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Since the early days of civilization, animals have played an enormous role in human activities. While they have a very definitive utilitarian purpose, they have also forged important strong emotional bonds with people from every walk of life, and it is no surprise that they have won the affection and interest of countless humans. Yet, as in so many of our dealings with animals, our relationships with them are full of contradictions. We spend billions of dollars on some animals—showering them with affection and using them for non-harmful pleasures—yet we use other animals to generate billions of dollars in commerce and often exploit them in the process.

This publication has never released an issue that focuses solely on animal welfare. Rather, it has focused on topics ranging from energy law and policy to land and water use as well as other important topic areas that come to mind when you think of “sustainable development.” However, development will not be sustainable if animal welfare and human-animal relationships are not included in development programs, policies, and laws. In this issue, the Sustainable Development Law & Policy Brief seeks to highlight the commonality between animal welfare issues and human justice issues. Our first article, CAFOs: Plaguing North Carolina Communities of Color by Christine Ball Blakely, discusses the deleterious effects that Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) have on both humans and non-humans. Author LaTravia Smith in her article, The “Fowl” Practice of Humane Labeling: Proposed Amendments to Federal Standards Governing Chicken Welfare and Poultry Labeling Practices, discusses the unique opportunities to improve poultry welfare in the United States’ agricultural industry and offers methods to ensure the accurate labeling of poultry products. The final article in this issue, Cruelty to Human and Nonhuman Animals in the Wild-Caught Fishing Industry by Kathy Hessler, Becky Jenkins, and Kelly Levenda, delves into the grave impacts that the fishing industry has on humans, including health and safety issues, labor law violations, and even human rights abuses, such as human trafficking, child labor, and slavery.

This issue also includes six featured articles exploring other important human and animal welfare topics. Carolyn Larcom discusses how anthropogenic noise interferes with echolocation, a process by which marine mammals use to communicate. Our second featured article by Stephanie Kurose discusses the recent and increasing legislative efforts by some members of Congress to weaken the Endangered Species Act. Alexandra C. Nolan examines “cow-tapping,” a technology developed in Argentina for cleaner methane extraction, which entails inserting a tube into a cow’s stomach to extract methane to use as an alternative fuel source. Savannah Pugh explores how pesticides, mites, and global warming have contributed to a 90% decline in bee populations in the last twenty years. Israel Cook explores how the growth of the meat industry has placed pressure on slaughterhouses to increase the pace of their product lines in order to satisfy humanity’s demand for meat. Due to the faster pace of production, workers are suffering high rates of injury, and animals are being mistreated while still alive. Amanda Arrington, Director of the Pets for Life Program at The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), and Michael Markarian Chief Operating Officer for The HSUS—discuss how limited affordable veterinary and pet wellness services disadvantage millions of people and their pets across the United States. The Pets for Life Program promotes the understanding within the larger animal protection movement that a lack of financial means does not equate to a lack of love for a pet. The program delivers direct care to thousands of pets in underserved communities each year.

On behalf of the Sustainable Development Law and Policy staff, we would like to thank all of the authors who contributed their time, efforts, and scholarship to this issue. Their scholarship is an inspiration to us all as we search to understand how to
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incorporate animal welfare and human-animal relationships into development programs, policies, and laws. Their pieces highlight how animal welfare is inextricably intertwined with human welfare—they are not mutually exclusive. Their pieces also demonstrate how affinity groups and animal welfare groups share many of the same challenges, goals, and enemies—creating potential opportunities for movements to collaborate against exploitation, poverty, and cruelty. We would also like to thank our staff for all of their hard work and dedication to SDLP. Lastly, we would like to thank our readers for your continuing interest and support of SDLP.

Sincerely,

Luke Trompeter
Co-Editor in Chief

Ingrid Lesemann
Co-Editor in Chief
CAFOs: Plaguing North Carolina Communities of Color

Christine Ball-Blakely*

I. INTRODUCTION

Grocery shopping has become a foraging expedition through a market of lies. The coolers are stocked with milk cartons boasting pastoral scenes of cows grazing on verdant hills. Egg cartons are stamped “all-natural.” Sausage is neatly packaged in a tube and emblazoned with a red barn. But the origins of most meat and dairy products are far divorced from these depictions of traditional farming. In stark contrast, animal products are overwhelmingly produced in Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs), otherwise known as “factory farms.”

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines CAFOs as particular types of Animal Feeding Operations (AFOs). AFOs are facilities where animals are confined together in a small area, along with “feed, manure and urine, dead animals, and production operations.” In AFOs, food is brought to the animals rather than the animals grazing in pastures. AFOs are designated as CAFOs under two circumstances: (1) where the AFO is a “significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States,” or (2) where the AFO “stables or confines” a minimum number of animals.

Today, about ten billion animals are raised and slaughtered in the United States every year. More than 99% of those animals are raised and slaughtered in CAFOs. American meat consumption has nearly doubled over the last century, and the USDA projects this consumption will further swell over the next decade. With this level of consumption, it comes as no surprise that animal products are cheap. Meat and dairy prices have been steadily dropping in the United States for over a century, in part due to the advent of CAFOs in the 1950s. But while the price Americans pay for animal products at the grocery store may seem low in dollars, the true price is staggeringly high.

CAFOs are deleterious to human and nonhuman animals alike. In addition to causing unquantifiable animal suffering, CAFOs put independent family farmers out of business, and they create deplorable working conditions for employees. CAFOs also create massive externalities in the form of environmental destruction while they ravage their vulnerable host communities and trample civil rights. Section II examines some of these communities, located on the North Carolina Coastal Plain, which are home to many African American, Latino, Native American, and economically disadvantaged people. This Section also describes the significant environmental damage that CAFOs deal to these vulnerable communities, which in turn causes plummeting property values and endangers health. Section III explores relevant law and how it fails to protect these vulnerable communities, creating the enforcement gap. Section IV explains how the idea of farming is America’s sacred cow, spurred by rosy visions of wholesome white farmers and their families living out the rugged individualism that our country has worshipped for centuries. Big Agribusiness (“Big Ag”) eagerly and effectively exploits this idea, raking in immense profit (including subsidies from misinformed tax payers) and power. With this power, Big Ag purchases politicians. Those politicians twist the law into an instrument of oppression by carving out the enforcement gap. The enforcement gap invites CAFOs to exploit vulnerable communities. Section V reckons that North Carolina presents a potential blueprint for the way forward. Though federal environmental and civil rights laws face further weakening (and perhaps even extinction) under the Trump administration and a Republican-controlled Congress, these vulnerable communities in North Carolina can fight CAFOs at the state level.

II. NORTH CAROLINA: A CASE STUDY IN HOW CAFOs PLAUGE VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

The “Black Belt,” a crescent-shaped band throughout the South where slaves worked on plantations, runs squarely through eastern North Carolina. This part of the country has historically been defined as those places with a “black population majority at the time of the Civil War.” After the Civil War and emancipation, many African Americans remained in the Black Belt and worked as sharecroppers and tenant farmers. But African American farmers in the Black Belt were systematically deprived of farmland, largely due to discrimination in land sales and lending:

By the turn of the century, many of the black farm operators in the South managed to acquire farmland. Thereafter, however, black farm ownership and control of land, and other resources such as capital, have been severely limited due to systematic discrimination in land sales and farm credit, reported in both historical and contemporary sources. This was particularly the case in the lack of access to credit . . . from the [Farmers Home Administration (FmHA)] which was established in the 1930s to service the credit needs of farmers who failed to meet the lending criteria of other lending institutions.
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Today, the communities in the Black Belt suffer from economic oppression in the form of high unemployment and poverty, low levels of education, low quality healthcare, and substandard housing.27 CAFOs descended on these vulnerable communities like a plague, beginning in the mid-1980s.28 Because communities of color and low-income communities often lack the political power of affluent white communities, CAFOs disproportionately occupy them.29 Indeed, the proportion of African American, Hispanic, and Native American people living within three miles of a North Carolina pig CAFO are 1.54, 1.39, and 2.18 times higher, respectively.30 Communities of color and low-income communities also lack the resources to leave compromised areas, where they are trapped by decreasing property values and a plummeting quality of life.31

There are 9.5 million pigs in North Carolina—the other victims of the state’s $3 billion pork industry.32 The pigs are spread across approximately 2,100 different operations33 and produce a total of ten billion gallons of waste each year, which is “enough to fill more than 15,000 Olympic-size swimming pools.”34 The pigs are confined to large indoor facilities with slatted floors, and their waste is pumped outdoors to what the pork industry calls a “lagoon.” Lagoons are vast open-air cesspools filled with untreated manure, urine, and afterbirth.36 Some lagoons are as large as seven-and-a-half acres and hold 20 to 45 million gallons of waste.37 There are more than 4,000 lagoons in North Carolina.38 These lagoons “have broken, failed, or overflowed, leading to major fish kills and other pollution incidents.”39 When the lagoons become full, CAFO operators manage volume by spraying the waste through sprinkler systems onto “sprayfields” in large quantities.40 “Operators have sprayed waste in windy and wet weather, on frozen ground, or on land already saturated with manure,” causing runoff and leaks into aquifers.41

This waste management system fails to protect surrounding communities from the environmental impacts of the industry. Instead, CAFOs heap further injustice on surrounding North Carolina communities by polluting their water and air, harming their health, and depressing their property values.

A. Polluted Water

CAFOs pollute surface water and groundwater in several different ways, including lagoon breaches, catastrophic flooding, and runoff.42 Potential contaminants include nitrates and pathogens43 as well as ammonium, phosphate, dissolved solids, metals and metalloids, pharmaceutical chemicals, and natural and synthetic hormones.44 “Pathogens are parasites, bacteria, or viruses that are capable of causing disease or infection in animals or humans . . . . There are over 150 pathogens in manure that could impact human health.”45 Metals and metalloids include copper, zinc, arsenic, nickel, and selenium.46 Pharmaceutical chemicals include antibiotics, and hormones include estrogen.47

The consequences of lagoon breaches are severe, endangering the water supply and aquatic life. In 1995, an eight-acre lagoon breached and spilled “25 million gallons of animal waste into the New River. The spill killed 10 million fish and closed 364,000 acres of coastal wetlands to shellfishing.”48 Lagoon compromises are more likely during hurricane season. Hurricane Floyd pummeled the North Carolina coast in 1999 and compromised fifty-two lagoons, releasing uncontrolled waste into the floodwaters.49 “Sampling conducted after Hurricane Floyd in 1999 found dangerous levels of E. Coli and Clostridium perfringens in water, even after floodwaters had receded.”50 In 2016, it happened again. Hurricane Matthew dumped eighteen inches of rain on the North Carolina Coastal Plain, causing flooding so extensive that it was visible from space.51 “[T]he flood partially submerged [ten] industrial pig farms with [thirty-nine] barns . . . and [fourteen] open-air pits holding millions of gallons of liquid hog manure.”52 Once more, uncontrolled waste flowed freely from lagoons into the floodwaters. Sprayfields saturated with lagoon waste are also submerged following such major flooding events.53

Even during normal weather conditions, sprayfield runoff threatens North Carolina lakes, rivers, streams, other surface waters, and groundwater.54 Indeed, “[t]he agriculture sector, including CAFOs, is the leading contributor of pollutants to lakes, rivers, and reservoirs. It has been found that states with high concentrations of CAFOs experience on average [twenty] to [thirty] serious water quality problems per year as a result of manure management problems.”55 These contaminations cause loss of aquatic life and invade the water supply.56 Lagoons and sprayfields also compromise groundwater on a regular basis.57

