



Inspection Report

Henry Hampton
Lazy 5 Ranch
14235 Hwy 801
Mount Ulla, NC 28125

Customer ID: **3271**
Certificate: **55-B-0069**
Site: 003
THE FARM AT WALNUT CREEK

Type: ROUTINE INSPECTION
Date: Apr-20-2015

2.40 (a) (1)

ATTENDING VETERINARIAN AND ADEQUATE VETERINARY CARE (DEALERS AND EXHIBITORS).

***During this inspection, two lambs were found with tail bands in place in the shop area. When questioned about which personnel perform tail docking and castration of sheep, the farm manager stated that these are done by the licensee. When asked if there is written veterinary guidance for these procedures, the farm manager stated that there is none but that the licensee has done thousands of them. Failure for the facility to maintain a written Program of Veterinary Care that includes guidance for procedures does not ensure adequate care for the animals on hand. Written guidance is required to ensure that the attending veterinarian is aware of those procedures to be performed by the licensee and that this guidance satisfies current accepted veterinary standards. Correct this by contacting your attending veterinarian and updating the Program of Veterinary Care to include written guidance for these procedures.

Correct by: Before any additional tail docking or castrations are performed by facility personnel and not later than May 1, 2015.

2.40 (b) (2) **REPEAT**

ATTENDING VETERINARIAN AND ADEQUATE VETERINARY CARE (DEALERS AND EXHIBITORS).

Five animals were identified in need of veterinary care at the time of inspection.

***One Black-faced Suffolk-type Ram with white ear tag #1636 in the left ear was present in the dairy barn (housed with 3 other sheep). This ram had a golf ball sized mass present on the chest just below the base of the neck and slightly off center to the right side. This mass had wool present over the majority, but there was an area near the bottom that was dark red and had a creamy off white to yellow discharge oozing from it. The ram appeared in good body condition and otherwise alert and active. The facility's daily observation records were reviewed and there were no notations regarding observation of this condition by facility staff. When the farm manager was asked about this animal he indicated that he was unaware of the condition. This type of mass is consistent with multiple causes including infectious diseases and requires appropriate diagnosis by the attending veterinarian to ensure that animals are properly isolated and treated. Correct by having this animal evaluated by a licensed veterinarian no later

Prepared By: **RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I**

RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I USDA, APHIS, Animal Care

Date:
Apr-22-2015

Title: ANIMAL CARE INSPECTOR Inspector 1063

Received By: **(b)(6), (b)(7)(c)**

Date:
Apr-22-2015

Title:



Inspection Report

than 24 June 2015. The licensee shall seek written guidance from the treating veterinarian regarding diagnosis and treatment. If the veterinarian believes this to be infectious in nature, additional written guidance must be sought regarding proper isolation of affected animals to control disease and prevent disease transmission to uninfected animals as well as proper disposal of manure and used bedding for similar control. Documentation of this examination and all veterinary guidance must be maintained by the licensee and available to APHIS Officials upon request.

*** Four lambs present in the pens in the machine shop area had excessive crusts around their eyes and / or noses. This included:

1. Black Suffolk-type lamb #1406 had a large amount of crusted light brown material around both eyes with the right eye most severely affected. This eye also had a large amount of clear wet discharge and the conjunctival membranes (tissues surrounding the eye itself) were red. This animal also had a moderate amount of crusts around the nose and an increased clear discharge from both nostrils.
2. Black faced Suffolk-type lamb #1405 had a moderate amount of light brown crusts around both eyes. Additionally there were large areas (approximately 2 inches by 1 inch) below the each eye that the wool appeared abnormal. This wool had a sticky appearance as though it had recently been wetted with a sticky fluid such as excessive tearing and then dried.
3. White Southdown-type lamb without an ear tag had a large amount of dried discharge present in the wool surrounding the right eye and a smaller amount of dry light brown crusts near the eyelid. The right eye also appeared slightly sunken when compared to the left.
4. Black Suffolk-type lamb #1423 had dried light brown crusted material around the right eye.

