



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 Quality Assurance International

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 **Quality Assurance International (QAI)**, based on our allegation that **Aurora dairy located near Dublin, Texas** 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 are 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 QAI for its certification of the Aurora dairy located near Dublin, Texas.

The aerial photography images (contained on the computer discs forwarded to you via Federal Express and available in a lower resolution on our website, at www.cornucopia.org/flyovers) indicate the vast preponderance of fields suitable for grazing surrounding the facility were recently cut and baled for hay. In some fields the bales are clearly still visible. Hay making equipment is still out (please see photos 206991-02 and 206991-10). There is a large quantity of balage and a structure filled with unwrapped bales (206991-13). Surrounding unirrigated pasture looks like it has been overgrazed.

There is a small grass yard between the two feedlots that had about 50 cows out, as well as approximately 450 cows in the distance (approximately 8% of the license capacity for this facility) on what looks like degraded pasture. These cows are clustered together, not behavior indicative of grazing when adequate forage is available. Because of the distance, size and behavior, it appears that these could be heifers rather than lactating cows that would have to be shuttled back and forth from a milking facility.

Given that these photographs were taken on May 5, 2014, it would seem to indicate the hay that was harvested likely was the growth in those fields since the beginning of the season.

According to filings with the state of Texas, this dairy is managing 6,410 head of cattle on 887 acres. No calves were visible, and without harvesting any forage off of these acres, that would equate to an overall stocking level of 7.22 cows per acre (a much higher effective rate depending how much of the growth was harvested for hay on an annual basis).

This contrasts with the data gathered from a Cornucopia Institute organic dairy producer study, in 2005, indicating the average available pasture for organic dairy cattle, across the country, was approximately one cow per acre.

We are a little bewildered by the reaction of Aurora Dairy subsequent to our public announcement of the filing of this complaint. They first told a reporter from the Washington Post that they did not recognize the facility. When confronted by the reporter, armed with some of our documentary evidence, they admitted that they had owned and operated the dairy but not since 2008.

Although we started this investigation in the spring of 2014, we revisited both the database of certified operations on the NOP website and the certifier's site (QAI) in mid-December, a few days after our announcement. Both of the websites indicate the Aurora operation is certified under the NOP.

Other public records, including the listing for the phone that is answered by Aurora, lead to the precise location that was photographed by our contractor.

As you know, there are provisions for the "temporary" confinement of cattle, primarily due to health or environmental factors, as detailed in §205.238 and §205.239. However, confining cattle in order to increase milk production, or because the size of the herd requires walking too far to access fresh pasture, or because of the need to produce stored feed, would not be among the enumerated legal exemptions from requiring "access to the outdoors/access to pasture."

Furthermore, keeping the majority of cattle confined in feedlots, for the majority of their lives, does not meet the requirement in the standards to accommodate the health and natural instinctive behaviors of the animals.

We respectfully request NOP investigators thoroughly review all records and interview relevant personnel based on this and prior complaints.

The Cornucopia Institute requests that the NOP's Compliance and Enforcement Branch make a timely, full, and good faith effort in their investigation of these allegations. In fact, failure to take such action will only encourage future scofflaws and corner cutting by organic operators, and will make a mockery of the federal organic regulations that are so diligently observed by the vast majority of participants in the nation's organic agriculture and food sector.

The USDA enjoys some investigative tools and access that The Cornucopia Institute does not have in further evaluating whether this facility is operating legally. Examining the operation, and their Organic Systems Plan (OSP), should be able to confirm how many of the "pasture" acres are managed with irrigation (in this climate unirrigated pasture would have a very short window for providing a material contribution to the dry matter intake required to maintain organic dairy cattle). Importantly, investigators should be able to review history for the last few years to determine what percentage of annual growth was cut as stored feed versus provided as pasture for livestock.

Investigators should be able to ascertain how much milk is produced by each animal on the farm. Relatively high production would indicate that intensively grazing the cattle would be unlikely.

We believe that an investigation of QAI is warranted to determine their compliance with administration of certification standards, particularly as it applies to Aurora dairy.

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, Codirector
715-839-7731

§205.238 Livestock health care practice standard.

(a) The producer must establish and maintain preventive livestock health care practices, including:

(4) Provision of conditions which allow for exercise, freedom of movement, and reduction of stress appropriate to the species;

§205.239 Livestock living conditions.

(a) The producer of an organic livestock operation must establish and maintain year-round livestock living conditions which accommodate the health and **natural behavior** of animals, including [emphasis added]:

(1) Year-round access for all animals to the outdoors, shade, shelter, exercise areas, fresh air, clean water for drinking, and direct sunlight, suitable to the species, its stage of life, the climate, and the environment: Except, that, animals may be temporarily denied access to the outdoors in accordance with §§205.239(b) and (c). Yards, feeding pads, and feedlots may be used to provide ruminants with access to the outdoors during the non-grazing season and supplemental feeding during the grazing season. Yards, feeding pads, and feedlots shall be large enough to allow all ruminant livestock occupying the yard, feeding pad, or feedlot to feed simultaneously without crowding and without competition for food. Continuous total confinement of any animal indoors is prohibited. Continuous total confinement of ruminants in yards, feeding pads, and feedlots is prohibited.