Contaminants can enter ground water from a variety of CAFO sources, including leaking lagoons, breaches in piping or barn infrastructure, and land application of liquid and solid wastes. There are guidelines for design and construction of barns, infrastructure piping, and lagoons that in theory would preclude leakage to ground water, but in practice these events do occur. In fact, even when properly constructed, slow leakage from lagoons over time can release large amounts of contaminants such as ammonium.58

Contaminated groundwater leads to contaminated drinking water in rural areas like the Black Belt.59 Indeed, rural populations have elevated rates of reliance upon wells for drinking water.60 Nonetheless, in this area of North Carolina, “[m]ost hog operations . . . are located in areas with high dependence on well-water for drinking.”61 Those that do rely on wells for drinking water are at higher risk for water contamination because the Black Belt is located on the North Carolina Coastal Plain, which has high water tables and wells that are unlined and shallow.62 For these reasons, some residents have stopped using their wells.63

The health impacts of polluted water are serious, particularly for those community members who have weakened immune systems. Symptoms of illnesses caused by contaminated water include “nausea, vomiting, fever, diarrhea, muscle pain, death,” and kidney failure.64 People at high risk of illness or death constitute approximately 20% of the United States population, and they include the elderly, infants, young children, and those who are pregnant, HIV positive, on chemotherapy, or are otherwise immunosuppressed.65
In addition to pathogen-driven illnesses, there is also the threat of new viruses.\textsuperscript{66} Indeed, there is speculation that H1N1 may have spawned in pig CAFOs in Mexico.\textsuperscript{67} But despite this risk, CAFOs are not required to test for new viruses because they are not on the list of mandatory reportable illnesses to the World Organization for Animal Health.\textsuperscript{68}

Finally, there are often antibiotics in CAFOs' animal feed.\textsuperscript{69} Seventy percent of all antibiotics used in the United States are administered to animals as additives in their feed.\textsuperscript{70} The goal of administering these antibiotics is to promote animal growth, and therefore profitability.\textsuperscript{71} The Center for Disease Control has recommended that the use of antibiotics in “food animals” be “phased out.”\textsuperscript{72} These antibiotics are dangerous because “[t]he antibiotics often are not fully metabolized by animals, and can be present in their manure. If manure pollutes a water supply, antibiotics can also leech into groundwater or surface water.”\textsuperscript{73} The risk to the community is high because this exposure causes antibiotics to be less effective for humans while also leading to the development of antibiotic-resistant microbes.\textsuperscript{74}

\section*{B. Polluted Air}

CAFOs produce emissions that fuel climate change\textsuperscript{75} and diminish ambient air quality.\textsuperscript{76} Indeed, between the animals themselves and the degrading waste in lagoons and on sprayfields, CAFOs cause asthma, acid rain, and climate change by releasing the following into the air: 400 volatile organic compounds (VOC), particulate matter, methane, ammonia, hydrogen sulfide, ozone, endotoxins, and noxious odors.\textsuperscript{77} CAFOs produce nearly 75\% of the United States’ ammonia air pollution.\textsuperscript{78}

These emissions are so concentrated that it can be dangerous even to approach a lagoon—particularly in hot summer months.\textsuperscript{79} “The oxygen-deficient, toxic, and/or explosive atmosphere which can develop in a manure pit has claimed many lives.”\textsuperscript{80} There are multiple tales of farm workers who entered lagoons to make repairs and succumbed to the emissions. Some died from hydrogen sulfide poisoning, while others asphyxiated in the oxygen-starved air.\textsuperscript{81} Others died after collapsing during rescue attempts.\textsuperscript{82}

But it is not necessary to be near a lagoon to suffer from the emissions—members of communities plagued by CAFOs also carry health risks. One study showed that people in CAFO-occupied communities “suffered disproportionate levels of tension, anger, confusion, fatigue, depression, and lack of overall vigor as well as more upper respiratory and gastrointestinal ailments than neighbors of other types of farms and non-livestock areas.”\textsuperscript{83} Ammonia is a “strong respiratory irritant” that causes chemical burns to the respiratory tract, skin, and eyes.\textsuperscript{84} It also causes severe coughing and chronic lung disease.\textsuperscript{85} Hydrogen sulfide is acutely dangerous, causing “inflammation of the moist membranes” in the eyes and respiratory tract as well as olfactory neuron loss, pulmonary edema, and even death.\textsuperscript{86} Particulate matter causes “chronic bronchitis, chronic respiratory symptoms, declines in lung function, [and] organic dust toxic syndrome.”\textsuperscript{87}

Some of the most vulnerable individuals in these communities are children. “Children are known to be more vulnerable to the adverse health effects of air pollution due to their higher minute ventilation, immature immune system, involvement in vigorous activities, the longer periods of time they spend outdoors, and the continuing development of their lungs during the postneonatal period.”\textsuperscript{88} Twenty-six percent of schools surveyed in North Carolina reported that CAFO odors are noticeable outside the school, and 8\% reported that the odors were noticeable inside the school.\textsuperscript{89} Economically disadvantaged children are more likely to suffer health impacts from CAFOs, including asthma, because those children are more likely to live and attend schools in closer proximity to CAFOs.\textsuperscript{90}

\section*{C. Plummeting Property Values}

There is evidence that CAFOs adversely affect property values. “The most certain fact regarding CAFOs and property values are that the closer a property is to a CAFO, the more likely it will be that the value of the property will drop.”\textsuperscript{91} This decline is due in part to the health risks that CAFOs bring to communities, but it is also due to the tremendous nuisances that CAFOs create: odors from pig CAFOs, “reminiscent of rotten eggs and ammonia,” are insufferable.\textsuperscript{92} “My family, neighbors, and I have been held prisoner in our own homes by the unbearable stench from the multiple industrial hog operations within a quarter mile of my community.”\textsuperscript{93} Many community members no longer hang laundry outside on clotheslines to dry for fear that their clothing will be ruined by the fine mist of manure that sprinkles their homes and cars.\textsuperscript{94} Swarms of flies and mosquitoes—attracted to the prolific waste in communities plagued by CAFOs—accompany the odor, bringing even further risk of disease.\textsuperscript{95}

The degree to which CAFOs harm property values varies depending on several factors. One study found that properties within three miles of a CAFO decreased in value by 6.6\% on account of the CAFO, while properties within one-tenth of a mile of a CAFO decreased in value by as much as 88\%.\textsuperscript{96} Another study suggests that properties downwind from and closest to CAFOs suffer the largest decreases in value.\textsuperscript{97} The size and type of CAFO can also affect the degree to which nearby properties decrease in value.\textsuperscript{98} A decrease in property value hurts the property owner most directly, but this harm infects the entire local economy when property tax rates plummet along with property values.\textsuperscript{99}

\section*{III. Law as an Instrument of Oppression: Propping Up CAFOs}

While CAFOs devastate the environment and public health, they are severely under-regulated at the federal level.\textsuperscript{100} And at the state level, so-called “right-to-farm” and “ag-gag” laws in North Carolina shield CAFO operators from nuisance suits and whistleblowers, while North Carolina purports to regulate CAFOs with laws that largely fail to protect communities.\textsuperscript{101} Thus, the law has parted like the Red Sea to make way for CAFOs and all the misery that they rain down on vulnerable communities.
A. DEVIL IN THE DETAILS: THE ENFORCEMENT GAP IN FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

American environmentalism was born in the 1960s. Following the passage of the Clean Air Act (CAA)\textsuperscript{102} in 1963 and the Clean Water Act (CWA)\textsuperscript{103} in 1972, landmark environmental protection laws began sprouting up through the decades. Still, because “farms are virtually unregulated by the expansive body of environmental law that has developed in the United States . . . \textsuperscript{104}” environmental injustice abounds in vulnerable communities.

1. THE CLEAN WATER ACT

The Clean Water Act (CWA) declares in § 101(a) that it aims to “restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters” and achieve “water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife” by establishing a framework for federal regulation of surface waters quality standards and pollution discharges into the navigable waters of the United States.\textsuperscript{105}

To accomplish this goal, the CWA “authorizes the regulation and enforcement of requirements that govern waste discharges into U.S. waters.”\textsuperscript{106} Section 402 of the CWA\textsuperscript{107} establishes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which administers the effluent (waste) limitations established in § 301\textsuperscript{108} and prohibits the discharge of pollution\textsuperscript{109} from point sources\textsuperscript{110} into navigable waters of the United States without a permit from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or the state.\textsuperscript{111}

Some CAFOs are large enough to qualify as regulated point sources under the CAFO Rule.\textsuperscript{112} Those CAFOs must fulfill permit and annual report requirements.\textsuperscript{113} Regulated CAFOs are also responsible for creating a plan for handling waste.\textsuperscript{114}

But the CWA still fails to prevent CAFOs from polluting water. First, fewer than 10% of all CAFOs are large enough to qualify as a regulated point source under the CAFO Rule.\textsuperscript{115} Second, the stormwater exception swallows the CAFO Rule. “Agricultural return flows and stormwater discharge are considered non-point sources and therefore do not require NPDES permits to discharge pollutants through these avenues. This exception to the Clean Water Act extends so far as to include rainwater that contacts stored manure and subsequently flows into navigable waters.”\textsuperscript{116}

Thus, the CWA fails to regulate runoff or to provide incentives to CAFO owners and operators to try to avoid catastrophes during hurricanes and floods.\textsuperscript{117} Third, punishing case law has greatly weakened the CAFO Rule, contributing to the low number of CAFOs that are actually required to obtain a NPDES permit.\textsuperscript{118} Fourth, noncompliance is rampant and enforcement is dismal—in part due to a lack of data on existing CAFOs.\textsuperscript{119} Fifth, the CWA does not directly regulate groundwater.\textsuperscript{120}

2. THE CLEAN AIR ACT

The Clean Air Act (CAA) “regulates ‘criteria-pollutants’ that deteriorate ambient air quality, hazardous air pollutants, and emissions from certain specific sources of air pollution.”\textsuperscript{122} The EPA is authorized to “set mobile source limits, ambient air quality standards, hazardous air pollutant emission standards, [and] standards for new pollution sources. . . .”\textsuperscript{123} The EPA is also authorized “to identify areas that do not attain federal ambient air quality standards set under the act . . . and phase out substances that deplete the Earth’s stratospheric ozone layer.”\textsuperscript{124} The goal of the CAA is to prevent ambient air emissions from harming the environment and public health.\textsuperscript{125}

Under the CAA, the EPA must set minimum national standards for air quality, or National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), but the states are primarily responsible for ensuring compliance with NAAQS.\textsuperscript{126} Areas that are struggling to meet NAAQS, called “nonattainment areas,” must implement special measures to control air pollution.\textsuperscript{127} The CAA also creates a comprehensive permit system that applies to major sources of air pollution, which are those sources emitting more than 100 tons of regulated pollutants each year.\textsuperscript{128}

The CAA applies to CAFOs in theory.\textsuperscript{129} But in reality, the CAA still fails to prevent CAFOs from polluting the air. First, “air emissions from farms typically do not exceed thresholds specified in the Clean Air Act . . . and thus generally escape most CAA regulatory programs.”\textsuperscript{130} Second, regulators at both the federal and state levels have been lax in enforcing the CAA (and other environmental laws) against CAFOs. Instead, regulators “traditionally focused most effort on controlling the largest and most visible sources of pollution to the water, air, and land—factories, waste treatment plants, motor vehicles—rather than smaller and more dispersed sources such as farms.”\textsuperscript{131} Third, the CAA Mandatory Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reporting Rule\textsuperscript{132} addresses manure management systems, but Congress barred the EPA from using funds to implement mandatory GHG reporting for manure management facilities.\textsuperscript{133} Fourth, there is a dearth of data.\textsuperscript{134} The CAA “requires accurate measurement of emissions to determine whether [CAFOs] emit regulated pollutants in quantities that exceed specified thresholds.”\textsuperscript{135}