When asked about these animals, the farm manager stated that several of the lambs in this area were under treatment. Inspectors were directed to a dry erase board as documentation. That board stated "#1406 Fri. Sat. Mon. 2:00 AM" and "1443 Thurs. Fri. Sat. Mon. 2:00AM" with no other description. When asked what this meant and what the treatment was for, the Farm Manager stated that the lambs listed (including one of the four lambs identified above) were breathing hard and that they were treated with an antibiotic he believed enrofloxacin by either the Licensee or himself. The farm manager further stated that a veterinarian had not looked at the animals in question and that he did not know whether the licensee had contacted the attending veterinarian or any other veterinarian for advice regarding this issue. There was no written documentation to show that the attending veterinarian (or any other licensed veterinarian) directed this care and there was no written guidance in the PVC for the treatment of eye discharge or respiratory problems in lambs or sheep. Additionally, (based on the statements of the farm manager and lack of documentation) three out of the four lambs listed were not previously observed by the facility. Ocular and nasal discharge and crusting as noted above can occur for many reasons and guidance by a veterinarian is necessary to ensure proper diagnosis and treatment in order to prevent worsening of disease. These animals must be examined by attending veterinarian to accurately diagnose the condition and determine the proper treatment. The licensee must maintain documentation of this exam and treatments for future review by APHIS officials. Even though this is a repeat non-complaint item, these animals must be examined by the attending veterinarian by COB on 24 April 2015.

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Prepared By: | RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I | | |
| Title: | RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I | USDA, APHIS, Animal Care Inspector 1063 | Date: Apr-22-2015 |
| Received By: | (b)(6), (b)(7)(c) | | |
| Title: | | | Date: Apr-22-2015 |



Inspection Report

*** There is no documentation at the facility since the last inspection showing discussion or any communication between the licensee and the attending veterinarian regarding reevaluation of the chemical restraint methods being used. The current program of veterinary care still authorizes the use of succinylcholine as the primary drug for chemical restraint (without any drugs for anesthesia or analgesia or equipment for respiratory support) for the majority of species including: Sika Deer, Grevy and Grants Zebra, Nilgai, Water Buffalo, Tahr Goat, Aoudad, Axis Deer, Fallow Deer, Eland, Mouflon Sheep, and Elk.

Succinylcholine is a paralytic agent that has no analgesic (pain relieving) properties. The use of this drug for routine non-painful procedures in the absence of anesthesia to alter conscious awareness is considered distressful to the animal and is not considered to be adequate veterinary care. Additionally, the use of this drug without anesthesia / analgesia for painful treatments or manipulations is inhumane. There are numerous alternative drugs and drug combinations available which are able to chemically restrain animals while providing anesthesia and analgesia.

In addition to preventing movement, this drug can also paralyze respiratory muscles causing animals to stop breathing and if animals are not properly ventilated they can die of suffocation while they remain conscious. This facility does not have adequate equipment, facilities, or training to intubate or mechanically ventilate animals in this event. It is likely that an animal experiencing paralysis of respiratory muscles would suffocate without such ability. In fact on previous inspections the farm manager was quoted as saying that when animals stop breathing while using this medication it isn't pretty and that they die. This is not considered adequate veterinary care.

When the Facility Manager was asked if succinylcholine had been administered to any animals since the last inspection, he stated that there had not been. Documentation was provided by the facility showing that last date that succinylcholine was administered to an animal was on 3/4/2015.

The licensee must maintain a program of adequate veterinary care that includes the availability of appropriate facilities, personnel, equipment, and services to comply with the provisions of the animal welfare act. Providing the authority to use paralytic drugs for immobilization without administration of anesthetic drugs, additional supportive care, and the equipment to provide for ventilation in the event of respiratory paralysis is not considered adequate veterinary care. Additionally, the use of these drugs without anesthesia or analgesia is not within established standards of veterinary care. This lack of adequate care can compromise the health of these animals and is likely to result in unnecessary pain and distress to the animals and / or death. Correct by working with your attending veterinarian to ensure that there are appropriate facilities, personnel, equipment, and services provide for appropriate veterinary care and that any additional guidance is incorporated into the written program of veterinary care. Records of any changes to the current methods for chemical restraint method shall be maintained for future evaluation by APHIS Officials.

Correct by: This is a repeat noncompliant item that remains uncorrected.

Note: The brown miniature zebu cited on the previous inspection was examined by the attending

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Prepared By: | RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I | | |
| Title: | RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I | USDA, APHIS, Animal Care Inspector 1063 | Date: Apr-22-2015 |
| Received By: | (b)(6), (b)(7)(c) | | |
| Title: | | | Date: Apr-22-2015 |



Inspection Report

veterinarian following the last inspection. This animal was observed at the time of this inspection and the condition appears improved.

2.40 (b) (3) **REPEAT**

ATTENDING VETERINARIAN AND ADEQUATE VETERINARY CARE (DEALERS AND EXHIBITORS).

