



CORNUCOPIA  
I N S T I T U T E

October 15, 2015

NOP Compliance and Enforcement Branch  
Attn: Mr. Matthew Michael  
Agricultural Marketing Service  
United States Department of Agriculture  
1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Mail Stop 0268, Room 2648-S  
Washington, D.C. 20250-0268

**RE: Complaint concerning possible violation of the National Organic Program's regulatory standards by the Iowa Department of Agriculture**

Dear Mr. Michael,

We were surprised that our formal complaint below, submitted in December 2014, was closed without the National Organic Program (NOP) conducting an investigation into our well-documented allegations of violations of federal organic standards.

While legally researching whether or not we had grounds to file a lawsuit challenging the NOP's lack of enforcement effort, we were surprised and dismayed to note that the procedures the NOP was following gave the National Organic Program itself discretion as to whether or not to investigate formal complaints submitted by members of the public.

Even though the NOP is currently operating in the "Age of Enforcement," in the words of Deputy Administrator Miles McEvoy, and despite Cornucopia's track record of bringing meritorious complaints forward, none of the 13 complaints was afforded even an investigation by the NOP, other than confirming with certifiers that these operations were in "good standing."

Our review of NOP procedures also determined that complaints brought against accredited certifiers would require a mandatory investigation by the NOP. Hence, we are re-filing the complaint below, and formally targeting the certifier.

In a thorough investigation, the NOP will be able to determine whether the certifier acted improperly in granting a certificate to an operation that is, allegedly, not properly providing pasture and/or outdoor access, sunshine, and fresh air and the opportunity for livestock to exhibit their natural instinctive behaviors (in addition to other organic management requirements). An investigation could also determine, if the certifier was

properly overseeing the operation but was intentionally deceived through an inaccurate Organic System Plan and/or subsequent subterfuge on the part of the operator.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the USDA's National Organic Program formally investigate the certifier the **Iowa Department of Agriculture**, based on our allegation that **Smart Chicken (MBA Poultry) in Tecumseh, Nebraska** is not complying with the organic standards. Please use the evidence that we provided to you in December 2014 for documents supporting this complaint.

For the past 10 years we have observed systemic violations of the law at numerous industrial-scale livestock facilities representing themselves as "organic." Although we have documented these with site visits, photographs, satellite imagery, first-hand witness accounts, and other documentary evidence, in most cases either no enforcement action whatsoever was taken by the USDA or minor sanctions were imposed.

In some cases the National Organic Program failed to carry out any independent investigation and instead delegated this function to the operation's certifier (which could have been deceived, could have acted incompetently, or could have been a co-conspirator in the violations). We're asking that NOP staff directly conduct investigations associated with this complaint.

In an effort to document the current improprieties, The Cornucopia Institute, facilitated by the generosity of a number of our individual, major donors, hired a firm that specializes in agricultural and industrial aerial photography to document some of the alleged abuses.

**We respectfully request that your office thoroughly investigate the Iowa Department of Agriculture for its certification of the Smart Chicken (MBA Poultry) facility located near Tecumseh, Nebraska.**

Although this is the name of the organization registered with the National Organic Program and marketing certified organic poultry, in some legal filings it appears that the organization in question is registered as Tecumseh Poultry, LLC.

The aerial photography images (contained on the computer discs forwarded to you via Federal Express and available in a lower resolution on our website) indicate the facility operates 40 broiler houses.

The photographs were taken on June 12, 2014 at 12:55 PM. State regulatory documents indicate this facility is managing 540,000 birds — none were visible outdoors, as federal law requires. However, marketing information available on the web states that they have approximately 25,000 birds per house. If that's correct, there are 1 million birds at this facility (we don't know if that means they are in violation of their permit in Nebraska).

Based on the published reports of the size of their houses (510' x 43') that would only provide birds with .88 ft.<sup>2</sup> each. The USDA should determine if, when the birds are fully

grown, this dubious amount of space meets the published standards for organic livestock management.