Citing a need for such data, the EPA entered into an Air Compliance Agreement\textsuperscript{136} with CAFO owners and operators.\textsuperscript{137} “Early in 2002, representatives of agriculture industry groups—especially pork and egg producers—approached EPA officials with a proposal to negotiate a voluntary agreement that would produce air quality monitoring data on emissions from animal feedlot operations.”\textsuperscript{138} In exchange for industry cooperation, the EPA agreed to provide immunity for past and ongoing violations of the CAA to all participating CAFOs. “EPA granted covenants not to sue and released participants from EPA liability for failing to comply with certain provisions of the CAA.”\textsuperscript{139} Critics of the agreement include environmental groups and state and local air quality officials, who were not included in the negotiation process.\textsuperscript{140}

More than 13,900 operations across forty-two states signed up to participate in the agreement, including 1,856 pig operations.\textsuperscript{141} After the EPA released the data gathered under the agreement in 2011, an Environmental Integrity Project analysis showed that “measured levels of several pollutants—particles, ammonia, and hydrogen sulfide—exceeded CAA health-based
standards, worker protection standards, and federal emission reporting limits at some of the study sites.”142 The EPA’s methodologies have come under fire, however, since the study failed to include turkey operations, beef cattle operations, or sprayfields, and collected data from a very small number of operations.143 Years later, after granting thousands of CAFOs immunity, the EPA still has not taken steps to use the data collected to better regulate CAFOs under the CAA. This holding pattern, and the enforcement gap more broadly across federal law, is likely the result of the politically powerful farm lobby exerting its influence.144

B. Industry Above People: North Carolina Law

North Carolina law serves CAFO owners and operators in three main ways. First, the state has eviscerated nuisance as a cause of action under its so-called “Right-to-Farm” law. Second, the state has passed an “ag-gag” law intended to prevent the public from discovering the misconduct and illegal actions of CAFO owner and operators. Third, the state has lax environmental regulations of CAFOs.

1. Insult to Injury: The North Carolina “Right-to-Farm” Law

Property owners have been suing pig farmers for centuries. In William Aldred’s Case,145 “the Court of the King’s Bench recognized [a]n action on the case lies for erecting a hogstye so near the house of the plaintiff that the air thereof was corrupted.”146 Common law nuisance theories remain an essential tool for U.S. property owners who seek to protect their right to enjoy their property, even after the development of complex environmental laws.147 But in North Carolina, nuisance suits against CAFOs are now an option extinguished and community members are left without legal remedy.

North Carolina first enacted its so-called “right-to-farm” (RTF) law148 in 1979.149 That early version of the law created an affirmative “coming to the nuisance” defense for preexisting CAFO owners and operators when they faced suits from community members who purchased property in the CAFO-occupied community.150 The rationale behind these laws was that the CAFO was there first.151

In 2013, North Carolina’s RTF law became a “right-to-commit-nuisance” law (RTCN).152 Now, a CAFO “may raise an affirmative defense to liability in a nuisance action regardless of whether it had undergone a change in ownership, size, or type of product produced. As a result, agricultural operations may be able to benefit from these protections regardless of whether the facility actually preceded its neighboring landowners.”153 The RTCN amendments followed close on the heels of lawsuits filed by hundreds of community members against Murphy-Brown, LLC—a subsidiary of Smithfield Foods, Inc.—for the operation of pig CAFOs in eastern North Carolina, and they will further disempower community members to fight the destruction of their homes and neighborhoods.154

The North Carolina legislature recently pushed through yet another RTCN bill, overriding Democratic Governor Cooper’s veto.155 Republican State Representative Jimmy Dixon, whose campaign finance records reveal that he has accepted $115,000 from the pork industry, sponsored House Bill 467.156 He characterized the bill as “protecting ‘red-blooded, hard-working’ American farmers.”157 Republican State Senator Brent Jackson sponsored the Senate companion bill, and his campaign finance records reveal that he has accepted more than $130,000 from the pork industry.158 Previous North Carolina law provided that the jury would determine the amount of compensatory damages in nuisance cases.160 But now, the law “will essentially cap the damages property owners can collect in nuisance lawsuits at the fair market value of their property, which critics point out is often made lower by the presence of those commercial farms.”161 Thus, this bill severely limits any damages that a community member might win against a CAFO owner or operator, which in turn makes challenging CAFOs via nuisance law a less appealing option.162

2. Gagging Whistleblowers: The North Carolina “Ag-Gag Law”

Ag-gag163 laws are designed to shield CAFOs from whistleblowers and reporters who seek to collect evidence of wrongdoing. “Ag-Gag bills were designed to place restraints on free speech by making it a crime to take photos or video on a factory farm without the written permission of the owner.”164 These laws are harmful to the public because they thwart undercover investigations that reveal dangerous and abhorrent activity such as animal abuse, environmental crimes, and food safety risks that could sicken millions.165 Without the investigations that ag-gag laws seek to prevent, the public may not discover such information until the damage is already done.

Nonetheless, ag-gag legislation is sweeping the nation.166 On January 1, 2016, North Carolina’s ag-gag law167 went into effect.168 This law is even broader than most ag-gag laws:

The law provides for a civil cause of action against whistleblowers who seek to inform the public about matters of public concern in their workplace. This law will deter whistleblowers in facilities like nursing homes, hospitals, day cares, schools, and animal agriculture from reporting concerning or illegal conduct.169

Organizations, journalists, and employees who conduct undercover investigations of CAFOs and release evidence of wrongdoing to the public or to the press will be liable and could face civil suit and damages.170 This law shrouds CAFOs in secrecy, making it more difficult for community members to discover any wrongdoing that CAFO owners and operators are committing in their backyards.171


Despite . . . documented environmental and human health harms from CAFO pollution, the industry and its allies have been able to emasculate government protection of its citizens at every level. Local governments have been stripped of control in many communities,
...preventing them from passing zoning or public health ordinances to address CAFO pollution. State and federal permitting and enforcement activity is nonexistent or weak.\textsuperscript{172}

In the 1980s, a pig farmer turned state senator named Wendell Murphy, set out to vertically integrate pig farming in North Carolina.\textsuperscript{173} He aimed to pass state laws that would incubate the pig CAFO industry and stymie environmental regulation.\textsuperscript{174}

In 1986, Murphy helped pass a bill that eliminated the sales tax on hog and poultry houses; in 1987, the sales tax was waived on any equipment related to the CAFO industry. In 1991, county managers from four of the state’s largest hog counties considered imposing regulations on the hog industry. Instead, Murphy cosponsored a bill that prohibited them from passing such zoning ordinances. When the bill passed, CAFO facilities were protected like traditional family farms.\textsuperscript{175}

Through his legislation, Murphy’s vision of vertical integration came to pass: though there were 22,000 pig farmers raising two million pigs in North Carolina thirty years ago, today there are only 2,300 farmers raising nine million pigs.\textsuperscript{176} Like Murphy’s legislation, this trajectory began in the 1980s when “[t]he number of small, diversified farms fell precipitously. Most of the farms that survived did so by going big—raising thousands of animals that spend their entire lives inside barns.”\textsuperscript{177} WH Group, a Chinese corporation that bought out Smithfield Foods in 2013, is now the dominant corporation behind pig CAFOs in North Carolina.\textsuperscript{178}

The North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regulates the state’s Animal Feeding Operations (AFOs), which are defined such that they include pig operations with (1) at least 250 pigs and (2) a liquid animal waste management system.\textsuperscript{179} DEQ has also been responsible for “establish[ing] siting requirements for application setbacks from property boundaries and perennial streams since 1992.”\textsuperscript{180} Almost all permitted pig CAFOs are subject to the regulations of the North Carolina Swine Waste Management System General Permit (General Permit), which contains requirements regarding operation and maintenance, monitoring and reporting, inspections, performance standards, general conditions, and penalties.\textsuperscript{181} The substance of the General Permit comes up for revision every five years, and was renewed in 2014 “following extensive public involvement.”\textsuperscript{182}

DEQ only agreed to regulate CAFOs after the disastrous lagoon breach of 1995, which dumped more than 20 million gallons of waste into the New River.\textsuperscript{183} In 1997, North Carolina instituted a moratorium on new and expanded pig CAFOs as a result of the disaster.\textsuperscript{184} This moratorium became permanent in 2007 with regard to CAFOs using or proposing to use the lagoon and sprayfield waste management system.\textsuperscript{185} The existing CAFOs, however, are still allowed to utilize this system under the General Permit.\textsuperscript{186} DEQ insists that the lagoon and sprayfield waste system is working because CAFO operators are limited in the amount of waste they can apply to sprayfields at once. “All waste must be applied at no greater than agronomic rates—an amount that can be used productively by the crops planted.”\textsuperscript{187} But in January 2015, researchers found that high levels of fecal bacteria in local waterways are linked to CAFOs, and state officials have only dismissed community members’ concerns.\textsuperscript{188} DEQ visits CAFOs only once each year, and the agency has never revoked a permit or shut down a farm.\textsuperscript{189}

IV. The Root of All Evil: Money as the Source of the Enforcement Gap and Law as an Instrument of Oppression

A. Special Interests

Section III presented the ways in which the law is failing to protect CAFO-occupied communities and even aids in their oppression. Big Ag has engineered this failure by maintaining a stranglehold on the American political process in two ways. First, Big Ag exploits the image of the wholesome farming family, almost always portrayed as white, that many Americans admire.\textsuperscript{190} By portraying industrial farms as the small family farms of yore, the Big Ag lobby successfully controls public and political opinion. Second, Big Ag spends tremendous amounts of money influencing members of Congress.

The American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), rated by Fortune magazine as one of the top twenty-five most powerful special interest groups in the United States, is a prime example of how Big Ag lobbying groups control the political process.\textsuperscript{191} “The [AFBF] promotes the interests of farm corporations in Washington D.C., and in state capitals. For decades, they have spent millions fighting environmental regulations of all kinds.”\textsuperscript{192} And because Big Ag has convinced the country that industrial farms are small family farms, it is all too easy to characterize environmental regulations as the big boot of the Federal Government standing on the little guy’s throat. Ron Prestage, President of the National Pork Producers Council, recently said of the proposed Clean Water Rule: “[T]his regulation isn’t about clean water. This massive land grab is about federal control of private property, growing the size of government and allowing activists to extort and micromanage all kinds of farming and business activities.”\textsuperscript{193}

And then there is money. “[Q]uestions about whether environmental laws should apply to CAFOs continue to give rise to controversy in Congress and the states, and the $297 billion and growing agricultural industry maintains an extensive bench of lobbyists to take advantage of that controversy.”\textsuperscript{194} Between 2005 and 2010, Big Ag spent $126.9 million lobbying Congress and federal regulatory agencies.\textsuperscript{195} AFBF alone spent $33.6 million and employed fifty lobbyists who spent their time fighting the Clean Water Act and other rules affecting CAFO pollution.\textsuperscript{196} In 2016, Big Ag spent $127,592,310 lobbying.\textsuperscript{197} Big Ag directed the majority of that money to Republican politicians, including $2,702,601 to then-Republican presidential candidate Donald J. Trump.\textsuperscript{198} Finally, Big
Ag receives an average of $38.4 billion in farm subsidies (also known as “corporate welfare”) per year.199

B. NORTH CAROLINA: “CAPTURED BY THE INDUSTRY”200

North Carolina makes no secret of its allegiance to Big Ag. In 2015, then-Governor Pat McCrory attended a rally held by the pork industry. “McCrory told those at the industry rally,” which was held to oppose lawsuits over the industry’s environmental practices, that the “state government would fight for them.”201 A Pulitzer Prize-winning investigative series on the North Carolina pork industry revealed that the industry and the government have been close since the beginning:

In a seven-month investigation, The N&O found that state agencies aid the expansion of pork production but are slow to act on a growing range of problems resulting from that increase. The industry has won laws and policies promoting its rapid growth in North Carolina. It also has profited from a network of formal and informal alliances with powerful people in government.202

One explanation for this closeness is that when the North Carolina tobacco industry went into decline in the 1980s, the burgeoning pork industry filled the void.203 But whatever reason, one thing is clear: North Carolina is prioritizing industry over community—especially communities of color.

