

10-7-2009

# Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board Ballot Issue Two

J. David Aiken

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, [daiken@unl.edu](mailto:daiken@unl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/agecon\\_cornhusker](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/agecon_cornhusker)



Part of the [Agricultural and Resource Economics Commons](#)

---

Aiken, J. David, "Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board Ballot Issue Two" (2009). *Cornhusker Economics*. 473.  
[http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/agecon\\_cornhusker/473](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/agecon_cornhusker/473)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Agricultural Economics Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Cornhusker Economics by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# CORNHUSKER ECONOMICS

## Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board Ballot Issue Two

On November 3, 2009 Ohio voters will vote on Ballot Issue Two, which would establish the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board. This newsletter discusses Ballot Issue Two and possible implications for Nebraska.

**What is Ballot Issue Two?** Ballot Issue Two would amend the Ohio Constitution by creating the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board. The 13-member board would be responsible for “establishing standards governing the care and well-being of livestock and poultry” in Ohio. In implementing this authority, the Board would “endeavor to maintain food safety, encourage locally grown and raised food and protect Ohio farms and families.” Ballot Issue Two was placed on the November ballot by the Ohio Legislature and Governor.

**Who would be on the Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board?** Ten of the 13 board members would be appointed by the Governor and approved by the Ohio Senate: (1) a family farm representative; (2) a food safety representative; (3) two representatives of statewide farm organizations; (4) a licensed veterinarian; (5) the State Veterinarian; (6) the Dean of Agriculture from an Ohio college or university; (7) two consumer representatives; and (8) a county humane society representative. The Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives and the President of the Ohio Senate would each appoint a family farmer to the Board. The Board would be chaired by the Ohio Director of Agriculture. No more than seven of the 13 board members could be from the same political party.

**What would be the Board’s authorities?** The Board would have the exclusive authority to establish animal care and well-being standards in Ohio, but could be legally overruled by the Ohio Legislature. In establishing animal care standards, the Board’s considerations would include (but not be limited to) “agricultural best management practices for such care and well-being, bio-security, disease prevention, animal morbidity and mortality data, food

Market Report	Yr Ago	4 Wks Ago	10/2/09
<b><u>Livestock and Products,</u></b>			
<b><u>Weekly Average</u></b>			
Nebraska Slaughter Steers, 35-65% Choice, Live Weight. . . . .	\$96.48	\$83.45	\$81.52
Nebraska Feeder Steers, Med. & Large Frame, 550-600 lb. . . . .	110.53	112.36	105.77
Nebraska Feeder Steers, Med. & Large Frame 750-800 lb. . . . .	108.77	102.85	99.83
Choice Boxed Beef, 600-750 lb. Carcass. . . . .	154.40	142.83	137.25
Western Corn Belt Base Hog Price Carcass, Negotiated. . . . .	68.19	49.65	48.72
Feeder Pigs, National Direct 50 lbs, FOB. . . . .	36.43	32.00	*
Pork Carcass Cutout, 185 lb. Carcass, 51-52% Lean. . . . .	73.44	55.02	53.99
Slaughter Lambs, Ch. & Pr., Heavy, Wooled, South Dakota, Direct. . . . .	94.62	91.13	94.12
National Carcass Lamb Cutout, FOB. . . . .	269.24	251.28	249.66
<b><u>Crops,</u></b>			
<b><u>Daily Spot Prices</u></b>			
Wheat, No. 1, H.W. Imperial, bu. . . . .	5.58	3.74	3.43
Corn, No. 2, Yellow Omaha, bu. . . . .	4.40	3.03	3.22
Soybeans, No. 1, Yellow Omaha, bu. . . . .	9.32	9.25	8.56
Grain Sorghum, No. 2, Yellow Dorchester, cwt. . . . .	6.23	4.75	4.89
Oats, No. 2, Heavy Minneapolis, MN, bu. . . . .	*	1.97	2.05
<b><u>Feed</u></b>			
Alfalfa, Large Square Bales, Good to Premium, RFV 160-185 Northeast Nebraska, ton. . . . .	190.00	*	*
Alfalfa, Large Rounds, Good Platte Valley, ton. . . . .	77.50	82.50	82.50
Grass Hay, Large Rounds, Premium Nebraska, ton. . . . .	85.00	*	*
Dried Distillers Grains, 10% Moisture, Nebraska Average. . . . .	160.00	78.00	93.00
Wet Distillers Grains, 65-70% Moisture, Nebraska Average. . . . .	58.00	34.00	36.12
<b>*No Market</b>			



safety practices and the protection of local, affordable food supplies for consumers.”

**Who supported Ballot Issue Two?** The Livestock Care Board Initiative is supported by Ohio agricultural groups and Ohio Governor Ted Strickland, among others. Ballot Issue Two is an effort to pre-empt a 2010 ballot effort by the American Humane Society. The 2009 ballot initiative is opposed by the Humane Society, which plans to go ahead with its campaign to collect enough signatures to put their own ballot initiative on the 2010 ballot. The Humane Society ballot initiative would probably ban (1) veal crates, (2) swine gestation crates, and (3) poultry battery. Ohio agricultural and political leaders might have been able to negotiate a more narrow ban had they foregone the 2009 ballot question.

**Is there any possible impact on Nebraska agriculture?** This is only the first part of what is likely to be a two-step ballot process in Ohio. The Humane Society is likely to continue its own 2010 ballot activities, regardless of the November 3, 2009 voting outcome. The Humane Society constitutional amendment would likely either repeal the Board, or make its ballot language superior to any inconsistent board regulation or animal care standard. So the dust really won't settle until November 2010. At that point we will have a clearer read on what implications this might have for Nebraska.

J. David Aiken, (402) 472-1848  
 Professor, Water & Agricultural Law Specialist  
 Department of Agricultural Economics  
 University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
[daiken1@unl.edu](mailto:daiken1@unl.edu)

<b>Animal Welfare Timeline</b>	
<b>1999</b>	European Union bans battery cages, effective 2012. German ban takes effect 2007.
<b>November 2002</b>	Florida voters ban gestation crates, effective 2008, 55-45 percent.
<b>November 2003</b>	Better Business Bureau rules that it is misleading to label eggs from battery-caged hens as “Animal Care Certified.”
<b>2004</b>	Cargill begins phasing out gestation crates in about half its facilities.
<b>May 2005</b>	Whole Foods Market, Wild Oats Natural Marketplace end sales of eggs from caged hens.
<b>September 2006</b>	Ben & Jerry’s phase out eggs from caged hens.
<b>November 2006</b>	Arizona voters ban gestation crates and veal crates 62-38 percent, effective 12/31/2012.
<b>January 2007</b>	Smithfield Foods announces phase out of gestation crates by 2017.
<b>March 2007</b>	Burger King announces five percent egg purchases from non-caged hens; 20 percent pork purchased from non-gestation crate producers.
<b>June 2007</b>	Oregon statute bans gestation crates, effective 2013.
<b>May 2008</b>	Colorado statute bans veal crates, 2012 and gestation crates, 2018.
<b>November 2008</b>	California Proposition 2 adopted 64-36 percent.
<b>May 2009</b>	Maine statute bans gestation and veal crates, effective 1/1/2011.
<b>May 2009</b>	Wendy’s agrees to purchase two percent cage-free eggs.
<b>May 2009</b>	McDonald’s agrees to participate in hen housing (battery cage) study.
<b>November 2009</b>	Ohio voters decide whether to create Ohio Livestock Care Standards Board