Five animals were found in need of veterinary care during this inspection including a Suffolk type ram with an oozing mass and four lambs with ocular/nasal discharge. Although the facility currently maintains logs of daily observations, all of these veterinary problems were identified by USDA inspectors during this routine inspection and were not observed by the facility. All licensees must establish and maintain an adequate program of veterinary care which includes daily observations of all animals to assess their health and well-being. Additionally, a mechanism of direct and frequent communication with the attending veterinarian (AV) is required so that timely and accurate information on problems of animal health, behavior, and well-being are conveyed to the AV. The number of sheep that were exhibiting medical problems that the facility failed to identify indicates that the methods of daily observation for the sheep at this facility are not adequate at this time. Correct by ensuring that adequate daily observations are conducted and that information is conveyed to the attending veterinarian as required.

THIS IS A REPEAT NON-COMPLAINT ITEM THAT REMAINS UNCORRECTED

2.75 (a) (1) **REPEAT**

RECORDS: DEALERS AND EXHIBITORS.

The following non-compliant items were noted in the records during this inspection:

*** Acquisition information was missing for the following species / animals:

Sheep: There were 89 sheep present on the last inspection. There are acquisition records for 12 sheep and disposition records for 36 sheep. The records for acquisition / disposition that were present at the facility include:

- Acquisition of 2 Sheep on 3/18/15 (from North Carolina site)
- Acquisition of 2 Sheep on 3/28/15 (2 lambs from another property)
- Acquisition of 2 Sheep on 4/8/15 (2 lambs from another property)
- 6 Sheep births recorded (1 on 4/7/15, 2 on 4/10/15, and 1 on 4/19/15, and 2 on 4/21/15)
- Disposition of 12 Sheep on 3/9/15
- Disposition of 1 Sheep on 4/1/15
- Disposition of 7 Sheep on 4/3/15
- Disposition of 2 Sheep on 4/8/15
- Disposition of 14 Sheep on 4/20/15 (these animals were not included in the inspection count)

There were 75 sheep present on today s inspection (14 less total sheep than last inspection). The facility is missing records of births or acquisition records for 10 Sheep.

Failure to provide accurate records makes the inspection process difficult and also inhibits the ability to

Prepared By:

RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I

RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I USDA, APHIS, Animal Care

Date:

Title:

ANIMAL CARE INSPECTOR Inspector 1063

Apr-22-2015

Received By:

(b)(6), (b)(7)(c)

Date:

Title:

Apr-22-2015



Inspection Report

successfully track animal movements. This is especially important in the event of a disease outbreak. The licensee must ensure complete and accurate records are maintained for all acquisitions and dispositions including births of all animals.

THIS IS A REPEAT NON-COMPLIANT ITEM THAT REMAINS UNCORRECTED

2.131 (c) (1) **REPEAT**

HANDLING OF ANIMALS.

*** The public continues to be permitted to walk directly up the primary enclosures containing several species of animals. This includes 5 camels, 8 jersey cows, 67 sheep, 13 goats, 3 African porcupines, and 3 kangaroos, and 10 muntjac. These animals are housed in multiple areas including the pastures near the parking lot, the walk through zoo, the production barn, the dairy barn, Daugthy barn, and the camel pasture all of which are open to the public. There are no barriers or signs present to discourage public contact and the guests are encouraged to feed food sold at the entry gate. Although the sign at the entrance of the facility stated that the facility was closed at the start of the inspection, the farm manager stated that if the weather cooperated (it was raining intermittently during this inspection) that the facility may open later in the day. There are no attendants present during public contact and guests may walk directly up to enclosures and pet the animals. Primary enclosure fences are made of material with spaces large enough for the guests to reach through and touch the animals. Unattended public contact continues to be a problem at this facility and has been documented on many previous inspections including 11/12/14, 6/4/14, 11/22/13, and 6/12/13. Continued unattended public contact does not ensure safe public interaction with these animals. Licensees must ensure that during periods of public exhibition animals are handled with sufficient distance and/or barriers between the animal and the general viewing public so as to assure the safety of animals and the public. Correct by placing barriers to prevent public contact with these animals or by ensuring that an adequate number of attendants are present at each of these locations to ensure the safety of both the public and the animals.

THIS IS A REPEAT NON-COMPLIANT ITEM THAT REMAINS UNCORRECTED

3.125 (a) **REPEAT**

FACILITIES, GENERAL.