V. NORTH CAROLINA: FIGHTING BACK AND GRASSROOTS GROWTH

Poor people, and people of color especially, continue to suffer from the horrible conditions brought on by the industrial hog industry . . . . People just can’t ignore this.204

Members of CAFO-occupied communities have pleaded with North Carolina government officials for years. “[C]ommunities have repeatedly asked [DEQ] for stronger protections. Citizens have tried to reach a resolution with government officials that is agreeable to neighbors, regulators, and the industry. Some have brought civil complaints for nuisance and trespass against individual facilities.”205 Advocacy organizations, including North Carolina Riverkeepers, Waterkeepers Alliance, North Carolina Environmental Justice Network (NCEJN), and Rural Empowerment Association for Community Help (REACH), have all joined in the fight to take back these communities from CAFO occupation.206 But alas, “over the decades, complaints have largely fallen on deaf ears.”207

A. COMMUNITY ORGANIZING AND INFORMATION GATHERING

Community members rallied together and armed themselves with information. Devon Hall, who was one such community member, co-founded REACH in 2002 and began collaborating with Professor Steve Wing, a public health professor at the University of North Carolina.208 Hall and Wing (the researchers) worked alongside community members to gather valuable data for their fight against CAFOs.209

In the Duplin Health Awareness Project,210 the first of ten such studies, the researchers set up equipment in neighborhoods within a mile of CAFOs to monitor the air quality for toxins and PM.211 Then, the researchers instructed community members to sit outdoors and note odor intensity and their own daily stress levels.212 At the same time, the community members tracked their own blood pressure and lung function with medical equipment.213 They recorded all of the data they collected about their surroundings, health, and well-being.214 The researchers and the community members were able to develop data proving what the community members already knew from experience: there are “correlations between hog waste and asthma and other respiratory problems, such as bronchitis, along with compromised immune systems and increased stress and anxiety.”215

REACH took further action to monitor air and water and to organize the community. First, the organization worked with Waterkeeper Alliance, who deployed Riverkeepers to take water samples from area waterways.216 Additionally, the collaborators created maps of the CAFOs and lagoons and patrolled the community to record violations of the General Permit, such as when CAFO operators spray manure on the sprayfields before or during a storm.217 Finally, REACH went door-to-door in communities to distribute fact sheets and unite neighbors. “‘We told them, this is how many pigs live around you, and this is who’s making the money. We got good at mobilizing the community.’”218

Ultimately, the community utilized the information and data they collected to try to prevent DEQ from renewing the General Permit in 2014.219 While they did not succeed in preventing the renewal, their efforts did come to fruition in 2007 when the North Carolina legislature made the moratorium on new lagoon and sprayfield CAFOs permanent.220

But community mobilization and investigative efforts are not without risk. CAFO operators harassed water samplers.221 Community members reported that CAFO operators subjected community members who spoke out to several intimidation tactics, “including sustained tailgating, yelling, threats of gun and other physical violence, and driving back in forth in front of their houses.”222 When community members called DEQ to report illegal spraying during or before a storm, they were rewarded with calls from disgruntled CAFO operators after DEQ informed them of the complaint.223 Such complaints are confidential—but nonetheless, DEQ regulators sometimes choose to expose those who make them.224 In the most egregious incident of harassment, a CAFO operator entered “the home of an elderly African American woman and shook the chair she sat in while threatening her and her family with physical violence if they continued to complain about the odors and spray.”225

B. CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

In March 2014, DEQ ignored community pleas and renewed the General Permit that allowed CAFOs to continue using lagoons and sprayfields as waste management.226 This was the last straw for North Carolina activists. “‘We’ve been asking the state and our representatives for years to do something different about how this industry operates in the state,’ says NCEJN’s
Muhammad. ‘It was an insult to the community and to the people of the state of North Carolina to renew those permits.’\textsuperscript{227}

In September 2014, Earthjustice and the University of North Carolina Center for Civil Rights, representing Waterkeeper Alliance, NCEJN, and REACH (Citizens), filed a complaint (‘Complaint’)\textsuperscript{228} in the EPA External Civil Rights Compliance Office (ECRCO) (formerly the Office of Civil Rights) under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI)\textsuperscript{229} and its implementing regulations.\textsuperscript{230} Under Title VI, state regulatory programs that receive federal funding may not operate in such a way that disproportionately impacts communities of color in a negative way.\textsuperscript{231} In their Complaint, the groups allege that “the State’s lax regulation of hog-waste disposal discriminates against minority communities in eastern North Carolina, and that its [Department of Environmental Quality’s] recent permit allowing thousands of hog facilities to function without adequate waste-disposal controls violates federal law.”\textsuperscript{232}

In February 2015, ECRCO began investigating DEQ on the basis of the Complaint.\textsuperscript{233} In March, the Citizens and DEQ agreed to enter into alternative dispute resolution, funded by the EPA.\textsuperscript{234} As the January 2016 mediation date approached, the National Pork Council and the North Carolina Pork Council moved to intervene—a troubling development for the Citizens, since the negotiations were confidential.\textsuperscript{235} The Citizens objected to industry involvement in the mediation:

On behalf of our clients, who were adamant that the Pork Council should not be at the table—this was not about them, it was about DEQ’s responsibility to protect the environment and health and safety of the people of North Carolina—we said no, there’s no place for you here.\textsuperscript{236}

 Nonetheless, the National Pork Council and the North Carolina Pork Council appeared at the session, and DEQ made it clear that the agency supported their presence during negotiations.\textsuperscript{237} Earthjustice attorney Marianne Lado declined to “speculate on whether DEQ told the pork councils about the mediation, but added that the agency ‘tried to normalize the problem and suggest that it was acceptable for pork councils to be there. [DEQ] didn’t act surprised that they were there.’”\textsuperscript{238} The Citizens were concerned about exposing the identities of the community representatives present at the meeting, due to the pork industry’s long history of intimidating residents.\textsuperscript{239} The Citizens withdrew from mediation in March 2016 and the negotiations broke down.\textsuperscript{240}

In May 2016, ECRCO reinstated its DEQ investigation.\textsuperscript{241} The Citizens filed an additional complaint (“Second Complaint”)\textsuperscript{242} against DEQ in July, alleging that the agency “engaged in and failed to protect [the Citizens] from intimidation, which is prohibited by Title VI and EPA regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 7.100.”\textsuperscript{243} The Second Complaint discussed the long history of the pork industry using intimidation tactics against residents of eastern North Carolina.\textsuperscript{244} In August, ECRCO agreed to investigate DEQ based on the Second Complaint.\textsuperscript{245} DEQ requested that the original Complaint be dismissed, but ECRCO declined to do so.\textsuperscript{246} In October, twenty community representatives drove to Washington, D.C., to share their story with EPA and members of Congress.\textsuperscript{247} A month later, officials from ECRCO toured the area and listened to residents with Senator Cory Booker, a member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.\textsuperscript{248}

Finally, in January of 2017, ECRCO took an “unprecedented step”\textsuperscript{249} and sent an official Letter of Concern to DEQ.\textsuperscript{250} In the letter, ECRCO expressed “deep concern about the possibility that African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans have been subjected to discrimination as the result of NC DEQ’s operation of the Swine Waste General Permit program, including the 2014 renewal of the Swine Waste General Permit.”\textsuperscript{251} ECRCO also expressed “grave concerns about these reports indicating a potential hostile and intimidating environment for anyone seeking to provide relevant information to NC DEQ or EPA.”\textsuperscript{252} ECRCO made several recommendations to DEQ:

- Assess the Swine Waste General Permit to determine how it should be changed to substantially reduce impacts on nearby residents. The EPA also asked for a timeline.
- Assess current regulations on industrialized hog farms and determined what could be changed. If the DEQ claims it doesn’t have the authority to change a rule, it needs to show evidence of the impediment.
- Evaluate risk management options, such as covering the lagoons, not using dead boxes [a holding pen for hog carcasses] and not spraying on the weekends.
- Assess current swine waste technologies and what could be adopted.
- Conduct an internal evaluation of DEQ’s enforcement and compliance of industrialized hog farms. If corrective measures are needed, deliver a timetable to do so.
- Evaluate its non-discrimination program if its [sic] in place, using a federal checklist. If the program hasn’t been established, DEQ is to correct the deficiencies.\textsuperscript{253}

While the Letter of Concern is not the firm decision that community members had hoped to receive, they are pleased that people are taking notice of the community’s plight.\textsuperscript{254} And there is reason to remain hopeful: “the agency’s pointed, harsh letter and its ongoing investigation—plus a new administration at DEQ—could tip the scales toward environmental justice.”\textsuperscript{255}

C. OVERCOMING IN A TIME OF AGGRESSIVE REGRESSION

In November 2016, Donald J. Trump was declared the victor of the 2016 United States Presidential Election.\textsuperscript{256} At the same time, both houses of Congress remained under Republican domination.\textsuperscript{257} As a result, both the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government now seek to greatly reduce or eliminate the EPA, and the President’s budget proposal included an External Civil Rights Compliance Office reduction of $268,000 and eleven full-time employees.\textsuperscript{258} The EPA has issued a plan to lay off 25% of its employees and eliminate fifty-six programs.\textsuperscript{259} Thus, it may be necessary for communities seeking to protect themselves from CAFOs to focus on state law in the foreseeable future.
North Carolina is an ideal state for such action. The community has succeeded in generating tremendous publicity, which will make it more difficult for state legislators and DEQ to continue to ignore their pleas. Roy Cooper, a Democrat and former Attorney General of North Carolina, unseated Pat McCrory in the state’s 2016 gubernatorial race.260 This change may give community members the toe-hold they need to take back their state from Big Ag, even if EPA fails them going forward.

There are several ways community members might move forward in this fight at the state-level. First, they may campaign to repeal the so-called “right-to-farm” law and the ag-gag law. Second, they may continue to exert pressure on DEQ to update the General Permit and ban lagoon and sprayfield waste management systems. In the (weaker) alternative, they may campaign for lagoons to be covered and for sprayfields to be rigorously inspected to avoid runoff. Third, they may leverage the EPA Letter of Concern to DEQ and petition DEQ to adopt EPA’s recommendations. Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, the communities may campaign to replace the Republican members of the North Carolina legislature with representatives who would aid them in their fight against CAFOs.

The fourth objective is likely to be difficult at present, however, as there is evidence that the Republican legislature suppresses the votes of North Carolinians of color261 and gerrymanders districts along racial lines.262 Fortunately, lawsuits have challenged both of these barriers to the full participation and representation of marginalized North Carolina communities.263 With the help of the federal courts, the communities may be able to change the makeup of their legislature and ensure that their representatives actually represent them and not Big Ag.

