated for use in written reasons. Unlike meat judging at the FFA or 4-H levels, mutton carcasses are not found in collegiate contests. Consequently, a judge will never move a carcass to the bottom of the class based only on age. Quality factors for unribbed lamb carcasses include: color and firmness of the lean and fat, upper and lower flank streaking, and youthfulness of the ribs and break joints. A desirable lamb carcass should possess creamy white fat and bright, pinkish-red lean in the ribeye and flank. Color of lean can range from the desirable pinkish-red to dark maroon and even brown. Color should be carefully evaluated between every pair and written if applicable. Flank streakings appear in both the upper and lower flank (also referred to as the primary and secondary flank) as streaks of fat. Extremely high quality carcasses will present an upper flank that is almost entirely covered with white fat streaks. Youthfulness of the ribs and break joints can be determined by evaluating these areas for redness, an indication that there was still substantial blood flow to this cartilage and little ossification had occurred. A youthful carcass will display round, red ribs, and red break joints. An older carcass will have flatter, white ribs, and white, flinty break joints. Quality factors for ribbed lamb carcasses also include marbling degree, color and texture of lean in the exposed ribeye.

In summation, lamb carcasses are ranked on cutability and, to a much lesser degree, quality (typically 90% cutability and 10% quality). Cutability evaluation should begin with external and internal fat and proceed with muscle development, especially in the ribeye and leg. Keep in mind, however, that it takes two degrees of difference in muscling to make up for only one degree difference in external fat. Differences in quality may be used only to place close pairs and should always be detailed in reasons.
TERMINOLOGY

1. **Trimness**
   a. less fat over the leg, sirloin, leg/loin juncture, loin, loin edge, ribeye, lower rib, rack and shoulder
   b. less internal fat or less kidney-pelvic fat
   c. less fat in the dock, cod (or udder), crotch and flank
   d. less breast fat
   e. less external fat
   f. less fat in the elbow pocket

2. **Muscling**
   a. a plumper cushioned leg
   b. a deeper, heavier muscled leg with a shorter shank
   c. a longer, thicker, heavier muscled leg with a greater outside flare
   d. a plumper, thicker, higher volume leg
   e. a thicker, fuller fleshed loin
   f. a fuller, more muscular sirloin
   g. a thicker, heavier muscled shoulder
   h. a thicker, deeper, heavier muscled loin and rack
   i. a larger ribeye contained in a fuller fleshed loin and rack

3. **Quality**
   a. a higher degree of primary and secondary flank streaking
   b. a brighter, more desirable pinkish-red lean in the flank
   c. a higher degree of marbling in a firmer lean with a more desirable color in the ribeye.
   d. redder, rounder, more youthful ribs
   e. redder, more youthful break joints
   f. redder ribs and break joints, indicative of a more youthful carcass

4. **Criticisms**
   a. the flattest, narrowest, lightest muscled carcass
   b. the fattest, wastiest, lightest muscled, lowest yielding carcass
   c. the fattest carcass in the class both internally and externally
   d. the darkest, most undesirable lean color in the flank (or the ribeye)
   e. a thinly muscled, low quality carcass
   f. combined trimness and muscling to the lowest degree
   g. combined cutability and quality to the lowest degree

5. **Cut-out Statements**
   a. a higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts (cutability)
   b. a higher percentage of closely trimmed retail cuts from the leg, loin, rack and shoulder (cutability)
   c. A higher muscle to bone ratio (muscle)
Reasons

Lamb Carcasses

Placing: 3-1-2-4

3/1 I, without hesitation, easily placed 3 over 1 due to superior muscling and greater trimness. 3's muscling was exhibited by a much thicker, heavier muscled leg, a more prominent sirloin, extending to a more muscular rack, and a thicker, more muscular shoulder. Additionally, 3's trimness was presented by less fat over the leg, sirloin, loin edge, rack and shoulder, coupled with less kidney-pelvic and cod/udder fat. Finally, 3 possessed a greater amount of flank streakings, especially secondary, in a more pinkish-red color of flank lean.