*** A fifteen foot section of fence (extending between two structural support poles) has a gap between the bottom of the fence and the ground which measures 9-10 inches (depending on location). This pasture houses five adult 4-horn sheep and one young lamb. The space under this fence is large enough for the lamb in this enclosure to escape should it be motivated to do so. The facility must ensure that all enclosures are constructed to protect the animals from injury and to properly contain the animals. This space is a potential escape and injury hazard. Correct this by repairing or replacing this section of fencing.

***Several loose metal wires were found hanging from the wooden fence partition separating two enclosures housing sheep in the production barn. A lamb was observed chewing on one of these pieces of wire. These loose wires are a potential injury hazard for the sheep in these enclosures and must be

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Prepared By: | RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I | | |
| Title: | RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I | USDA, APHIS, Animal Care Inspector 1063 | Date: Apr-22-2015 |
| Received By: | (b)(6), (b)(7)(c) | | |
| Title: | | | Date: Apr-22-2015 |



Inspection Report

removed or repaired to reduce the potential for injury.

THIS IS A REPEAT NON-COMPLIANT ITEM THAT REMAINS UNCORRECTED

3.125 (d) REPEAT

FACILITIES, GENERAL.

*** The large heap of animal waste and bedding remains in the drive through area of the facility. Animals continue to have access to this large pile and have been observed on previous inspections browsing and lying in the pile. During today's inspection, no animals were observed in or on the pile but additional spent bedding appears to have been recently added to the existing pile. While inspecting this drive through area, a facility employee indicated that questions about this pile would have to be directed to the licensee. While reviewing records, the farm manager stated that the current operation of this pile has not changed and they were continuing as in the past. When APHIS Officials were leaving the facility, the farm manager provided a paper documenting the review of this pile by a university poultry waste unit manager. This review was performed by a professor of poultry science who visited the facility to give recommendations and "strengthen the composting plan." This document did not address animal disease concerns or potential for disease transmission via movement of fecal material and/or potentially contaminated spent bedding from animals in other areas of the zoo into the drive through area. According to this documentation a recommendation that "there needs to be temperature monitoring documentation and on site recordkeeping" was made to the facility. During the exit interview of this inspection, the farm manager was asked if these recommendations have been implemented and he said that have not but plan to in the future. Continued animal contact with this waste pile has been a concern on many previous inspections (including 3/2/15, 11/12/14, 6/4/14, 2/19/14, 10/22/13, 6/12/13, and 12/4/12) as this unnecessarily exposes the animals to disease and potential disease transmission. This is especially of concern as one sheep was identified with an oozing mass similar to lesions previously observed by inspectors on other animals suggesting that the cause may be infectious. Correct this by removing this waste pile and dispose of all animal wastes properly.

THIS IS A REPEAT NON-COMPLIANT ITEM THAT REMAINS UNCORRECTED

3.131 (a)

SANITATION.

*** The stall for the camel in the Daughty barn and the stall for four adult pigs housed in the giraffe barn are excessively dirty and require cleaning. The camel stall is wet over at least one third of the floor space and the camel had several areas on its hind end that appeared to be wet fur. There is also a water receptacle on the floor in one corner of the stall for this animal. This water tub is not secured in any way and the bedding surrounding it is wet. The stall housing four adult pigs is excessively dirty. This stall contains a large accumulated "pack" of straw bedding mixed with brown material that appears to be a mix of feces and spilled feed. This pack is approximately 8 inches deep. The topmost layer in the back left corner of the stall is dark brown and there is little to no clean straw evident. Excessively dirty enclosures present a disease risk to the animals.

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Prepared By: | RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I | | |
| Title: | RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I | USDA, APHIS, Animal Care | Date: Apr-22-2015 |
| Received By: | (b)(6), (b)(7)(c) | | |
| Title: | | | Date: Apr-22-2015 |



Inspection Report

All licensees must remove excreta from primary enclosures as often as necessary to prevent contamination of the animals and minimize disease hazards and reduce odors. Correct by thoroughly cleaning these enclosures including removal of the dirty/spent bedding, a thorough cleaning of the enclosure, and replacing fresh/clean bedding.

Correct by: April 24, 2015

***Inspection conducted on 4/20/15 by ACI Randy Coleman, SACS Dana Miller with the farm manager and other farm personnel.

**Exit interview conducted on 4/22/15 by ACI Randy Coleman, SACS Dana Miller, and the farm manager.

Prepared By: RANDALL COLEMAN, A C I
RANDALL E COLEMAN, A C I USDA, APHIS, Animal Care
Title: ANIMAL CARE INSPECTOR Inspector 1063

Date:
Apr-22-2015

Received By: (b)(6), (b)(7)(c)
Title:

Date:
Apr-22-2015