VI. CONCLUSION

CAFOs are major polluters that exploit and endanger the vulnerable communities they occupy. Therefore, they must be treated as such at both the federal and state levels. CAFOs should be strictly regulated as major polluters and should be subject to strict siting regulations that protect vulnerable communities like those of the North Carolina Coastal Plain.

To break down the political barriers that prevent these essential regulations from coming to fruition, it is necessary to attack the corrupting influence of corporate money in politics. So long as the farm lobby can buy politicians to guard and promote the interests of Big Ag, including the corporate welfare the industry siphons from taxpayers in the form of subsidies, it will be impossible to make meaningful progress in this arena.

Likewise, it is necessary to challenge and change the narrative that CAFOs are family farms with happy pigs dotting their pastureland. This lie, which depends upon the American tradition of exalting the white, rugged farmer of yesteryear, has proven wildly successful and forms the foundation of the CAFO house of cards. The first step in challenging and changing this narrative is to unmask CAFOs and Big Ag. Their true faces are those of massive industry, not small business. Once unmasked, it will become politically feasible to regulate this industry appropriately. Such regulation has the potential to ensure that the industry’s access to our economic infrastructure and society is a privilege that will not be to the detriment of the most vulnerable among us, including non-human animals.

In this time of great political turmoil, the North Carolina communities have modeled a path forward: grassroots organization and mobilization. By forging connections among neighbors, researchers, advocacy organizations, and public interest law firms, the communities created a formidable coalition of justice-minded people. While it may be that EPA is of little help going forward, these communities can continue to fight CAFOs at the state level. With Mr. Cooper in the Governor’s Mansion, they just may be able to get enough traction to make change in their state.

More broadly, Americans must recognize and resist the vast destruction that CAFOs cause. CAFOs fuel climate change, wantonly torture sentient non-human animals, and harm human health. Big Ag manipulates our political system and exploits taxpayers for tremendous profit. And, as the case of North Carolina demonstrates, CAFOs are cogs in the machine that has systematically oppressed communities of color for centuries. While comprehensive CAFO regulation (or, ideally, elimination) will increase the cost of animal products at the checkout counter, the status quo is a cost that communities of color cannot continue to bear.
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ANTHROPOGENIC NOISE AND THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Carolyn D. Larcom*

In 2016—with the help of the U.S. Coast Guard—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Oregon State University sent a titanium encased hydrophone to a depth of more than 36,000 feet. The hydrophone’s mission was simple—to listen. During its three-week commission, at the deepest point in the Mariana Trench, the hydrophone heard ship propellers, the moans of baleen whales, a magnitude five earthquake, and a category four typhoon. Anthropogenic, or human-caused, noise contributes to this underwater symphony in a myriad of ways and poses unique challenges in the marine environment to cetaceans. This feature examines the continued rise of anthropogenic noise and its harmful effects on whale species. It also advocates for the use of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in litigation as an instrument to quiet anthropogenic noise. The North Atlantic right whale is used as a case study because of its status as a critically endangered species and its close proximity to noise pollution along the Atlantic coast and in the Gulf of Mexico.

Increasing human activity along coastlines is leading to rising levels of anthropogenic underwater noise. This coastal activity overlaps with critical habitat for species like the North Atlantic right whale. In 2010, NOAA created “CetSound,” a working group to guide the agency to a more comprehensive management of ocean noise impacts. Christopher Clark of Cornell University, a marine bioacoustics expert, refers to anthropogenic noise as “acoustical bleaching” of the oceans.

The two major forms of anthropogenic noise are chronic and acute. Chronic noise pollution is the low frequency sound made by ship traffic. The hydrophone sent by NOAA managed to pick up the constant humming of container ships passing overhead some 36,000 feet above. Acute noise pollution is created mostly by ocean exploration for oil and gas and is doubling every decade. The energy from these explosions “fills the oceans with noise.”

Anthropogenic noise disrupts marine life, especially whales, by interfering with their acoustic senses. This interference disrupts their social networks, thus affecting their survival and reproductive success. For the North Atlantic right whale, the reduction of noise pollution is considered essential to ensure their long-term recovery. Whales are acoustically oriented and “see” the ocean through sound. The effects of noise pollution on whale populations have been recognized for over forty years. The exclusive statutory protections for endangered species may provide the best opportunity for stalling detrimental anthropogenic noise in the marine environment.

The ESA makes it unlawful for any person to “take” endangered or threatened species. “Take” means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. The term “take” has been broadly defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in actual injury or death to members of an endangered species. North Atlantic right whales have been observed increasing their call amplitude with the rise of background noise. An increase in stress related fecal hormone metabolites has been correlated with noise pollution. Whales rely on sound to breed, navigate coastlines, and find food. Anthropogenic noise interferes with their ability to eat, mate, and navigate; therefore, it is essential to their survival that these sounds travel the ocean undisturbed. Given this interference, noise pollution should qualify as a “taking” under the ESA as it significantly degrades their habitat.

To satisfy the “injury in fact” test, members of an organization must demonstrate that they are significantly affected by the actions of the noise polluter. Standing is not confined to economic harm. First, a member would need to be personally affected by the decline in the North Atlantic right whale population to qualify for standing. Second, a causal connection between the actions of the noise polluter and the plaintiff’s injury must be established. The effects of noise pollution on whale populations are well understood. A plaintiff would need to associate a specific oil and gas exploration project or ocean freight carrier with the harms suffered by the North Atlantic right whale population. Third, it must be likely that the injury can be redressed by a favorable ruling. The technology to reduce noise pollution exists and implementing these technologies to reduce underwater noise would improve the viability of North Atlantic right whale populations. A favorable ruling that, at a minimum, demands the implementation of these technologies will remedy the injury to North Atlantic right whale populations.

The Trump administration has sought to lift a five-year ban on drilling along the Atlantic coastline, which is critical habitat for North Atlantic right whale. Despite these unfortunate developments that seek to increase the rising rates of anthropogenic noise, litigation has been successful in combating noise pollution. Litigation has successfully targeted navy sonar, seismic surveys, and offshore oil and gas exploration as a means to combat noise pollution.

* J.D. Candidate 2019, American University Washington College of Law.
The North Atlantic right whale is a critically endangered species that will undoubtedly be detrimentally harmed by a continued increase in anthropogenic noise. Further litigation is needed to protect threatened whale species, like the North Atlantic right whale, from total elimination. Litigation that qualifies anthropogenic noise as a “taking” under the ESA will prove to be a significant instrument in combatting this silent killer.
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**Legislative Efforts to Increase State Management for Imperiled Species Should Be Rejected**

By Stephanie Kurose*

The Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA or “Act”)¹ is our nation’s most successful conservation law. Its purpose is to prevent the extinction of our most at-risk plants and animals, increase their numbers, and effect their full recovery—and eventually their removal from the endangered list. Since its enactment in 1973, the Act has been more than 99% effective at saving species under its protection from extinction, and it has put hundreds more on the road to recovery.² Scientists estimate that at least 227 species would have likely gone extinct without the ESA’s passage.³

Despite this success, legislative efforts by some members of Congress to weaken the ESA have significantly increased recently. Since 2011, 300 attacks have been launched against endangered species and the ESA.⁴ These attacks continue despite the fact that nine out of ten Americans support the Act and want it either strengthened or left unchanged by Congress.⁵

Common among these attacks are calls for increasing state authority to manage threatened and endangered species. The ESA is known as a “law of last resort,”⁶ in that it is only triggered after a state’s efforts to conserve habitat and protect species has fallen short. It is a necessary backstop that provides species with federal protections, typically after decades of decline and after state management has proven insufficient. Since a majority of states lack legal authority and resources to fill the conservation role played by federal wildlife agencies, legislation that seeks to shift back this authority to the states could spell disaster for species.

Introduced by Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.), the “Endangered Species Management Self-Determination Act” would allow governors to take over management of species found only in one state with no requirement that such management be equivalent to ESA protections.⁷ This legislation would severely undermine protections for as many as 1,100 species,⁸ including nearly 500 species in Hawaii alone and at least one species in most states across the country. States would be able to take over management of species perceived to conflict with powerful special interests, provide little to no protection, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)—one of the wildlife agencies in charge of implementing the ESA—would be powerless to intercede.

Another disturbing bill is the “State, Tribal, and Local Species Transparency and Recovery Act,”⁹ which seeks to undermine the Act’s “best available science” standard by automatically deeming any and all information submitted by a state, tribal, or county government as the best available science—even if that information is outdated, incorrect, contradictory, or not supported by peer review. This legislation is completely unnecessary because the ESA already requires the FWS to utilize any data that is considered “best available” in its decision-making.¹⁰

Currently, the majority of state conservation laws are severely inadequate to achieve the ESA’s conservation and recovery goals.¹¹ Only eighteen states have laws that protect all animals and plants covered by the federal ESA, with thirty-two states providing less coverage than the federal statute.¹² West Virginia and Wyoming do not have any endangered species laws, and seventeen states offer no protections for imperiled plants.¹³ And perhaps most concerning is the fact that forty-five states provide very limited or no authority for species recovery planning.¹⁴ Given that a primary goal of the federal ESA is to recover species to the point that they no longer require the Act’s protection, and the fact that almost every single state currently has no authority for such recovery planning is a clear sign that management for imperiled species should not yet be handed back to those states.

In addition to inadequate state laws, many states do not have, or in some instances are unwilling to provide, the funding needed to manage their threatened and endangered species. Hawaii—a state that has over 500 listed species—will spend only $3.5 million in 2017 on endangered species, out of the total budget of $138 million allocated to the Department of Land and Natural Resources.¹⁵ That averages out to less than $7,000 spent on endangered species. By contrast, each of Hawaii’s twenty-two game species will receive around $250,000. Funding for Hawaii’s endangered plants and animals mostly comes from the Federal Government via grants under Section 6 of the Endangered Species Act.¹⁶ Thus, the state itself spends almost none of its own funding on listed species.

Oil-producing states, like Wyoming, are often very hostile towards the ESA because they falsely argue it is a threat to economic development. As a result, they do not prioritize the recovery of endangered species. However, a 2015 paper analyzed over 88,000 ESA consultations since 2008 and found that no projects were stopped because of endangered species.¹⁷ Nonetheless, in FY 2016 Wyoming allocated only $3.2 million—or 5%—of its wildlife budget to the state’s twelve threatened and endangered species. Out of that $3.2 million, 37% was federally-funded, 4% came from the State General Fund, 57% came from Game

---
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and Fish license revenues, and 1% came from nongovernmental grants. Thus, Wyoming only spent $128,000 of its own funding on managing its imperiled species. By contrast, the state spent $54.8 million on its game species.  

Without significant reforms to state wildlife conservation laws and a substantial increase in funding for imperiled wildlife, legislation proposals to cede federal authority over imperiled species back to the states will likely undermine conservation and recovery efforts, lead to a greater number of species declining, and result in fewer species recovered. If states manage their species properly from the onset, it is highly unlikely that the federal government would ever have to step in. The federal ESA is only triggered once a species is at such a critically low level that it would otherwise go extinct if not for the federal protection. Thus, legislation that would cede federal authority to manage threatened and endangered species back to the states should be rejected.
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THE “FOWL” PRACTICE OF HUMANE LABELING: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL STANDARDS GOVERNING CHICKEN WELFARE AND POULTRY LABELING PRACTICES

By LaTravia Smith

ABSTRACT

Chickens raised specifically for meat production are the world’s most intensively farmed land animals. Yet, the existing legal frameworks that regulate the production and labeling of poultry products in the United States allow poultry producers to mistreat chickens, falsely distinguish poultry products, and defraud conscious consumers. This article proposes unique opportunities to improve poultry welfare in the United States’ agricultural industry and offers methods to ensure the accurate labeling of poultry products.

