Agricultural Law Update

The Official Newsletter of the

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL LAW ASSOCIATION

Volume 29, Number 2 **Fall 2017**

Inside This Issue

THE BATTLE OVER "AG-GAG" LAWS CONTINUES

by Justin Newell Heesser*

Challengers of so called "ag-gag" laws obtained two victories from the courts this summer. In July, the federal district court in Utah declared that state's statute unconstitutional because it violated the First Amendment.[1] Then in September, the Tenth Circuit dealt a blow to Wyoming's statute when it held that the "collection of resource data constitutes the protected creation of speech."[2]

Utah

Utah's "ag-gag" statute passed in 2012 created a crime for "agricultural operation interference."[3] The law made it a crime to obtain "access to an agricultural operation under false pretenses" or to record images or sound from the operation under certain circumstances.[4] The Court in *Animal Legal Defense Fund v. Herbert* referred to these different types of conduct as the

[1] *Animal Legal Def. Fund v. Herbert*, No. 2:13-cv-00679-RJS, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 105331 (D. Utah July 7, 2017).

[2] *W. Watersheds Project v. Michael* (*W. Watersheds II*), No. 16-8083, 2017 U.S. App. Lexis 17279 (10th. Cir. Sept. 7, 2017).

[3] UTAH CODE ANN. § 76-6-112 (LexisNexis 2017).

[4] UTAH CODE ANN. § 76-6-112(2) provides as follows: A person is guilty of agricultural operation interference if the person:

(a) without consent from the owner of the agricultural operation, or the owner's agent, knowingly or intentionally records an image of, or sound from, the agricultural operation by leaving a recording device on the agricultural operation;

(b) obtains access to an agricultural operation under false pretenses; (i) applies for employment at an agricultural operation with the intent to record an image of, or sound from, the agricultural operation; (ii) knows, at the time that the person accepts employment at the agricultural operation, that the owner of the agricultural operation prohibits the employee from recording an image of, or sound from, the agricultural operation; and (iii) while employed at, and while present on, the agricultural operation, records an image of, or sound from, the agricultural operation; or

(c) without consent from the owner of the operation or the owner's agent, knowingly or intentionally records an image of, or sound from, an agricultural operation while the person is committing criminal trespass, as described in Section 76-6-206, on the agricultural operation.

lying provision and the recording provisions.[5]

The Court's decision analyzed in detail whether the lying and recording prohibited in the law were protected speech under the First Amendment. Because the act's "false pretenses" language could apply to "a host of trivial, harmless misrepresentations" the Court concluded that at least some of the lies covered by the law were protected speech.[6] The Court also followed several decisions from other district courts and circuits to determine that the act of recording is protected speech.[7]

After concluding that Utah's law was subject to First Amendment scrutiny, the Court had little problem determining it was a content-based restriction subject to strict scrutiny.[8] Finally, the Court determined that the statute did not pass strict scrutiny because of the health and safety interests given by the state were "entirely speculative" and did not constitute a compelling state interest.[9]

Although the Utah statute was found unconstitutional, the court noted that it was not deciding one of the key issues in the debate regarding ag-gag laws. The Court recognized that the "complex policy questions" never materialized in the case based on the interests asserted by the state, and later noted:

> What the Act appears perfectly tailored toward is preventing undercover investigators from exposing abuses at agricultural facilities. The State has not argued this as a government interest motivating the Act. And had it done so, it is not clear whether that interest could be sufficiently compelling to withstand strict scrutiny. But that question is for another day.[10]

Wyoming

At issue in *Western Watersheds Project v. Michael* were statutes that created criminal and civil liability for individuals who trespassed upon private property to collect research data or crossed private property to collect research data on public lands.[11] These laws had broad application and did not just apply to the agriculture industry.[12] The district court in July 2016 dismissed the plaintiffs' challenge to this law, concluding individuals do not have a First Amendment right to engage in speech on the private property of others.[13]

The plaintiffs in *Western Watersheds* appealed part of district court's ruling to the Tenth Circuit. Plaintiff's argued the portion of the statute that made it unlawful to cross private land to access adjacent or proximate land to collect resource data prohibited them from engaging in protected speech on public property.[14] The Court agreed stating the "fact one aspect of the challenged statutes concerns private property does not defeat the need for First Amendment strutiny."[15] The Court determined only that the statute at issue regulated protected speech—the first part of a three-part first amendment challenge—remanding to the district court to determine the level of scrutiny to be applied and whether the statute survives that scrutiny.[16]

Conclusion

The decisions in these two cases followed Judge B. Lynn Winmill's decision from August 2015 declaring Idaho's statute unconstitutional.[17] The fate of the Idaho statute is still pending in an appeal to the Ninth Circuit, in what will likely be the next decision addressing ag-gag laws. These cases are likely to pave the way for plaintiffs' challenges to similar laws in other states.

