

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Cornhusker Economics

Agricultural Economics Department

---

1-3-2007

## Federal Court Invalidates Initiative 300

J. David Aiken

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

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



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

---

Aiken, J. David, "Federal Court Invalidates Initiative 300" (2007). *Cornhusker Economics*. 298.

[https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/agecon\\_cornhusker/298](https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/agecon_cornhusker/298)

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

UNIVERSITY OF  
**Nebraska**  
Lincoln

January 3, 2007

University of Nebraska–Lincoln Extension

Institute of Agriculture & Natural Resources  
Department of Agricultural Economics  
<http://www.agecon.unl.edu/Cornhuskereconomics.html>

## Federal Court Invalidates Initiative 300

Market Report	Yr Ago	4 Wks Ago	12/29/0
<b><u>Livestock and Products,</u></b>			
<b><u>Weekly Average</u></b>			
Nebraska Slaughter Steers, 35-65% Choice, Live Weight . . . . .	\$93.38	\$85.85	\$87.58
Nebraska Feeder Steers, Med. & Large Frame, 550-600 lb . . . .	138.50	114.81	116.76
Nebraska Feeder Steers, Med. & Large Frame 750-800 lb . . . .	116.27	107.50	*
Choice Boxed Beef, 600-750 lb. Carcass . . . . .	158.19	140.96	143.44
Western Corn Belt Base Hog Price Carcass, Negotiated . . . . .	57.41	59.87	55.97
Feeder Pigs, National Direct 45 lbs, FOB . . . . .	57.52	56.56	*
Pork Carcass Cutout, 185 lb. Carcass, 51-52% Lean . . . . .	64.11	65.60	63.63
Slaughter Lambs, Ch. & Pr., 90-160 lbs., Shorn, Midwest . . . . .	79.00	*	*
National Carcass Lamb Cutout, FOB . . . . .	241.32	254.73	252.09
<b><u>Crops,</u></b>			
<b><u>Daily Spot Prices</u></b>			
Wheat, No. 1, H.W. Imperial, bu . . . . .	*	4.79	4.54
Corn, No. 2, Yellow Omaha, bu . . . . .	1.94	3.39	3.57
Soybeans, No. 1, Yellow Omaha, bu . . . . .	5.75	6.25	6.46
Grain Sorghum, No. 2, Yellow Columbus, cwt . . . . .	2.79	5.46	5.95
Oats, No. 2, Heavy Minneapolis, MN , bu . . . . .	2.19	2.77	2.85
<b><u>Hay</u></b>			
Alfalfa, Large Square Bales, Good to Premium, RFV 160-185 Northeast Nebraska, ton . . . . .	130.00	135.00	135.00
Alfalfa, Large Rounds, Good Platte Valley, ton . . . . .	65.00	87.50	87.50
Grass Hay, Large Rounds, Good Northeast Nebraska, ton . . . . .	52.50	82.50	82.50
* No market.			

On December 15, 2005, the U.S. District Court for Nebraska (Judge Camp) ruled that Article 12 Section 8 of the Nebraska Constitution (popularly known as Initiative 300) violated federal law. The court ruled that I300, which regulates corporate farming, violated the Interstate Commerce Clause and the Americans with Disabilities Act. On December 13, 2006, a three-judge panel of the Eighth Federal Circuit Court of Appeals upheld Judge Camp's 2005 ruling that I300 violated the Interstate Commerce Clause. The state of Nebraska will appeal the circuit court's decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

**What did the court do?** The court of appeals upheld the district judge's 2005 ruling that I300 violated the Federal Interstate Commerce Clause without holding a trial first.

**How does I300 violate federal law?** The residence and daily labor requirements violated the Interstate Commerce Clause. The circuit court did not address the Americans with Disabilities Act issue. The circuit court determined that requiring people to either live on the family farm or ranch, or else provide daily labor and management on the farm or ranch essentially required people to live on or near the farm, which would exclude most non-Nebraskans.

**Was this a surprise?** Not really. Once the federal courts invalidated South Dakota's Amendment E (which was a modest rewrite of I300), it was only a matter of time before they also invalidated I300.