I. INTRODUCTION

“Chickens, whether intelligent or stupid, individual or identical, are sentient beings. They feel pain and experience fear. This, in itself, is enough to make it wrong to cause them pain and suffering.”

Called “broilers” in the poultry industry, chickens raised specifically for meat production are the world’s most intensively farmed land animals. Around 9 billion broilers are raised for slaughter yearly. Broilers are “fed for abnormally fast growth without consideration for their well-being.” For instance, a broiler weighing 5.7 pounds can be produced in just forty-seven days.

Studies have shown that chickens possess significant cognitive skills parallel to the abilities of some mammals. Contrary to popular belief, chickens are intelligent, brave, and sentient beings capable of emotion, numeracy, and self-control. Chickens possess more than twenty vocalizations to communicate, including: predator alerts; mother/baby calls; mating calls; and even calls to communicate the discovery of food.

In the past fifty years, farming operations in the United States have shifted away from small family farms and individualized production to mass production, commonly known as factory farming. These massive, mechanized “megafarms,” also referred to as concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), are more concerned with profit and efficiency to the detriment of an animal’s welfare. Living conditions for chickens in CAFOs are unnatural and inhumane. The minimum size threshold for broiler chickens in a large CAFO consists of “125,000 or more” chickens. According to the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), the minimum space required for a broiler is one-half square-foot per bird. The National Chicken Council (NCC) requires a mere eight-tenths of a square-foot of space per bird. NCC’s guidelines are indeed in excess of the minimum requirement by CAST, which requires one-half of a square-foot to maneuver, however, confined chickens under either requirement spend their lives packed wing-to-wing on floors covered in waste. With little room to spread their wings, it is difficult for chickens to engage in natural behaviors, resulting in physical and mental distress, including crippling bodily injuries.

The conditions in CAFOs have significant impacts on animal welfare and human health. As consumers become aware of the modern husbandry practices of some of today’s farmers, there has been an increase in demand for improved animal welfare. To help lessen the impact of the inhumane practices of the animal agricultural industry, some consumers are willing to pay premium prices for “humane” meats. Some consumers feel that if they pay just a little more they can “have their meat and eat it too.” The leading animal welfare regulations (i.e., Animal Welfare Act, Humane Slaughter Act, and Twenty-Eight Hour Law) do not provide legal definitions for terms like “welfare” or “humane.” There is no specific set of animal welfare standards to substantiate welfare-related labeling claims. Furthermore, the Animal Welfare Act definition of “animal” does not include animals raised for food.

Some companies have exploited the increase in consumer demand for the humane treatment of animals to increase their profits. By simply labeling their products as “humanely raised,” some companies are able to falsely distinguish their products and charge consumers premium prices. There have been instances when “humanely raised” chickens have endured distress, including crippling bodily injuries.

* LaTravia Smith is a LL.M. candidate at Vermont Law School, currently enrolled in the Environmental Law program. LaTravia earned her Juris Doctor from Florida A&M University College of Law (FAMU) where she graduated cum laude and received a certificate in International Human Rights and Global Justice. During law school, she worked as an honors law clerk for the Environmental Protection Agency’s National Enforcement Training Institute in Washington, D.C. She also worked as a Research Assistant for Dean Randall S. Abate. LaTravia received a fellowship from the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration and was recognized as a Next Generation Leader by the American Constitution Society. She also attended Stetson University College of Law Summer Study Abroad program where she studied Comparative Animal Law.
the same deplorable treatment as the average factory farmed chicken.\textsuperscript{30} Meanwhile, purchasers of these so-called “humanely raised” chickens are being deceived by packaging labels and led to believe “all is well in the mythical world of humane animal agriculture.”\textsuperscript{31} False labeling is not only a problem for the poultry industry, but also for consumers and organizations that buy and sell organic products.\textsuperscript{32}

Food labels are of great importance to consumers and producers because the information on food labels helps consumers make educated and informed decisions.\textsuperscript{33} Labels allow companies to advertise the benefits of their products to their target market. For some companies, food labels are the sole method to connect and engage with consumers.\textsuperscript{34} The use of value-added animal welfare claims on products produced from animals raised under conventional factory farming animal welfare standards exploits the time, money, and resources of companies that actually exercise humane care for their animals and properly label their products.\textsuperscript{35} Dishonest companies profit at the expense of the animals, consumers, and to the detriment of the humane farming industry.\textsuperscript{36}

Class action lawsuits have been filed on behalf of consumers against poultry producers for deceptively advertising their poultry products as “humanely raised.”\textsuperscript{37} However, instead of implementing humane reforms, some producers simply agreed to remove the deceptive labeling from their product packaging.\textsuperscript{38} Consumers prevailed in the sense that they are no longer being deceived by some companies, yet the paramount problems at the heart of the “humanely raised” movement still exist.\textsuperscript{39} Farm animals continue to live and die in deplorable conditions. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has yet to promulgate laws protecting poultry from inhumane treatment, and the labeling laws governing poultry products remain inadequate.\textsuperscript{40} In order to truly resolve this issue, there must be federal regulatory reform regarding animal welfare, specifically the implementation of poultry labeling laws and independent oversight.

Section I of this article provides a glimpse into the inhumane life and death of a Perdue Farms’ broiler chicken. It also offers evidence of a company’s willingness to remove misleading labeling without resolving the underlying problem of its inhumane factory farming practices.\textsuperscript{41} Although this article focuses solely on one chicken producer, Perdue Farms, Perdue’s poultry husbandry practices are common throughout the broiler chicken industry.\textsuperscript{42} Section II addresses the lack of poultry protection under existing federal legislation. It also examines the loopholes in the current regulation of labels on poultry products.\textsuperscript{43} Section III of this article examines the deficiencies of the early years of the “organic movement” in relation to the “human movement.” Next, it briefly discusses how the organic industry regulated industry-wide organic standards resulting in a more accurate and unified certification process. Additionally, it explores the benefits derived from being “certified” organic.

Section IV proposes three potential solutions to improve poultry welfare in the agricultural industry: first, amending existing federal animal welfare laws to include poultry; second, establishing methods to ensure the accurate labeling of poultry products including specific guidelines and third-party verification of animal welfare related labeling claims; and third, encouraging voluntary compliance with poultry welfare and labeling laws through incentives.

II. “Humanely Raised” Labels Can Deceive Consumers

This section explores the unveiled truth behind Perdue Farms’ misleading “humanely” labeling. The need for increased poultry welfare standards is demonstrated through an examination of the life and death of Perdue chickens advertised as “humanely raised.” Although this discusses Perdue’s agreement to remove “humanely raised” from its poultry products, it also shows the company’s petition to replace the phrase with another deceptive phrase—indicating the need for a more stringent poultry labeling process. Finally, this section unveils Perdue’s upcoming proposal to improve their animal welfare practices and briefly examines the effectiveness of their voluntary pledge.

A. The Truth About Perdue’s “Humanely Raised” Chickens Exposed

Perdue Farms is a top international food and agricultural producer, providing products and services in over seventy countries.\textsuperscript{44} With annual sales in excess of $6 billion,\textsuperscript{45} Perdue ranks third in poultry industry sales.\textsuperscript{46} Perdue advertised its Harvestland brand of chicken as “humanely raised” and “USDA process verified” when it charged consumers premium prices for the purportedly humane meat.\textsuperscript{47} Perdue Farms’ “humanely raised” claims were based on The National Chicken Council’s guidelines, a trade group for the chicken industry,\textsuperscript{48} whose members consist of chicken producers and processors, fowl processors, distributors, and allied industry firms.\textsuperscript{49} According to the NCC, proper treatment of animals is an ethical obligation.\textsuperscript{50}

Poultry packaging stamped with the USDA’s approval and enhanced with phrases such as “humanely raised”\textsuperscript{51} would lead a reasonable consumer to believe that a Perdue Farms’ Harvestland “humanely raised” chickens lived a “comfortable avian middle-class” lifestyle.\textsuperscript{52} “Doing the right thing is things like treating your chickens humanely,” says Jim Perdue, the Chairman of Perdue Farms, in a promotional video for the company.\textsuperscript{53} In the promotion, Jim Perdue is featured taking a stroll through an immaculate chicken farm.\textsuperscript{54} The advertisement displayed healthy-looking, active, unsoiled chickens, walking around, eating and drinking in a spacious facility with lots of room to move about.\textsuperscript{55}

After almost twenty-two years of raising broiler flocks for Perdue, Craig Watts—a former farmer for Perdue Farms—became frustrated at Perdue’s lack of interest in the welfare of the chickens.\textsuperscript{56} He decided to expose the truth behind Perdue’s “human” labeling claims by allowing Compassion in World Farming, a farm animal advocacy group, to film inside his North Carolina farm, where he raised approximately 720,000 chickens for Perdue every year.\textsuperscript{57} Perdue claimed that the farmer was negligent in caring for his flocks; however, the director of Compassion in World Farming performed an independent analysis and determined Watts was following Perdue’s guidelines “to the letter.”\textsuperscript{58}
1. THE INHUMANE LIFE OF “HUMANELY RAISED” CHICKENS

Watts’ farm contained over 30,000 chickens crammed wing-to-wing on the floor of a dark, windowless grow-out house.60 According to Watts, sometimes years will pass before the barn floor is cleaned for a new flock.61 Processed at only eight to ten weeks of age,62 broilers are genetically manipulated to rapidly produce large pieces of meat,63 which results in numerous health and welfare problems.64 Fast growth has been referred to “in both magnitude and severity, the single most severe, systematic example of man’s inhumanity to another sentient animal.”65

At the time of hatch, a broiler chicken weighs an average of forty grams, and can weigh about 4,000 grams by the time they are only eight weeks old.66 If humans grew at a similar rate, a 3 [kilogram] (6.6 [pounds]) newborn baby would weigh 300 [kilograms] (660 [pounds]) after 2 [months].67 Unfortunately, the skeletal structure of a broiler is unable to support this hasty growth.68 Many suffer from skeletal abnormalities, including leg deformities, which cause lameness and make it difficult to stand and walk, thereby making it often impossible for these creatures to access food and water.69 They spend an inordinate amount of time squatting to alleviate the strain on their debilitated legs.70 As a result, the bellies and chests of almost all the chickens on Watts’ farm feature raw, featherless flesh resembling bedsores, presumably due to ammonia burns from continuous squatting in their own waste.71

In addition to skeletal abnormalities, accelerated growth contributes largely to a vast number of health conditions including: cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease,72 and big liver spleen disease.73 Acute death syndrome is also common in fast-growing broiler chickens.74 Broilers frequently die suddenly of heart attacks or collapsed lungs due to ascites, a condition in which the heart and lungs cannot sufficiently support an overgrown body.75 The poultry industry casually refers to this condition as “flip over disease,”76 because after wing-flapping convulsions, chickens “flip over” and die.77 These health conditions are rarely experienced by chickens living in a natural environment.78 Based on a study by the University of Georgia, poultry farmers typically experience a 3% death rate per flock.79 Thus, a farm that has 30,000 chickens per flock will experience a death rate of about 900 chickens per flock.80

The pain and discomfort chickens endure because of their genetic makeup is compounded by the inhumane living conditions in which Watts’ broilers were raised.81 When crammed together, chickens relentlessly peck each other out of boredom and frustration, resulting in loss of feathers, injuries, and even death.82 Dead chicken carcasses are often left among the living, adding to the stressful and unsanitary living conditions.83 The high ammonia levels from the waste irritate and burn their eyes, skin, and throat.84 To reduce the effects of confinement, chickens are often forced to undergo a series of mutilations, including the partial removal of beaks and toes.85 These painful procedures are typically performed without anesthesia.86