The buildings were grouped into nearby locations, one with 30 separate barns and one with 10. All are illustrated in the series of photographs on discs shipped to you.

Although there was fenced grass between each building (most of the gates were open), it was neatly mowed with no evidence of birds having been outdoors.

Although all buildings have doors, of the 40 buildings only one had doors open (no birds out and the gates were open — it would be our conjecture that this building was between flocks and was being aired out).

Furthermore, there appear to be no windows in the buildings. In addition to being deprived access to the outdoors these birds apparently are also deprived of “year-round access to direct sunshine” that federal organic regulations also require.

### **Outdoor Access in the Rule**

Current organic standards state that organic livestock producers must “establish and maintain living conditions which accommodate the health and natural behavior of animals, including year-round access for all animals to the outdoors, shade, shelter, exercise areas, fresh air and direct sunlight suitable to the species” (7 CFR 205.239 (a)(1)).

The final rule released in February 2010 also specifies that “total continuous confinement of any animal indoors is prohibited” (7 CFR 205.239(a)(1)).

We believe that meaningful outdoor access — at a bare minimum an area large enough for every bird to be outside at the same time, and covered with either vegetation and/or dirt — is necessary to accommodate the health and natural behavior of laying hens, as the rule states — and there must be meaningful egress so that the birds can access the outdoors.

Studies published in peer-reviewed, scientific journals and respected organic publications reveal that outdoor runs are necessary to accommodate the health and *natural behavior* of laying hens. As such, Cornucopia asserts that producers that provide only porches and fail to provide outdoor runs are in violation of the rule requiring affording organic livestock conditions that promote the “health and natural behavior of animals.”

### **The Importance of Outdoor Runs/Pasture for Organic Poultry**

When the organic standards were created, public input from the organic community made clear that stakeholders — consumers, farmers, marketers — expect organic animals to go outside. This is clear from the preamble to the final rule, published in 2002:

*Commenters were **virtually unanimous** that, except for the limited exceptions for*

*temporary confinement, **all animals of all species must be afforded access to the outdoors.** Commenters also maintained that the outdoor area must accommodate natural livestock behavior, such as dust wallows for poultry (page 91) [emphasis added].*

*The NOSB recommended that the final rule state that all livestock shall have access to the outdoors. As a result of these comments, we have revised the final rule to establish that access to the outdoors is a **required** element for **all** organically raised livestock (page 91) [emphasis added].*

When the NOSB considered adopting this recommendation to clarify the intent of the rule, NOP staff member Richard Matthews told the Board members: “The preamble I think has always been pretty clear that the intent [of the rule] was that the birds go outside” (NOSB transcript, May 7, 2002, page 710).

And we would like to echo Mr. Matthews’ comments by emphasizing that, while the regulations were being promulgated, organic stakeholders did not just advocate for livestock to have “access” to the outdoors. They assumed that the application of these rules would result in animals actually being outdoors!

Our attorneys tell us that every law has “meaning” and “intent.”

If municipal building standards call for an exit, on the second floor of the building, you can make the assumption that a staircase is required, not just a door that would force those exiting to drop to the ground.

The Smart Chicken/MBA facility is not even creating the illusion of birds being outside by opening the doors (as evidenced the day photos were taken and evidenced by the pristine condition of the grass surrounding the barns). The barns were obviously designed for organic production with outdoor access (we know of no commercial poultry producers of this scale, that are conventional, that have doors or let chickens outdoors).

Besides for the doors all being closed, this facility, like others, discourages birds from actually going outside by providing inhospitable conditions, lack of feed, water and shade, inadequate size and number of doors, doors structured so birds cannot be assured that there are no avian predators present before exiting.