(2) For all ruminants, management on pasture and **daily grazing throughout the grazing season(s)** to meet the requirements of §205.237, except as provided for in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section [emphasis added].

(b) The producer of an organic livestock operation may provide temporary confinement or shelter for an animal because of:

(1) Inclement weather;

(2) The animal's stage of life: Except, that lactation is not a stage of life that would exempt ruminants from any of the mandates set forth in this regulation;

(3) Conditions under which the health, safety, or well-being of the animal could be jeopardized;

- (4) Risk to soil or water quality;
 - (5) Preventive healthcare procedures or for the treatment of illness or injury (neither the various life stages nor lactation is an illness or injury);
 - (6) Sorting or shipping animals and livestock sales: *Provided*, that, the animals shall be maintained under continuous organic management, including organic feed, throughout the extent of their allowed confinement;
 - (7) Breeding: Except, that, bred animals shall not be denied access to the outdoors and, once bred, ruminants shall not be denied access to pasture during the grazing season; or
 - (8) 4-H, Future Farmers of America and other youth projects, for no more than one week prior to a fair or other demonstration, through the event and up to 24 hours after the animals have arrived home at the conclusion of the event. These animals must have been maintained under continuous organic management, including organic feed, during the extent of their allowed confinement for the event.
- (c) The producer of an organic livestock operation may, in addition to the times permitted under §205.239(b), temporarily deny a ruminant animal pasture or outdoor access under the following conditions:
- (1) One week at the end of a lactation for dry off (for denial of access to pasture only), three weeks prior to parturition (birthing), parturition, and up to one week after parturition;
 - (2) In the case of newborn dairy cattle for up to six months, after which they must be on pasture during the grazing season and may no longer be individually housed: *Provided*, That, an animal shall not be confined or tethered in a way that prevents the animal from lying down, standing up, fully extending its limbs, and moving about freely;
 - (4) In the case of dairy animals, for short periods daily for milking. Milking must be scheduled in a manner to ensure sufficient grazing time to provide each animal with an average of at least 30 percent DMI from grazing throughout the grazing season. Milking frequencies or duration practices cannot be used to deny dairy animals pasture.
- (d) Ruminant slaughter stock, typically grain finished, shall be maintained on pasture for each day that the finishing period corresponds with the grazing season for the geographical location: Except, that, yards, feeding pads, or feedlots may be used to provide finish feeding rations. During the finishing period, ruminant slaughter stock shall be exempt from the minimum 30 percent DMI requirement from grazing. Yards, feeding pads, or feedlots used to provide finish feeding rations shall be large enough to allow all ruminant slaughter stock occupying the yard, feeding pad, or feed lot to feed simultaneously without crowding and without competition for food. The finishing period shall not exceed one-fifth ($\frac{1}{5}$) of the animal's total life or 120 days, whichever is shorter.

§205.240 Pasture practice standard.

The producer of an organic livestock operation must, for all ruminant livestock on the operation, demonstrate through auditable records in the organic system plan, a functioning management plan for pasture.

- (a) Pasture must be managed as a crop in full compliance with §§205.202, 205.203(d) and (e), 205.204, and 205.206(b) through (f). Land used for the production of annual crops for

ruminant grazing must be managed in full compliance with §§205.202 through 205.206. Irrigation shall be used, as needed, to promote pasture growth when the operation has irrigation available for use on pasture.

- (b) Producers must provide pasture in compliance with §205.239(a)(2) and manage pasture to comply with the requirements of: §205.237(c)(2), to annually provide a **minimum of 30 percent of a ruminant's dry matter intake (DMI), on average, over the course of the grazing season(s)** [emphasis added]; §205.238(a)(3), to minimize the occurrence and spread of diseases and parasites; and §205.239(e) to refrain from putting soil or water quality at risk.
- (c) A pasture plan must be included in the producer's organic system plan, and be updated annually in accordance with §205.406(a). The producer may resubmit the previous year's pasture plan when no change has occurred in the plan. The pasture plan may consist of a pasture/rangeland plan developed in cooperation with a Federal, State, or local conservation office: *Provided*, that, the submitted plan addresses all of the requirements of §205.240(c)(1) through (8). When a change to an approved pasture plan is contemplated, which may affect the operation's compliance with the Act or the regulations in this part, the producer shall seek the certifying agent's agreement on the change prior to implementation. The pasture plan shall include a description of the:
 - (1) Types of pasture provided to ensure that the feed requirements of §205.237 are being met.
 - (2) Cultural and management practices to be used to ensure pasture of a sufficient quality and quantity is available to graze throughout the grazing season and to provide all ruminants under the organic system plan, except exempted classes identified in §205.239(c)(1) through (3), **with an average of not less than 30 percent of their dry matter intake from grazing throughout the grazing season** [emphasis added].
 - (3) Grazing season for the livestock operation's regional location.
 - (4) Location and size of pastures, including maps giving each pasture its own identification.
 - (5) The types of grazing methods to be used in the pasture system.
 - (6) Location and types of fences, except for temporary fences, and the location and source of shade and the location and source of water.
 - (7) Soil fertility and seeding systems.
 - (8) Erosion control and protection of natural wetlands and riparian areas practices.