2. DEATH OF A BROILER

In the United States, approximately nine billion chickens and other poultry are slaughtered for consumption each year.87 The journey from the chicken farm to the slaughterhouse can be hundreds of miles long.88 The Twenty-Eight Hour Law Regulating the Interstate Transportation of Livestock prohibits the confinement of animals in vehicles of vessels for more than twenty-eight consecutive hours without food, water, and rest when being transported across state lines for slaughter.89 However, the Twenty-Eight Hour Law excludes poultry.90 Thus, chickens on their way to slaughter could remain cramped in their crates through extreme temperatures without food, water, or rest.91

Upon arrival at the slaughterhouse, the broilers are often stunned to incapacitate them in an Electric Immobilization System, a low electricity water bath.92 Sadly, many birds remain conscious due to inadequate stunning.93 After being dipped in the stunning tank, the birds’ throats are cut by a mechanical blade.94 Finally, broilers are dipped into scalding-hot water to remove their feathers.95 These birds often defecate in the scalding tanks, contaminating the birds that follow, which are then condemned due to adulteration and cannot be sold.96 As previously mentioned, Perdue based its “humanely raised” claims based on the animal welfare guidelines established by the NCC.97 However, as evidenced by Watts’ farm, these conditions are not quite what the reasonable consumers would consider to be humane.98

B. DECEPTIVE ADVERTISEMENT SUITS LEADS TO REMOVAL OF LABELS

In response to Perdue falsely advertising its chickens as “humanely raised,” two class action lawsuits were filed by The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) on behalf of New Jersey and Florida customers who purchased Perdue Farms’ Harvestland chicken.99 The plaintiffs alleged that Perdue preyed on consumers’ increasing sensitivity to animal cruelty and charged premium prices for so-called “humanely raised” chickens that were in reality subjected to extreme pain and harsh living conditions.100 Perdue rejected the allegations and insisted its labels were not misleading.101 Nevertheless, Perdue agreed to remove the labels from its packaging.102 In exchange, the HSUS agreed to dismiss with prejudice the Complaint alleging misleading labeling claims.103

In a similar class action lawsuit, consumers alleged Kroger, one of the world’s largest supermarket chains, misled consumers and violated California consumer protection laws by ironically falsely labeling it Simple Truth brand chicken.104 Kroger labeled its Simple Truth chicken as cage-free, insinuating their chickens were superior to competitors even though broiler chickens raised for meat are not raised in cages.105 Perdue Farms is the chicken supplier for Kroger.106

After much unfavorable media coverage, Perdue unveiled it will begin overhauling its animal welfare practices.107 Accordingly, Perdue plans to improve the conditions on its broiler farms to allow their chickens to live higher quality lives.108 Perdue will install windows in their grow-out houses,
provide more space in their barns, and put their chickens to sleep before slaughter.\textsuperscript{108} In addition, Perdue "may tinker with breeding to decrease the speed at which birds grow or to reduce their breast size, steps that could decrease the number and severity of leg injuries."\textsuperscript{109} Unfortunately, there are no regulations to guide the poultry producer, thus they are left to regulate themselves in accordance with their own volition.\textsuperscript{110}

III. THE LACK OF EXISTING LEGAL PROTECTION FOR POULTRY

In the United States, chickens are raised and slaughtered for food more than all other farm animals combined,\textsuperscript{111} yet they lack protection under federal and state laws.\textsuperscript{112} For instance, a veterinarian from the USDA allowed the owners of Ward Egg Range, an egg farm in San Diego County, California, to dispose of over 30,000 live spent egg-laying hens by tossing them into a wood-chipper.\textsuperscript{113} The District Attorney referred to the use of a wood-chipper to dispose of live spent hens as "following professional advice" and refused to prosecute the owners.\textsuperscript{114} Tossing live chickens into a wood chipper did not violate any federal or state laws; therefore, no crime was committed.\textsuperscript{115}

This section examines the lack of coverage for poultry under existing federal animal welfare legislation and poultry labeling laws. It then discusses the relevant regulatory agencies and the roles they play in the regulation of poultry products. Finally, it examines federal initiatives that have been taken to improve poultry production and labeling practices.

A. LACK OF COVERAGE UNDER THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) provides that "minimum standards of care and treatment be provided for certain animals bred for commercial sale, used in research, transported commercially, or exhibited to the public."\textsuperscript{116} It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate "transport, sale, and handling" of specific covered animals.\textsuperscript{117} The AWA's definition of "animal" was amended in 1970 to include "warm-blooded animals generally used for research, testing, experimentation or exhibition, or as pets . . ."\textsuperscript{118} However, despite being warm-blooded,\textsuperscript{119} chickens and other animals farmed for food and fiber lack protection under this law.\textsuperscript{120}

B. THE USDA'S FAILURE TO REQUIRE THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF POULTRY

The Humane Slaughter Act of 1958 (HMSA or "Act") was designed to decrease the suffering of livestock during slaughter.\textsuperscript{121} In drafting the HMSA of 1958, Congress declared:

[T]he use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock prevents needless suffering; results in safer and better working conditions for persons engaged in the slaughtering industry; brings about improvement of products and economies in slaughtering operations; and produces other benefits for producers, processors, and consumers which tend to expedite an orderly flow of livestock and livestock products in interstate and foreign commerce.\textsuperscript{122}

The HMSA of 1958 contains three principal provisions. First, the Act specifies that "cattle, calves, horses, mules, sheep, swine, and other livestock . . . are rendered insensible to pain by a single blow or gunshot or an electrical, chemical or other means that is rapid and effective, before being shackled, hoisted, thrown, cast, or cut."\textsuperscript{123} The HMSA of 1958 did not define the phrase "other livestock."\textsuperscript{124} Second, the HMSA authorized the Secretary of Agriculture "to designate methods of slaughter and of handling . . . with respect to each species of livestock."\textsuperscript{125} Third, in an enforcement provision that was later repealed and replaced in 1978, the HMSA of 1958 prohibited the federal government from purchasing inhumanely slaughtered livestock.\textsuperscript{126} Congress amended the HMSA of 1958 with a more general, yet stronger enforcement mechanism, the HMSA of 1978.\textsuperscript{127} The amendment, a separate and distinct law from the HMSA of 1958,\textsuperscript{128} required "that meat inspected and approved be produced only from livestock slaughtered in accordance with [the Act]."\textsuperscript{129}

In 1978, provisions of the HMSA of 1958 were incorporated into the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) making humane slaughter of livestock mandatory for all federally inspected slaughterhouses engaged in interstate commerce.\textsuperscript{130} The HMSA of 1978 eliminated the reference to "other livestock" and instead provided a list of animals to which the humane standards applied.\textsuperscript{131} The list was limited to "cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines," explicitly excluding poultry.\textsuperscript{132} The incorporation of the HMSA of 1958 provisions into the FMIA made FMIA's criminal penalties applicable to facilities that failed to comply with humane slaughter requirements.\textsuperscript{133}

In 2005, the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), the public health agency within USDA, issued a Federal Register Notice titled "Treatment of Live Poultry Before Slaughter."\textsuperscript{134} In the Notice, the FSIS acknowledged that employing humane methods of handling and slaughtering poultry decreases the likelihood of adulteration.\textsuperscript{135} Nevertheless, the FSIS announced, "there is no specific federal humane handling and slaughter statute for poultry" thus declaring that the HMSA did not require the humane handling and slaughtering of poultry.\textsuperscript{136} It simply recommended that poultry be treated humanely to avoid "adulteration."\textsuperscript{137}

In response to the Notice issuance, the HSUS filed suit against the USDA.\textsuperscript{138} The HSUS alleged that the Notice was erroneous because the 1958 HMSA, as applied to "other livestock," was valid and included poultry.\textsuperscript{139} The HSUS alleged, as a result of the Notice, the majority of animals slaughtered for consumption in USDA-inspected slaughterhouses lacked federal protection. Consequently, poultry processors were granted permission to slaughter poultry inhumanely without violating federal law.\textsuperscript{140} The USDA denied having the legal authority to protect poultry under the HMSA.\textsuperscript{141} The agency asserted that the meaning of "other livestock," was ambiguous as to both the statutory text and the legislative history.\textsuperscript{142} In vacating the
district court’s decision due to lack of standing, the Ninth Circuit noted that “[c]ongressional debate revealed views favoring both interpretations . . . one that would include chickens, turkeys, and other domestic fowl within its expanse and one that would preclude such inclusiveness.”143 This language indicates the USDA may indeed have the authority to include poultry under the HMSA.144

C. LEGAL LOOPHOLES IN POULTRY LABELING LAWS

The USDA is responsible for ensuring that “poultry products distributed to them are wholesome, not adulterated, and properly marked, labeled, and packaged.”145 The FSIS is charged with inspecting poultry products capable for human consumption,146 and establishing the poultry product labeling policy to ensure that products are not mislabeled.147 The FSIS derives its authority to regulate poultry product labeling under the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA), implemented by the Secretary of Agriculture.148

Congress enacted the PPIA of 1957 in response to the significant growth in the poultry industry.149 Modeled after the FMIA, the PPIA expressly recognized that as a fundamental source of the nation’s food supply, it is necessary to the health and welfare of consumers to ensure poultry products that enter or substantially affect commerce are “wholesome, not adulterated, and properly marked, labeled, and packaged.”150 Congress acknowledged the effects that mislabeled poultry products have on the market; the potential to undermine the regulation of interstate commerce; and the resulting harm to consumers and public welfare alike.151 As a result, poultry product labels must be approved before being applied to poultry products and offered for sale.152 Like the FMIA, violators of the PPIA face suspension of mandatory inspection, imprisonment of up to one year, or a fine of up to $1,000.153 The PPIA also allows for imprisonment up to three years, and/or a fine of up to $10,000 if there is “intent to defraud” or adulterated products are involved.154

One of the key provisions of the statute states, “no person shall . . . sell, transport, offer for sale . . . in commerce . . . any poultry products which are capable of use as human food and are adulterated or misbranded . . . .”155 According to the PPIA, a poultry product is considered adulterated:

- if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance or is for any other reason unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food; if it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health; if it is, in whole or in part, the product of any poultry which has died otherwise than by slaughter.156

- For example, poultry that arrives at the slaughterhouse post-mortem would be considered adulterated and thus condemned.157

The causal connection between inhumane treatment and adulterated poultry led the FSIS to develop a directive instructing Public Health Veterinarians (PHVs) and inspection program personnel on “how to perform ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection of poultry and of the conditions under which the birds are processed,” to assist in preventing adulterated poultry products from entering commerce.160 The directive outlines the operating procedures that federal poultry plants (FPP) must follow to “ensure sanitary processing, proper inspection, and the production of poultry products that are not adulterated.”161

Per the directive, processors are required to handle all live birds humanely, in accordance with good commercial practices (GCP).162 However, the FSIS neglected to develop GCP guidelines for producers to follow and failed to implement adequate oversight to ensure compliance.163 Relying instead upon standard poultry industry practices,164 the FSIS simply addressed the verification process as it related to GCP for processing poultry based on the company’s GCP records.165