* Justin Newell Hesser is an attorney with Dray, Dyekman, Reed & Healey, P.C. in Cheyenne, WY. Justin devotes his practice to helping agricultural businesses and families with their legal needs. He grew up on a ranch in Western Nebraska and applies this knowledge on the ranch and in his legal practice.

In his transactional practice, Justin negotiates oil and gas leases and surface use agreements; drafts agreements and conducts due diligence for real estate transactions, assists in curing mineral title defects, and prepares estate plans. Justin also helps families through trust administration or probate, including litigation involving fiduciary duties.

Justin received his JD from the Univ. or Wyoming with honors and is licensed in WY and NE.

Contact Justin at (307) 634-8891 or iustin.hesser@dravlaw.com.

[5] *Animal Legal Def. Fund*, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 105331, at *9.
[6] *Id*. at *20–21.
[7] *Id*. at *28–32.
[8] *Id*. at *35–39.
[9] *Id*. at *39-43. The state provided the following four government interests in support of the law: "(1) the Act protects animals from diseases brought into the facility by workers; (2) it protects animals from injury resulting from unqualified or inattentive workers; (3) it protects workers from exposure to zoonotic diseases; and (4) it protects workers from injury resulting from unqualified or inattentive workers." *Id*. at *40.
[10] *Id*. at 43. The State of Utah did not file an appeal of the district court's summary judgment decision.
[11] WYO. STAT. ANN. § 6-3-414; 40-27-101 (2017).
[12] For a discussion of the history of "ag-gag" laws and four categories they fit within, *see* Jacob Coleman, *ALDF v. Otter: What does it mean for other States*, 13 J. Food L. & Pol'y 198, 201–06 (Spring 2017).
[13] *W. Watersheds Project v. Michael*, 196 F. Supp. 3d 1231, 1248 (D. Wyo. 2016).
[14] *W. Watersheds Project*, 2017 U.S. App. Lexis 17279, at *8.
[15] *Id*. at *9.
[16] *Id*. at *16.
[17] *Animal Legal Def. Fund v. Otter*, 118 F. Supp. 3d 1195 (D. Idaho 2015).

WILL SHARING AG-DATA LEAD TO ANTI-TRUST VIOLATIONS?

by Todd J. Janzen*

The use of cloud-based ag-data software platforms is on the rise by farmers, livestock producers, and ranchers. Nearly every company that sells, markets, or buys goods from farmers, has developed a platform to capture agricultural data. Even pure technology companies are now crowding a space that was once left to niche players, attempting to deliver data analytics as a stand-alone service to farmers.

From 175 year old agricultural legacy companies to the newest Silicon Valley ag-tech startup, all of these companies have one thing in common—they all want as much ag-data as possible to ensure their platforms work. The more ag-data fed into the system, the better the analytics and services these companies can offer to the farmer.

As the ag-data space gets more crowded, the competition grows fiercer, and the need to squeeze profit out of captured ag-data increases. Will the desire to make money from farmers' ag-data cause some ag tech providers to push the limits of anti-trust law? This article addresses two of those possibilities, "price fixing" and "product tying."

Price fixing among competitors is illegal under Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act:

> Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal.[1]

The penalties for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act can be severe. Any person who makes a contract or conspires to restrain trade is guilty of a felony, subject to a fine of up to $100 million and imprisonment up to 10 years.[2]

Case law is full of examples of companies that have violated the Sherman Antitrust Act by sharing data and then using that information to raise prices. For example, in *US v. Container Corp.* shipping companies agreed to exchange price data among themselves, and this was enough to violate the Act.[3] The *Container* case is notable because it did not involve an *agreement* among competitors to fix prices – just an agreement to share data from which prices could be deduced.[4] That data sharing resulted in price collusion.[5]

The exchange of ag-data could likewise cause price fixing where companies with access to ag-data also have access to competitors' data. Here is a hypothetical to illustrate.

> Alpha Fertilizer Company collects data from its growers about the types and prices of fertilizer Alpha's growers are applying. Growers share this information with Alpha so that Alpha's agronomists can make recommendations for future plantings.
>
> Alpha's growers, however, also upload data about types and prices of fertilizer purchased from other fertilizer retailers, such as Beta Fertilizer Company. Alpha's employees can now view their competitors' pricing and soon realize Alpha's growers are paying more for fertilizer from their competitor Beta Fertilizer Company.
>
> As a result, Alpha raises prices on its farmers knowing these customers cannot get a better deal from Beta.

If Alpha and Beta had openly exchanged their pricing information and agreed on a minimum price for fertilizer, it would be a clear case of price collusion. By using ag-data pricing information unknowingly entered by their farmers the result is the same. This could, therefore, also be considered price collusion. *Container* established that collusion does not require an agreement.[6]

The same result could occur if Alpha and Beta enter into a data sharing agreement that allows their farmers to openly share data between their platforms. Sharing data may seem like a benefit to the farmer, as it eases data transfer, but the result could lead to higher prices. Perhaps farmers share the same agronomist, who uploads data from both companies into the same platform. If Alpha and Beta can view this data as well, the building blocks for price fixing have been laid.