**What happens next?** The Nebraska Attorney General will appeal the circuit court's decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. It is very unlikely that the Supreme Court will agree to hear the case. The Supreme Court's decision whether to hear the appeal could come as early as Summer 2007.



Extension is a Division of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln cooperating with the Counties and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

University of Nebraska Extension educational programs abide with the non-discrimination policies of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln and the United States Department of Agriculture.

**Is I300 still enforceable until all the appeals have been taken?** Yes it is, assuming the Nebraska Attorney General meets all the court appeals deadlines.

**If the Eighth Circuit's decision is not reversed, can some version of I300 be reenacted and be legal?** Possibly. If both the daily labor requirement and the residency requirement are lifted, some type of corporate farming restriction might be constitutional. The prohibition on livestock ownership and agricultural land ownership by non-family farm corporations would also need to be removed. Of course, at this point the corporate farming restrictions would be very mild and would not significantly restrict investor participation in non-family farm operations.

If Nebraska policymakers wanted to retain the daily labor, residency, livestock ownership and agricultural land ownership restrictions, these restrictions could only be applied to Nebraskans. If they were extended to out-of-state individuals or businesses, the restrictions would violate the Federal Interstate Commerce Clause. Also, any such restriction would have to be lifted if any out-of-state person or business was involved in a Nebraska agricultural operation. So these restrictions would be very easily avoided by simply, for example, giving one share of corporate stock to someone living outside of Nebraska. So the regulations would not restrict anyone who did not wish to be restricted.

**So, this is probably the end of the line for I300.** I would say so, certainly in anything resembling its present form.

**I300 has been challenged in court before, why was this challenge successful?** In the last several years the federal courts have started taking a harder line on state regulations that impact or interfere with interstate commerce. This has been a significant legal change from 1982, when I300 was adopted. If I300 opponents thought they could have gotten it invalidated under the Interstate Commerce Clause earlier than now, I have no doubt that they would have tried to do so sooner.

**What did I300 accomplish?** First, it stopped the ill-advised development of sandhills ranches into wall-to-wall center-pivot farms. Ironically, most of those investor-financed pivots have been replanted to grass and are now enrolled in the Federal Conservation Reserve Program (at taxpayer expense). Second, I300 significantly slowed the development of large swine facilities in Nebraska in the mid-to late 1980s. This gave large livestock opponents enough time to allow nearly 50 Nebraska counties to adopt zoning regulations intended to control or prevent large livestock developments.

**If I300 is finally declared unconstitutional, what will the likely impacts be?** First, remember that this isn't likely to occur for at least one to two years. But if the

federal ruling is not overturned on appeal, the end of I300 will legally facilitate livestock development in Nebraska, although not necessarily large swine confinements. However, if economic conditions are favorable, livestock developers might look for either an unzoned county, or a livestock-friendly county to locate in. More likely is the development of networked livestock operations among local farmers, such as some ranchers banding together to establish a cattle feedlot, etc. But these localized developments would also be subject to county zoning restrictions.

Farm business planning and estate planning would also be simplified. More farmers would use limited liability companies (LLCs) to legally structure their business. Off-farm heirs would be able to put inherited farm property into an LLC without meeting I300 residency or farm labor requirements.

**Is this the end of state regulation of corporate farming?** It is the end for meaningful restrictions but not necessarily for "fake restrictions." The other states with corporate farming requirements don't have I300's daily labor requirement. So a "family farm corporation" could be established if a family member is engaged in simply managing the farm. This "fake restriction" is a pretty easy requirement to meet – simply following crop or livestock markets would typically qualify as management. So corporate farming laws in other states haven't had the restrictive effect that I300 has had in Nebraska because their restrictions were "fake" and I300's was "real." The absence of a daily labor requirement similar to I300's may be enough of a difference to allow other state corporate farming bans to avoid a successful court challenge. In addition, I300 restricts corporate ownership of livestock, another unique feature. Only Iowa has a similar requirement, and the only entities restricted are large packers. That feature of the Iowa corporate farming law is vulnerable to legal attack. Otherwise, if a state's "fake" corporate farming requirements can be easily satisfied (as is true in most cases), few legal challenges to those restrictions are likely to arise or to succeed.

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