Likewise, published studies by poultry scientists reveal that allowing chickens to exhibit their “natural behavior” — which the rule states is a requirement of organic livestock production — requires access to the outdoors. Natural chicken behavior that requires an outdoor run or pasture includes foraging and sunbathing. Moreover, outdoor runs promote the health of chickens by strengthening their bones.

Lower stress on the animals results in demonstrably lower feather packing, injury and death of flock mates. These are the kinds of conditions that stakeholders assume exist under organic management.

### ***Foraging***

Producers who let their chickens outside notice that hens spend a lot of time foraging and pecking in the vegetation and the dirt; therefore, observation of laying hen behavior leads to the conclusion that foraging is a natural behavior. Research confirms this.<sup>i</sup> One particular study demonstrated that hens in outdoor runs spend 35.3% to 47.5% of their time foraging,<sup>ii</sup> suggesting that foraging is an instinctive and natural behavior.

Based on a review of various scientific studies on the topic, one scientist concluded: “Depending on their quality, outdoor runs have a much higher number and diversity of stimuli than any indoor housing environment can provide .... Especially exploratory and foraging behavior is stimulated by such a rich environment. The diversity of plant species present in an outdoor run may elicit pecking, scratching, tearing, biting and harvesting of seeds.”<sup>iii</sup>

Again, research suggests that a chicken’s ability to peck for insects and peck in the grass and the dirt on pasture may prevent her from pecking at flock mates. One researcher suggests feather pecking may be a redirection of ground pecking, which is a normal behavior of foraging and exploration in chickens.<sup>iv</sup>

### ***Natural sunlight***

Pasture-based producers notice that chickens like to sunbathe. Research supports that hens exhibit sunbathing behavior only under real sunlight, not under artificial light indoors.<sup>v</sup> Therefore, they would need a real outdoor run with adequate access to the outdoors to exhibit this natural behavior. This facility even lacks windows so the chickens are not even afforded natural light when they are in confinement.

### ***Bone health***

Exercise is important for chicken health, especially bone health,<sup>vi</sup> and studies show that birds in housing systems that promote physical activity, such as outdoor runs, have less osteoporosis.<sup>vii</sup> Weak bones lead to fractures caused during the laying period or during depopulation, and are a serious welfare issue.<sup>viii</sup> When comparing different systems currently used by organic producers, one study showed that aviaries without real access to an outdoor run, used by many industrial-scale organic producers, produces more bone fractures in hens than free-range systems that are popular with medium- and small-scale organic farmers.<sup>ix</sup>

Another study showed that lack of exercise contributed to the problem of weak bones more than did calcium depletion — as with humans, chickens need exercise in addition to calcium supplements to prevent fractures.<sup>x</sup>

### **Some Specific Alleged Violations of the Organic Standards**

Broiler houses used by the producer named in this complaint share a common feature with other industrial-scale operators, which we allege violates the national organic standards for outdoor access.

**Not all birds have access to the outdoors — outdoor area is too small — and/or birds are regularly prevented from any outdoor access.**

The outdoor space, at the bare minimum, should be as large as the indoor space (with the woefully inadequate conventional industry standard of 1.20 feet per bird — adopted by many of the larger organic producers). In this country what is likely the largest name-brand egg distributor, Organic Valley, requires its member-producers to provide 5 ft.<sup>2</sup> per bird. A competitor, Egg Innovations, is outfitting their newest buildings with 10 ft.<sup>2</sup>. European standards require 43 ft.<sup>2</sup> and a few individual marketers in the U.S. require as much as 140 ft.<sup>2</sup> or more.

Although broiler operations are different than egg production facilities, especially given the productive life of the chickens, they are still required to have legitimate access to the outdoors.

Deputy Administrator McEvoy's policy memo, stating not all animals have to be outdoors at the same time, is misdirected. Precedent, in the form of the current regulations for ruminants, relating to access to pasture, stipulates that when pasture is unavailable/temporarily not required, and the animals are in an outdoor area, that the space provided has to accommodate 100% of the herd. We should expect nothing less, in terms of humane animal husbandry, when outdoor space is required for poultry or other species. At a very minimum, 100% of the flock should be accommodated.