Contract poultry growers have already filed a lawsuit alleging that pricing data-sharing among integrators, even though allegedly "anonymized," resulted in price fixing.[7] Various poultry integrators report to a data service company to track industry trends. The poultry growers' suit is novel because the growers allege that price data shared with the data service company does not contain pricing information for individual farms, but instead "price" is determined by some reverse engineering by the participants.[8] *Haff Poultry* has yet to be decided, but it foreshadows a modern application of the Sherman Antitrust Act on ag-data platforms.

Price fixing is not the only antitrust pitfall for ag-data sharing platforms. Companies that sell seed, equipment, and crop protection chemicals may find it irresistible to bundle their ag-data platforms with their traditional, more desirable agricultural products. For

[1] 15 U.S.C. § 1 (2017).
[2] *Id.*
[3] *US v. Container Corp.*, 393 US 333 (US 1969).
[4] *Id.*
[5] *Id.*
[6] *Id.*
[7] Haff Poultry, Inc. v. Tyson Foods, Inc., 17-cv-00033-SPS (E.D.Okla. 2017).
[8] *Id.*

example, a farmer may want to purchase a red tractor but use a green ag-data platform in the cab. The red tractor company can eliminate the green ag-data platform as a competitor if it requires the purchaser to license the red ag-data product as a condition of purchasing its tractor.

Companies that have one desirable product often require customers to purchase a second, less desirable product in order to use the main product. Occasionally, these sales tactics go too far and either the federal Department of Justice (DOJ) or competitors intervene by filing anti-trust complaints against the manufacturer. These types of two-product sales are considered unlawful "tying arrangements" – where a company sells one product on the condition that a customer must purchase a second ("tied product") which the purchaser ordinarily would not buy.[9] Such tying arrangements are a violation of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts because they are anti-competitive and restraints on trade.[10]

In the late 1970s, for example, an air-conditioner manufacturer sued Volkswagen (VW) for an unlawful "tying arrangement" with its dealers.[11] At the time, VW cars imported into the United States lacked factory air conditioner (A/C) units, and thus dealers installed these units for customers. When VW acquired an A/C manufacturing company, VW pressured its dealers to use the VW-model A/C units. Another A/C manufacturer, Heatransfer Corporation, watched its market for A/C units in VW cars slowly erode (even though there was some evidence Heatransfer units were superior). A jury determined that VW's dealer franchise agreement unlawfully "tied" the VW A/C unit to VW cars, forcing dealers to use the VW unit, and unlawfully preventing Heatransfer from competing in the A/C market.[12]

Similarly, in 2000, the DOJ accused Microsoft of unlawfully "tying" the Internet Explorer web browser to Windows software.[13] The District Court judge explained the four elements for a "tying" claim: (1) two separate "products" are involved; (2) the defendant affords its customers no choice but to take the tied product in order to obtain the tying product; (3) the arrangement affects a substantial volume of interstate commerce; and (4) the defendant has "market power" in the tying product market.[14] The District Court determined Microsoft was guilty of unlawfully tying Internet Explorer to Windows, restricting competitor Netscape from competing for the web-browser market.[15] Microsoft ultimately settled with the DOJ.

The VW and Microsoft examples of unlawful tying should be warnings to ag equipment manufacturers, retailers, and crop input suppliers. It may be tempting to artificially boost your subscription numbers by requiring farmers to sign up for your ag-data platform when purchasing goods, but the conduct may also be illegal.

Ag-data platforms have exploded onto the market in recent years. When the novelty of these products wears off, ag-tech competitors will find themselves using every tool available to attract new, and retain existing, subscribers. If history is any guide, this pressure will lead some companies to test the antitrust protections offered to farmers, livestock producers, and ranchers. Fortunately, history also provides us with ample case law precedent to address these antitrust issues when they arise.

* Todd Janzen is the founder and President of Janzen Ag Law, LLC, a law firm focused on the legal needs of the growing agricultural industry and located in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Todd grew up on a diversified grain and livestock farm in south central Kansas and received his J.D. from Indiana University. He now focuses his practice on diverse issues facing ag businesses, including ag technology providers.

Todd can be contacted at (317) 855-9920 or Janzen@aglaw.us. You can also follow him on Twitter @janzenlaw or his blog, Janzen Ag Law Blog, at www.aglaw.us/janzenaglaw.com.

[9] 15 U.S.C. § 14 (2017).
[10] *Id.*
[11] Heatransfer Corporation v. Volkswagenwerk, AG, 553 F.2d 964 (5th Cir. 1977).
[12] *Id.*
[13] US v. Microsoft, 87 F. Supp. 2d 30 (D.C. Cir. 2000).
[14] *Id.* at 47.
[15] *Id*. at 51.

GMO FOOD – MANDATORY LABELING IN THE UNITED STATES

by Drew Kershen*

On July 29, 2016, President Barak Obama signed into law the National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard.[1] The 2016 law amended the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 by adding Subtitle E (National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard) and Subtitle F (Labeling of Certain Food).[2] The law requires the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to draft regulations to implement the law within two years.[3] Thus, by July 29, 2018, the United States will have a mandatory labeling requirement for bioengineered food.