1/2 In a close pair, I placed 1 over 2 due to greater external trimness. 1's trimness was exhibited by less fat over the leg, loin edge, rack, shoulder and breast. Moreover, 1 evidenced a thicker, heavier muscled shoulder. 1 recognize 2 possessed less crotch, cod/udder and kidney-pelvic fat. Also, 2 revealed a thicker, plumper cushioned, more muscular leg. In addition, 2 presented a greater amount of flank streakings in a more pinkish-red colored flank.

2/4 Due to much higher cutability as shown by clearly greater trimness and muscling, I easily placed 2 over 4. 2's trimness was displayed by less fat over the leg, sirloin, loin edge, body wall, rack and shoulder, as well as less in the crotch, over the flank and cod/udder. Furthermore, 2's muscling was expressed by a thicker, plumper cushioned, more muscular leg extending to a plumper, heavier muscled shoulder. Finally, 2 possessed a more pinkish-red colored flank, a long with redder ribs indicative of a more youthful carcass. I concede 4 revealed a greater amount of flank streakings.

4 I acknowledge 4 possessed the greatest amount of primary and secondary flank streakings. Nevertheless, I easily placed 4 last as it was undoubtedly the fattest carcass in the class. 4 displayed the most fat over the leg, sirloin, leg/loin juncture, loin edge, body wall, rack and shoulder, coupled with the most udder/cod fat. Thus, 4 would yield the lowest percent boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts.

*Written by Gretchen Hilton – Southwestern, 1992 – Score = 49
Reasons

Lamb Carcasses

Placing: 1-2-4-3

1/2 I easily placed 1 over 2 due to greater cutability resulting in a higher percent of boneless, closely trimmed preferred product. 1’s muscling was evidenced by a thicker, plumper, more muscular leg blending into a heavier muscled sirloin, a meatier rack, and amore muscular shoulder. Furthermore, 1 revealed less fat over the sirloin, loin, dock and breast, as well as less kidney and pelvic fat. Finally, 1 displayed a grater amount of primary flank streakings, as well as redder ribs and a more pinkish-red colored lean. I grant 2 possessed less fat over the shoulder and in the cod/udder region. 2 also displayed a greater amount of secondary flank streakings.

2/4 Due to greater trimness, I placed 2 over 4. 2 revealed less fat over the leg, loin edge, loin, rack, shoulder and dock, as well as less kidney, pelvic, cod and crotch fat. Moreover, 2 had a meatier rack. I concede 4 presented a thicker, plumper, more muscular leg, as well as a more muscular shoulder. 4 also possessed less fat over the breast. Finally, 4 displayed a greater amount of primary and secondary flank streakings coupled with a more pinkish-red colored lean in the flank.

4/3 I placed 4 over 3 due to greater trimness and muscling resulting in a higher percent of boneless, closely trimmed preferred product. 4 revealed clearly less kidney and pelvic fat, as well as less fat over the leg, sirloin and shoulder and less cod/udder and crotch fat. Moreover, 4 presented a thicker, plumper, more muscular leg with a shorter shank, as well as a meatier rack and a heavier muscled shoulder. Finally, 4 displayed a greater amount of primary and secondary flank streakings. I grant 3 possessed less fat over the rack.

3 I placed 3 last as it clearly combined trimness and muscling to the lowest degree. 3, without a doubt, revealed the most kidney and pelvic fat along with excess fat over the loin edge and loin. Moreover, 3 presented the thinnest muscled leg, as well as a thinly muscled rack and shoulder. Therefore, 3 would yield the lowest percent of boneless, closely trimmed preferred product from the leg, loin, rack and shoulder.