The outdoor space provided, at this facility, would not meet even the lowest standard accommodating true outdoor access.

It should be noted that if a producer afforded space for just 100% of the birds they would likely be violating a number of other tenets in the organic standards requiring sustainable stewardship, and competent environmental management, of the land, water and soil.

## **Conclusion**

Some certified organic CAFO operators argue that the existing rule is vague, and especially that the intent of the rule is unclear. We disagree. The rule clearly states that outdoor access is required for organically produced livestock — the amount of space offered does not constitute legitimate outdoor access.

The farm operators who truly have a legal basis to complain are those that are complying with the spirit and letter of the law, affording their animals true access to the outdoors, and being placed at a competitive disadvantage by these giant agribusinesses that are not doing so.

Producers also have access to the preamble to the final rule, published in 2002, which clearly states that the organic community, at the time of the rule's writing, supports full access to the outdoors for all livestock, including poultry (the basis for the "intent" of the reasons).

Furthermore, the regulations make it clear that animals need to be afforded the ability to display their "natural behavior." Even if adequate space was provided, the use of concrete and many other materials clearly restricts the natural pecking behavior of the birds.

No producer is forced to become organic. Unlike most other federal rules, abiding by organic standards is completely voluntary. Producers wishing to become organic have a responsibility to their customers and to the organic community as a whole to understand the organic standards, including their intent. If they choose to look for loopholes in the rules, it is a gamble they willingly took and must be prepared for the consequences.

The USDA allowing porches and minute outdoor spaces has been viewed as a precedent by some certifiers, it does not hold the weight of the law and can easily be reversed by the current USDA administration if it respects both the organic standards and the principles on which the organic standards were founded.

This is clearly true because of documented abuses in the way that past NOP management handled incidents such the allowance of illegal synthetic substances in organic infant formula. In this case the current USDA administration recognized that the impropriety could not be left unchallenged by the current management at the USDA and reversed the prior decision.

We believe that an investigation of the Iowa Department of Agriculture is warranted to determine their compliance with administration of certification standards, particularly as it applies to MBA Poultry.

Please keep The Cornucopia Institute apprised of the status and progress of your investigation into this complaint.

It should be noted that nothing in this formal complaint shall be interpreted as a waiver of our right to appeal under the Adverse Action Appeals Process cited above.

You may contact us at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Will Fantle  
Research Director  
The Cornucopia Institute

---

<sup>i</sup> Cooper, J.J. and M.J. Albentosa (2003) Behavioural priorities of laying hens. *Avian and Poultry Biology Reviews* 14: 127-149.

<sup>ii</sup> Folsch, D.W. and K. Vestergaard (1981) Das Verhalten von Tieren. *Tierhaltung Band 12*, Basel, Birkhäuser Verlag.

<sup>iii</sup> Knierim, U. (2006) Animal welfare aspects of outdoor runs for laying hens: a review. *NJAS* 54-2. Pages 133-145.

<sup>iv</sup> Blokhuis, H.J. (1986). Feather pecking in poultry: its relation with ground pecking. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 16: 63-67.

---

v Huber (1987).

vi Whitehead C.C. (2004) Overview of bone biology in the egg-laying hen. *Poultry Science* 83: 193-199.

vii Webster (2004) and Fleming (1994).

viii Knowles, T.G. and L.J. Wilkins (1998) The problem of broken bones during the handling of laying hens—a review. *Poultry Science* 77: 1978-1802.

ix Gregory, N.G., L.J. Wilkins, S.D. Elperuma, A.J. Ballantyne and N.D. Overfield (1990) Broken bones in chickens. 3. Effect of husbandry system and stunning methods in end of lay hens. *The Veterinary Record* 132: 127-129.

x Leyendecker (2005).