The Trump Administration has vowed to meet the statutory deadline for regulations, but has indicated that food manufacturers will likely be given a transition time beyond the two years for bringing their food labels into compliance. Indeed, the law explicitly gives small food manufacturers (to be defined by the forthcoming regulations) at least one year after promulgation before their labels must comply.[4]

Three Certain Consequences

Although the regulations have yet to be proposed, much less adopted, three certain consequences of the law can be stated:

• The United States will have mandatory labeling of bioengineered food (more commonly known as genetically modified or genetically engineered food).

• The U.S. federal government, through regulations developed and issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, has exclusive power and control over labels for bioengineered foods.

• The federal law has exercised expressed, field preemption of food labeling. Consequently, states and other subordinate political jurisdictions cannot adopt any different or additional label requirements. Their laws must be identical to the federal requirements.

Regarding the third point about federal preemption, the federal law preempts requirements related to labels. The federal law explicitly states that it does not preempt any "remedy created by a State or Federal statutory or common law right."[5] Thus, if a food manufacturer mislabels a bioengineered food, or if the food is for some reason adulterated, regulators and consumers will seek their remedy under other state or federal statutes or through private law suits. The federal mandatory labeling law itself does not contain any remedies or penalties, and the Secretary of Agriculture does not have any authority to recall a food on the basis that the food manufacturer's label does not comply with the Secretary's regulations for labels on bioengineered foods.[6]

Major Issues for Clarification in the Regulations

The federal law defines the term "bioengineering."[7] However, the definition is not crystal clear. The Secretary of Agriculture will need to clarify in the regulations whether bioengineering is broad or narrow. More precisely, the Secretary will need to address specifically whether various genome editing techniques – for example ZFN, TALEN, CRISPR and others – result in foods that must be labeled. If the Secretary reads the definition narrowly, the federal labelling law would not apply to foods created, developed, and bred through genome-editing techniques that are replacing, to a large degree, rDNA techniques.

The federal definition of "bioengineering" states: "The term 'bioengineering'… refers to a food ... that contains genetic material that has been modified" through whatever techniques the Secretary determines are bioengineering.[8] Due to the word "contains," a strong argument exists that the mandatory labeling law does not apply to refined processed oils or to plants (and their resulting foods) from which genetic material added by bioengineering has been removed. These refined processed oils and non-bioengineered plants do not contain genetic material that has been modified. The Secretary needs to address explicitly the meaning and consequences of the word "contains" in the definition of the term "bioengineering."

The federal law expressly commands the Secretary to determine the "amounts of a bioengineered substance" that can be in a food for

[1] S. 764, 114th Cong. § 2 (2016).
[2] *Id*.
[3] *Id*.
[4] *Id*.
[5] *Id*. at 5.
[6] *Id*.
[7] *Id*. at 1.
[8] *See Id*.

that food to be a bioengineered food.[9] Thus, the Secretary will determine the threshold below which a food manufacturer will not have to label the food as bioengineered. Obviously, if the Secretary sets a high threshold, such as in Japan or Korea, fewer foods will carry the mandatory label. If the Secretary sets a low threshold, such as in the European Union, many more foods will carry the mandatory label.

One major exemption from the mandatory label exists in the federal law. The Secretary must issue a regulation that prohibits a mandatory label on a food solely because the food comes from an animal that consumed a bioengineering feed or other bioengineered substance.[10] Consequently, meat, milk, eggs, and other animal products produced with bioengineered feed will not carry a mandatory label.

With one exception, bioenginnered animals are in the developmental stage but not yet on farms and ranches. Once bioengineered animals and their food products reach the consumer food market, these animals and their foods must carry the mandatory label.

The one exception is the fast-growing salmon, known as the AquaAdvantage® salmon, that US regulatory agencies have approved for sale to consumers. Whether this salmon must carry the mandatory label depends upon whether it is "bioengineered" as defined in the statute. The statute has two elements to the definition: modified through rDNA techniques and the modification "could not otherwise be obtained through conventional breeding or found in nature."[11] The AquAdvantage® salmon is a faster growing Atlantic salmon modified with genes taken from Pacific salmon species. The food manufacturer, AquaBounty, will have to determine whether its salmon could be created through conventional breeding or whether it could be found in nature.

Depending on that determination, the AquAdvantage® salmon is a "bioengineered" salmon that must carry the mandatory label or is not a "bioenginnered" salmon. Of course, AquaBounty may voluntarily label its salmon to indicate its modified origin so long as the label is not false or misleading.[12]

The Disclosure Label

The Secretary has the obligation to develop precisely the physical appearance and wording of the label. The law authorizes the Secretary to develop a textual label, a symbol label, and an electronic or digital link label.[13]

Regarding the electronic or digital link, the statute clearly authorized electronic or digital links.[14] But the law mandated that the Secretary conduct a study, to be completed by July 29, 2017, about the efficaciousness of consumer access to disclosure through electronic or digital links.[15] If the study indicates consumers will not have adequate access, the statute then states that "the Secretary, after consultation with food retailers and manufacturers, shall provide additional and comparable options to access the bioengineering disclosure."[16] Thus, depending upon the consumer study and upon consultations with the food industry, the precise manner and means by which electronic and digital disclosure will take place is yet to be settled.