*Written by Eddie Behrends – American Royal, 1990 – Score = 46
Reasons

Lamb Carcasses

Placing
4-3-1-2

4/3 I easily placed 4 over 3 due to clearly greater muscling and advantages in trimness resulting in a higher cut out value. 4’s muscling was shown by a deeper, plumper, thicker, obviously heavier muscled leg, a more muscular sirloin and a fuller fleshted rack and loin. Moreover, 4 showed less fat over the sirloin, over the loin, rack and shoulder with less cot fat, fat in the flank and less fat over the breast. Also, 4 had a lighter pinkish-red colored flank. I grant 3 showed a thicker shoulder. Also, 3 possessed a greater amount of primary flank streakings.

3/1 Due to superior muscling and a greater trimness resulting in clearly higher cutability, I easily, without hesitation, placed 3 over 1. 3 showed an obviously thicker, plumper, heavier muscled leg coupled with a more muscular sirloin and a much heavier muscled loin, rack and shoulder. Moreover, 3 showed less fat over the dock, sirloin, in the sirloin/loin juncture, over the loin, rack and over the shoulder. Also, 3 had a greater amount of secondary flank streakings and a brighter pinkish-red flank color. I grant 1 had less kidney and pelvic fat.

1/2 I placed 1 over 2 due to clearly greater trimness. 1 exhibited less fat over the dock, sirloin, in the sirloin/loin juncture, over the loin and loin edge, over the rack and less cod fat, fat in the flank, over the breast and in the elbow pocket with less kidney and pelvic fat. I grant 2 was heavier muscled carcass with a deeper, thicker, plumper, heavier muscled leg and a thicker shoulder. Also, 2 had a greater amount of primary flank streakings, and redder ribs and break joints.

2 I grant 2 had the greatest amount of primary flank streakings as well as the reddest ribs and break joints, indicative of a youthful carcass. However, I placed 2 last as it was the fattest, wastiest, lowest yielding carcass in the class. 2 showed the most fat over the dock, sirloin, loin, loin edge and rack with the most cod, kidney and pelvic fat. Thus, 2 would yield the lowest percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts.

Reasons
Lamb Carcasses
Placing 3-1-2-4

3/1 I placed 3 over 1 due to clearly greater muscling. 3 was obviously heavier muscled as shown by a clearly deeper, thicker, heavier muscled leg, a thicker, higher volumed, heavier muscled sirloin, extending into a clearly fuller fleshed, heavier muscled rack, and shoulder. I immediately realize 1 was a clearly trimmer carcass as evidenced by less fat over the sirloin/loin juncture, loinedge, rack, and shoulder, as well as over the dock. Moreover, 1 clearly presented a greater amount of secondary flank streakings.

1/2 I easily placed 1 over 2 due to greater trimness and muscling, resulting in a much higher percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts. 1 was clearly trimmer as shown by less fat over the leg, sirloin, loinedge, rack, and shoulder, as well as less fat in the flank and over the dock. Moreover, 1 was heavier muscled from end to end with an especially thicker, heavier muscled leg and a much more bulging, heavier muscled sirloin. I realize 2 clearly displayed a much greater amount of primary and secondary flank streakings.

2/4 I placed 2 over 4 due to clearly greater trimness. 2 was clearly trimmer as evidenced by less fat over the sirloin, loin edge, rack, and shoulder, as well as less cod fat, fat in the flank and crotch region, and less fat over the dock. Moreover, 2 possessed a clearly greater amount of primary and secondary flank streakings. I realize 4 displayed a thicker, plumper cushioned leg as well as a thicker sirloin, rack and a thicker shoulder (partially due to fat).

4 I acknowledge 4 was a USDA Choice carcass. However, 1 placed 4 last as 4 clearly combined trimness and muscling to the lowest degree. 4 was clearly the fattest as evidenced by the most excess fat over the sirloin, loin edge, rack and shoulder, as well as displayed the most fat in the crotch region. Moreover, 4 displayed a light muscled leg. Thus, 4 would clearly yield a low percentage of boneless, closely trimmed retail cuts from the leg, loin, rack and shoulder.