After the Secretary has developed the text, symbol, and (as appropriate) electronic and digital disclosures, food manufacturers have the statutory permission to adopt the disclosure option that the manufacturer wants to use for their bioengineered food products.[17] Small food manufacturers will also have the option to use a telephone number with accompanying language saying that calling the number will get more information about the bioengineered food.[18] The law explicitly excludes very small food manufactures (to be defined by the regulations) and food retail establishments (e.g., restaurants) from mandatory labeling of bioengineered foods.[19]

Organic Foods and the Non-GMO label

The federal law contains a

[9] *Id*. at 2.
[10] *Id*.
[11] *Id*. at 1.
[12] The AquAdvantage salmon faces an additional labeling hurdle. Due to a rider to appropriations bills, the salmon cannot reach US consumers until the FDA approves special labeling. As of September 2017, FDA has not taken action on this mandate. Moreover, it is unclear how the FDA and the USDA labeling obligations will coordinate, mesh, or conflict.
[13] *Supra*.note 1 at 2.
[14] *Id*.
[15] *Id*. at 3. Note that In the fall 2016, the Secretary signed a contract with a consumer research company to conduct that study and to report before July 29, 2017. The study is not completed as of April 2017.
[16] *Id*.
[17] *Id*. at 2-3.
[18] *Id*.
[19] *Id*. at 3.

provision stating that a food certified as organic under the U.S. National Organic Program is sufficient to allow a claim regarding the absence of bioengineering for organic food.[20] The USDA NOP has now explicitly authorized organic food manufacturers to place on their foods the label "Non-GMO" or other similar claims. Food manufacturers now are adding the absence label "Non-GMO" to their certified organic food products.

In addition, the USDA-Agricultural Marketing Service for years has had a marketing program called the "Process Verified Program."[21] In light of the federal law, the USDA has begun to verify the process presented by individual food manufacturers that assures that no bioengineered techniques or ingredients exist in a particular food. Under the Process Verified Program, some food manufacturers have begun to add the words "Non-GMO" to their labels.

The USDA apparently considers the process-verification program to allow this absence label even though the federal label law states that food manufacturers cannot use a Non-GMO label "solely because the food is not required to bear" a bioengineered disclosure.[22] Thus, food manufacturers are using the process verified program to gain a non-GMO label for food products (e.g., orange juice) when, in fact, there are presently no genetically modified oranges in farmers' commercial orchards. This expansion of the "Process Verified Program," for absence labeling, is an interesting, legally untested consequence of the mandatory food labeling law.

When the Secretary ultimately releases the bioengineered food label regulations, it is reasonable to expect additional interesting, untested consequences of the mandatory food labeling law. Be ready to learn much more no later than early August 2018.

* Drew L. Kershen, is an Earl Sneed Centennial Professor of Law Emeritus, at the University of Oklahoma, College of Law.

Professor Kershen taught agricultural law for thirty-plus years. Beginning in 1997, he focused his research, writing, and speaking on agricultural bio-technology law and policy. Professor Kershen retired from teaching in 2012.

[20] Id. at 5-6.
[21] *See* USDA, Process Verified Program, https://www.ams.usda.gov/services/auditing/process-verified-programs (last visitated Oct. 15, 2017).
[22] *Supra* Note 1 at 5.

INTRODUCTION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA NATURAL RESOURCE USERS LAW AND POLICY CENTER

by Joe Willis*

The University of Arizona's James E. Rogers College of Law and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS) Cooperative Extension System (CES) have partnered to launch a Natural Resource Users Law and Policy Center (NRULPC). The Center was the first of its kind in the nation. The overarching aims included collaborating with stakeholders and mentoring student clinicians and fellows to address the currently unmet legal needs of ranchers, farmers, miners and others whose business involves the use of natural resources.

The collaboration includes a Natural Resource Users Public Interest Law Clinic affiliated with the NRULPC to provide a mechanism for client advocacy in addition to the three classical Land Grant University missions of education, research and cooperative extension that the NRULPC will deliver. The Clinic will also provide real-word experience for law and CALS students. The Clinic, which will communicate closely with the NRULPC including our Taskforce, helps businesses, most often run by families, individuals or small entities in Arizona, deal with a wide array of legal and regulatory issues including land, environment, tourism, water, employment, trade, food safety and security, and economics. These issues are often difficult to resolve without the advice of private legal counsel; which many natural resource users cannot afford. The CES statewide reach, along with other affiliated facilities, will ensure the Center can serve clients throughout Arizona. The NRULPC, the CES and CALS, and the College of Law will provide information resources for the Clinic.

Private donors have funded the Clinic director. There remain opportunities for those would like to support the development of the Center to promote the wise use of natural resources to help with funds for programming and special projects.

AALA member, Richard Morrison, attorney, Salmon, Lewis and Weldon PLC., shared his thoughts about the Center saying "I am very excited about the development of this center," said "Having represented agricultural interests all of my career, I know there have never been enough agricultural lawyers and there has always been an issue of affordability. I believe this clinic can provide the solution."

The University will start a selection process for the Natural Resource Users Law & Policy Center Executive Director as soon as the ongoing Natural Resource Users Law Clinic director search is completed.

Until a NRULPC Executive Director is hired, John Lacy, Esq., director of the Global Mining Law & Policy Program and longtime professor of practice at the University of Arizona Rogers College of Law, will serve as NRULPC Coordinator. Professor Lacy is shareholder in the firm of DeConcini McDonald Yetwin & Lacy P.C., where his practice has focused on mining and natural resource law. As director of the Global Mining Law Program he has led the development of a full on-line masters level curriculum in mining law for lawyers (LLM) and non-lawyers (MLS). See https://law.arizona.edu/global-mining-law-program. The program also puts on a conference each year, and the announcement for this year's mining conference appears below.

CALS Extension specialist and Marley Endowed Chair for Sustainable Rangeland Stewardship, Professor George Ruyle will work with Professor Lacy as the CES NRULPC liaison. Professor Ruyle is an internationally renowned expert on appropriate and rational long-term natural resource use; he also served on the previous NRULPC executive director search committee.

One of the NRUPLC's major goals is to promote the law as a career options to students doing degrees associated with natural resource use. The first class for undergraduate students (in CALs, the Rogers College, and any other UA college) is "ACBS/LAW 411: An Introduction to Agricultural Law and Policy for the Modern Day Natural Resource User". This course, which is shared between CALS' School of Animal & Comparative Biomedical Sciences and the Rogers College of law, will be primarily co-taught by Richard Morrison, Esq. and Joe Willis, Esq. Celeste Steen, Esq. is the instructor of record. Ms. Steen is UA's legal counsel responsible for all CALS land and contracts as well as a Rogers College of Law professor of practice.

With the creation of the Natural Resource Users Law and Policy Center, the University of Arizona offers a resource as well as a model to the agricultural community across the United States. The membership of AALA is invited to events such as the Second Annual Global Mining Law Summit: "Building Capacity for Mineral Development with Native Americans and Indigenous Communities: A Two-Way Street." The Summit will be held October 20, 2017.

* Joe Willis is a shareholder at Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt focusing on Natural Resources, Real Estate, and Construction. Joe received his J.D. from the University of Oregon School of Law and is admitted to practice in Oregon, Washington State, and federal courts.

For over 40 years, Joe has helped property owners in condemnation proceedings, handling over 1,000 cases, and recovering money for clients in inverse condemnations.

Joe can be reached at (503) 796-2929 or by email at jwillis@schwabe.com.

AGRICULTURAL LAW BIBLIOGRAPHY – 2ND QUARTER, 2017

by Drew Kershen* and the National Center for Agricultural Law**

Administrative Law

Denny, Worosz & Wilson, The Importance of Governance Levels in Alternative Food Networks: The Case of Red Meat Inspection Rules, 81 RURAL SOCIOLOGY 601-634 2016

Note, Encouraging Climate Adaptation through Reform of Federal Crop Insurance Subsidies, 91 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1684-1718 2016

Student Article, Farmers Plead the Fifth: Is the Plea against the Mandate to Reserve Raisins in Horne v. Department of Agriculture Legitimate?, 36 J. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 602-637 2016

Biotechnology

Glas & Carmeliet, The European Court to Rule on Milestone in European GMO Legislation: The Legal Classification of Mutagenesis in Plant Breeding, 16 BIO-SCIENCE L. REV. 91-104 2017

Menon & Jha, National Biosafety System for Regulating Agricultural Biotechnology in India, 14 INTERNATIONAL J. BIOTECHNOLOGY 151-169 2016

Saravanan, The Biotechnology Regulatory Authority of India Bill 2013 – A Threat to the Safety of India's Food and Farming, 35 BIOTECHNOLOGY L. REP. 269-289 2016

Sax, Biotechnology and Consumer Decision-Making, 47 SETON HALL L. REV. 433-486 2017

Sax, Contours of GMO Regulation and Labeling, 19 SMU SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY L. REV. 413-418 2016

Smyth, Genetically modified crops, regulatory delays, and international trade, 6(2) FOOD & ENERGY SECURITY 78-86 2017

Energy Issues

Kesan, Yang & Peres, An Empirical Study of the Impact of the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) on the Production of Fuel Ethanol in the U.S, 2017 UTAH L. REV. 159-206

Environmental Issues

Note, Agricultural Drainage and the Des Moines Water Works Lawsuit, 22 DRAKE J. AGRICULTURAL L. 109-134 2017

Note, Allies and Adversaries: A Look into the Relationship between Herbal Medicines and the Environment, 28 GEORGETOWN ENVIRONMENTAL L. REV. 693-712 2016

Note, Protecting Kentucky's Honey Bees: What's Killing the Buzz, Why It Matters, and What We Can Do to Help, 9 KENTUCKY J. EQUINE, AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCE L. 269-296 2017

Pollans, Drinking Water Protection and Agricultural Exceptionalism, 77 OHIO STATE L. J. 1195-1260 2016

Student Article, Sugar, Politics, and the Destruction of Florida's Natural Resources: The Problem with Constitutional Amendments, 18 FLORIDA COASTAL L. REV. 89-111 2016

Estate Planning/Divorce

Note, Divorce & Farmland: What is the Best Solution?, 22 DRAKE J. AGRICULTURAL L. 89-107 2017

Farm Labor

Aliens

Griffith, The Power of a Presumption: California as a Laboratory for Unauthorized Immigrant Workers' Rights, 50 UC DAVIS L. REV. 1279-1322 2017

Child Labor

Student Article, Planting the Seed for Change: Protecting Washington's Most Vulnerable Workers, 15 SEATTLE J. for SOCIAL JUSTICE 193-227 2016

Collective Bargaining

Gould, Some Reflections on Contemporary Issues in California Farm Labor, 50 UC DAVIS L. REV. 1243-1278 2017

General & Social Welfare

Comment, You Are the Employer even if You're Not: Joint Employment Under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 25 SAN JOAQUIN AGRICULTURAL L. REV. 90-114 2016

Note, Deficiencies in the Agricultural Labor Market, 9 KENTUCKY J. EQUINE, AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCE L. 297-316 2017

Farm Policy and Legislative Analysis

Domestic

Note, Data Privacy and Protection in the Agriculture Industry: Is Federal Regulation Necessary?, 18 MINNESOTA J. L. SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY 309-342 2017

International

Comment, Seed Banks and their Sprouting Need for Stricter Contracts, 47 CALIFORNIA WESTERN INTERNATIONAL L.J. 81-108 2016

Financee and Credit

Castleton, The Mandatory Mediation and Conciliation Act: A Partisan Remedy Disguised as a Resource for Neutral Dispute Resolution, 25 SAN JOAQUIN

AGRICULTURAL L. REV. 1-16 2016

Food and Drug Law

Aguirre, Contagion without Relief: Democratic Experimentalism and Regulating the Use of Antibiotics in Food-Producing Animals, 64 UCLA L. REV. 550-601 2017

Card, The Paradox of Clean Food and the Food Safety Modernization Act: Understanding the FDA's Preventive Controls for Human Food Rule, 19 SMU SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY L. REV. 381-395 2016

Note, "So Close, yet So Far": The United States Follows the Lead of the European Union in Mandating GMO Labeling, But Did It Go Far Enough? 40 FORDHAM INTERNATIONAL L.J. 625-746 2017

Note, The Recent Enactment of National Mandatory GMO Labeling Law: Superior to a Voluntary Labeling Scheme but unlikely to End the Labeling Controversy, 40 SEATTLE UNIV. L. REV. 821-840 2017

Sax, Contours of GMO Regulation and Labeling, 19 SMU SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY L. REV. 413-418 2016

Sunstein, On Mandatory Labeling, with Special Reference to Genetically Modified Foods, 165 UNIV. PENNSYLVANIA L. REV. 1043-1095 2017

Winters, Less May Be More: Reading into FDA's Labeling Requirements, 19 SMU SSCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY L. REV. 419-430 2016

Hunger & Food Security Issues

Note, Vermont Food Access and the "Right to Food": Using the Human Right to Food to Address Hunger in Vermont, 41 VERMONT L. REV. 177-207 2016

International Trade

Otieno, Agricultural Investments: The New Frontier of Human Rights Abuse and the Place of Development Agencies, 12 J. FOOD L. & POLICY 141-162 2016

Smyth, Genetically modified crops, regulatory delays, and international trade, 6(2) FOOD & ENERGY SECURITY 78-86 2017

Livestock and Packers & Stockyards

Sanders, Ag-gag Free Detroit, 93 U. DETROIT MERCY L. REV. 669-690 2016

Student Article, Agroterrorism, Resilience, and Indoor Farming, 23 ANIMAL L. 103-140 2016

Marketing Boards, Marketing Orders, Marketing Promotion, & Marketing Quotas

Comment, Organized Robbery: How Federal Marketing Orders Amount to Unconstitutional Takings Without Just Compensation, 25 SAN JOAQUIN L. REV. 67-89 2016

Patents and Other Intellectual Property Rights in Agriculture

Note, Geographical Indicators: A Rising International Trademark Dispute between Europe's Finest and Corporate America, 34 ARIZONA J. INTERNATIONAL & COMPARATIVE L. 159-185 2017

Pesticides, Herbicides, Insecticides, Fungicides, Fertilizers

Note, Weeding the Garden of Pesticide Regulation: When the Marijuana Industry Goes Unchecked, 65 DRAKE L. REV. 223-253 2017

Public Lands

Babcock, Illegal Marijuana Cultivation on Public Lands: Our Federalism on a very Bad Trip, 43 ECOLOGY L. Q. 723-779 2016

Comment, Cowboys Gone Rogue: The Bureau of Land Management's Mismanagement of Wild Horses in light of its Removal Procedures of 'Excess' Wild Horses, 37 NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. L. REV. 371-400 2017

Rural Development

Comment, Putting the Heart Back in the Heartland: Regional Land Bank Initiatives for Sustainable Rural Economies, 69 ARKANSAS L. REV. 1055-1100 2017

Symposium, Cultivating New Urban Communities: Urban Agriculture and Community Gardens, 43 FORDHAM URBAN L. J. 195-421 2016

Cahn & Segal, You Can't Common What You Can't See: Towards a Restorative Polycentrism in the Governance of our Cities, 195-245;

Ela, Urban Commons as Property Experiment: Mapping Chicago's Farms and Gardens, 247-294;

Haber, CED after #OWS: From Community Economic Development to Anti-authoritarian Community Counter-institutions, 295-376;

Miller, Financing Local Food Factories, 377-403;

Witt, Towards a Human Right to Food: Implications for Urban Growing in Baltimore City, Maryland, 405-421.

Sustainable & Organic Farming

Bowling, Why Did the Organic Chicken Cross the Road? To See the Proposed Livestock Welfare Rules in the National Organic Program, 9 KENTUCKY J. EQUINE, AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCE L. 221-236 2017

Goeringer & Suri, Community Supported Agriculture: How Do Maryland Operators Manage Legal Risks?, 9 KENTUCKY J. EQUINE, AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCE L. 211-219

2017

Torts and Insurance

EldenBrady, Family Farms Versus Factory Farms: Preemption of Local Ordinances under Michigan's Right to Farm Act, Why the Current Preemption Standard Doesn't Work and What Needs to Change, 33 WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIV. COOLEY L. REV. 333-366 2016

Marzen, Insurance Coverage and Custom Farming, 9 KENTUCKY J. EQUINE, AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCE L. 191-210 2017

Note, Ensuring Indemnity: Why Insurers Should Cease the Practice of Depreciating Labor, 22 DRAKE J. AGRICULTURAL L. 65-87 2017

Redick, Liability Prevention for Agricultural Biotechnology, 22 DRAKE J. AGRICULTURAL L. 31-64 2017

Trade Regulation/Antitrust

Monica, Agricultural Antitrust Liability: What about the "Reasonable Farmer?", 22 DRAKE J. AGRICULTURAL L. 1-30 2017

Williams, Zhao & Williams, The OPEC of Potatoes: Should Collusive Agricultural Production Restrictions Be Immune from Antitrust Law Enforcement?, 11 VIRGINIA L. & BUSINESS REV. 399-450 2017

Water Rights: Agriculturally related

Comment, Unilateral Curtailment of Water Rights: Why the State Ware Resource Control Board Is Overstepping its Jurisdiction, 25 SAN JOAQUIN AGRICULTURAL L. REV. 115-135 2016

Comment, Walking on a Slippery Slpte: Desperate Farmers Turn to Oil Wastewater to Irrigate Drought Stricken Crops, 25 SAN JOAQUIN AGRICULTURAL L. REV. 39-66 2016

Comment, Groundwater Managed: California Takes its First Step towards Groundwater Sustainability, 25 SAN JOAQUIN AGRICULTURAL L. REV. 17-38 2016

Griggs, The Political Cultures of Irrigation and the Proxy Battles of Interstate Water Litigation, 57 NATURAL RESOURCES J. 1-73 2017

Student Article, Thirsty for a Solution: Promoting More Efficient Water Use in the West, 20 UNIV. DENVER WATER L. REV. 65-89 2016

If you desire a copy of any article or further information, please contact the Law School Library nearest your office. The National AgLaw Center website: http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org has a very extensive Agricultural Law Bibliography. If you are looking for agricultural law articles, please consult this bibliographic resource on the National AgLaw Center website.o

* Drew L. Kershen, Professor of Law, The University of Oklahoma Norman, OK.

*The National Agricultural Law Center at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR. Learn more about the Center at http://nationalaglawcenter.org/.

Ag Law Update

The official newsletter of the American Agricultural Law Association

Editor
Edward E. Cox

Agricultural Law Update is published by the American Agricultural Law Association.

Edward E. Cox, Editor,
105 W Van Buren, PO Box 518
Centerville, IA 52544
ph. 641-856-3251
e-mail: edcox@ommglaw.com

For AALA membership information, contact:
Maureen Kelly Moseman,
Executive Director
American Agricultural Law Association
PO Box 241555
Omaha, NE 68124
402-915-3166
email: mmoseman@aglaw-assn.org

AALA on the web:
www.aglaw-assn.org