Compliance with these requirements is supposed to ensure that poultry are treated humanely.166 However, per the directive, establishments are not required to keep or maintain GCP records.167 If an establishment does not keep or maintain GCP records, or the records lack sufficient information to determine whether the establishment is following GCP, inspection personnel are to observe the FPP’s poultry line process.168 If inspection personnel determine that the establishment is not following GCP—for instance, they observe mistreatment or birds dying by means other than by slaughter—they merely document the violation on a Noncompliance Record (NCR) and meet with the FPP to discuss remedial plans on behalf of the establishment.169 Between the aforementioned shortcomings of this seemingly comprehensive existing legal framework and the minimal disincentives for violators, FPPs have little reason to abide by the GCP.170

Oversight of GCP in FPPs is “infrequent and uneven among USDA field offices.”171 Even though the USDA’s policy is to audit all the FPP’s over an eighteen-month period, “only 21% of federal poultry plants received a formal GCP review.”172 Furthermore, “there was no documentation regarding GCP activities of any kind at approximately half of all federal poultry plants during the 18-month period.”173 This verification system exemplifies inconsistent oversight and ineffective use of resources resulting in the continued abuse of poultry and labeling laws.174

According to the PPIA, poultry products are considered to be misbranded “if [their] labeling is false or misleading.”175 If a product is determined to be misbranded under the PPIA, the FSIS can impose a range of penalties including: rescinding or withholding the approval of misleading labels; prohibiting shipment of the product through seizure; prohibiting sale through detention; requesting a recall of the product; issuing press releases and/or fines; and criminal prosecution.176

The FSIS developed the Animal Production Claims Outline of Current Process (“The Guidance”), which is a labeling guidance designed to protect consumers from false animal welfare claims as they pertain to meat, poultry, and egg products.177 Correspondingly,
the FSIS Statement of Interim Labeling Guidance Documentation Needed to Substantiate Animal Production Claims for Label Submission (“The Interim Guidance”) elaborates on the labeling approval process. In accordance with The Interim Guidance, the FSIS requires a producer to show:

1. [a] detailed written protocol explaining controls for assuring the production claim from birth to harvest. If purchased, include protocol information from the supplier;
2. [a] signed affidavit declaring the specifics of the animal production claim(s) and that the claims are not false or misleading;
3. [p] products tracing and segregation mechanism from time of slaughter through further processing for wholesale or retail distribution; and
4. [a] protocol for the identification, control, and segregation of non-conforming animals/products.

When a producer submits an application to use the phrase “humanely raised” (or a derivative term), the FSIS determines whether the description of the producer’s conditions on its farm qualify as humane. Again, there are no set guidelines to verify whether a producer’s declarations constitute a “humane” claim. The Guidance merely states, “[t]he documentation must support the claims.” The Interim Guidance allows the company or producer to define animal welfare claims according to guidelines established by the NCC. FSIS agents do not visit farms to ensure that humane labeling claims are aligned with on-farm practices. The approval is based solely on the documentation provided by the producer. The lack of oversight contributes to inhumane on-farm conditions.

IV. LESSONS FROM THE ORGANIC INDUSTRY

This section explores how the humane farming industry can learn from the organic farming industry. It discusses the similarities between the early years of the “organic movement” and the deficiencies of the current “humane movement.” Next, it will briefly discuss how the organic industry unified the standards among producers, handlers, and state and private certification organizations. Additionally, it explores the benefits derived from being “certified organic.”

Much like the “humane movement,” the “organic movement” was a response to industrialized farming practices. As consumers became aware of environmental and health concerns associated with modern agriculture, the demand for safer and more natural foods increased. Initially, each state or certifying agency established its own “organic” standards. Similar to the chicken industry, this decentralized self-regulating approach caused a lack of clarity and inconsistency among organic products. The organic industry petitioned Congress—requesting a definitive definition for the term “organic.” After evaluating the problems associated with organic food regulation, Congress acknowledged that the inconsistencies caused consumer confusion and recognized the need for federal action. Congress further recognized that the premium prices producers could charge for organic products provided an incentive for false or misleading labeling.

As a result, Congress passed the Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA), which mandated the USDA to develop and write regulations that unified the differing standards among producers, handlers, and state and private certification organizations. The USDA implemented the National Organic Program (NOP), a verification process responsible for overseeing organic farmers and businesses to assure consumers that organically certified products meet a consistent standard. NOP established the requirements for how organic products are grown, processed, handled, and also labeled.

Unlike “humane care standards,” the USDA organic standards describe in detail the means by which organic farmers may grow crops and raise livestock. To become certified, organic farmers, ranchers, and food processors must adopt and adhere to a specific set of guidelines. These standards cover the product from farm to table, including soil and water quality, pest control, livestock practices, and rules for food additives. To become “certified organic,” the operation submits an application, which is then reviewed by certifying agents, consisting of state, private, or foreign entities accredited by the USDA. The application must include: “(1) a detailed description of operation to be certified; (2) a history of substances applied to the land in the previous three years; (3) the organic products grown, raised, or processed; and (4) a written organic plan describing the practices and substances to be used.”

The costs for organic certification vary depending on the type, size, and complexity of the organic operation and the cost for the certifying agent. For example, California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF), an organic certifying agency, collects fees for first-time certification. The fees are derived from three main areas: (1) a one-time application fee; (2) an annual inspection fee; and (3) an annual certification fee based on the “Gross Organic Production Value (GOPV)” of the operation. Organic operations can recover the cost of organic certification in several ways. First, the Agricultural Marketing Service Organic Certification Cost Share Programs such as the National Organic Certification Cost Share Program (NOCCSP) help defray the costs associated with organic certification. Once certified, eligible organic operations can be reimbursed up to 75% of the cost of certification. Organic operations are also able to factor in the costs of production, enhanced environmental protection, and animal welfare standards into organic price premiums to supplement the cost of production.

V. PROPOSAL TO ENHANCE POULTRY WELFARE AND LABELING LAWS

The inhumane treatment of poultry in the agricultural industry is facilitated by the lack of protection under federal legislation. To ensure comprehensive results that will protect the farmers who follow humane husbandry practices, consumers who purchase humane products, and the birds—there needs to be reform of animal welfare laws, poultry labeling laws, and also an implementation of third party verification programs.

This section proposes three potential remedies to improve poultry welfare in the agricultural industry. First, amending
existing federal animal welfare laws to include poultry; second, adopting methods to ensure the accurate labeling of poultry products including establishing specific guidelines and third-party verification of animal welfare related labeling claims; and third, developing incentives to promote voluntary compliance with poultry welfare and labeling laws.

A. Amend Existing Animal Welfare Laws to Include Poultry

In 2014, broiler sales in the U.S. rose 6% from the previous year with sales totaling $32.7 billion, and a per capita consumption of 83.48 pounds. These figures reflect the substantial effect poultry has on interstate commerce. Based on the vast quantities of chickens used for food, chickens arguably suffer more abuse than any other animal. Yet, chickens are not deemed to be animals under the definition of the AWA. The abuse endured by these innocent birds as well as the substantial effect that poultry and other warm-blooded farm animals have on interstate commerce warrant, at the very least, the minimum protections provided by the AWA.

Expanding the definition of “animal” under the AWA to include poultry and animals raised for food is imperative to the improvement of poultry and animal welfare. To officially declare a chicken as an “animal” deserving of respect and protection under the AWA would help mitigate the abuse of broilers in the farming industry. As it stands, continued omission of poultry (and other animals raised for food) under the AWA permits farmers to continue to abuse chickens without consequence.

Additionally, requiring GCP compliance to reduce product adulteration is an inadequate attempt to improve poultry welfare standards without amending the HMSA. To ensure poultry receive sufficient coverage under federal legislation, the USDA must use its statutory authority to promulgate regulations to amend the HMSA to include poultry under “other livestock.” Further, requiring poultry to be rendered unconscious prior to slaughter would reduce the unnecessary suffering of broilers during the slaughtering process, decrease the likelihood of adulteration associated with inhumane handling, improve working conditions for slaughterhouse employees as well as increase the overall finished product.

Considering the HMSA was designed in part to protect animals used for food from inhumane slaughter, improve worker health and safety, and enhance products and economies in slaughtering—omitting poultry from its coverage is inherently contradictory and undermines its very purpose.

Focusing solely on the regulation of poultry through an advertisement-based approach to improve poultry welfare will not help to enhance the treatment of chickens used for food production. Advertisement-based challenges can be applied against producers who falsely market their poultry products or mislead consumers by failing to disclose information. Meanwhile, producers who make no such welfare related claims remain free to treat their chickens cruelly.

An animal welfare-based approach protects the animals through established federal welfare standards. This is not to say that an advertisement-based regulatory approach will not prove beneficial in the improvement of poultry welfare. When used in conjunction with a welfare-based approach, advertisement–based regulations can serve as a supplemental safeguard to protect consumers and discourage companies from deceptive labeling.

B. Promulgate Poultry Welfare Standards Under Provisions of the Poultry Products Inspection Act

Though the USDA’s authority to include poultry under the HMSA has yet to be determined, the USDA nevertheless, possesses the authority to regulate inhumane handling and the slaughter of poultry under provisions of the PPIA. The PPIA grants the USDA the authority to promulgate regulations not only to improve the way chickens are raised and slaughtered, but also to improve poultry product labeling. To assist in preventing future poultry abuses, there are a few areas in the validation process where if precautionary measures are taken, the purposes of the PPIA would be fulfilled, and poultry welfare would be enhanced. Pursuant to the PPIA, “no person shall . . . sell, transport, offer for sale . . . in commerce . . . any poultry products which are capable of use as human food and are adulterated or misbranded.” The USDA has expressly acknowledged, through issuances of official notices and directives, the causal connection between inhumane handling of poultry and adulterated poultry products. The conventional electric immobilization system has proven to be inadequate in rendering broilers unconscious prior to slaughter, thus resulting in the unnecessary condemnation of millions of birds. To reduce the probability of adulteration and the needless suffering of broiler chickens, the USDA, through its regulatory authority granted by the PPIA, should require a more humane slaughter method rather than allow for the continued use of the conventional immobilization system.

One alternative USDA-approved method of slaughter is “controlled-atmosphere killing” (CAK). CAK can diminish numerous animal welfare problems such as adulteration and work-related injuries and health risks associated with the handling and processing of live birds. With CAK, birds remain in their transport crates while oxygen is slowly eliminated from the atmosphere and replaced with a nonpoisonous gas. Birds are dead prior to being removed from their crate; therefore, the birds are already dead when handled by workers. CAK can improve the quality of the meat because there is less bruising and hemorrhaging, thus lowering the chance of adulteration.

One objection to using CAK is the cost associated with its implementation. However, return on investment (ROI) can be reached and surpassed within a few years. Accordingly, considering the minimization of the animal suffering, the reduction of the probability of adulteration, and minimal ROI, the USDA should require the use of CAK or comparable methods to be used in substitution of conventional immobilization slaughter methods.

According to the PPIA, poultry products are considered to be misbranded “if its labeling is false or misleading.” Based on the conditions of J. Craig Watts’ farm, consumers felt Perdue
Farms’ Harvestland “humanely raised” chicken labeling was clearly false and misleading. As demonstrated, the lack of definitive legal definitions for poultry producers to adhere to will assist in achieving national uniformity for humane farming and labeling claims from CAFOs, as conditions in CAFOs have been proven to be inhumane to say the least. Moreover, the USDA needs to develop an animal welfare labeling claim, requiring definitive definitions for animal welfare claims are necessary to provide: “(1) meaningful, verifiable standards; (2) consistency of meaning and of the verification process; (3) transparency, including the public availability of standards; (4) independence from users of the label; (5) opportunity for public comment.” Unlike the self-regulating standards imposed by the NCC, true third-party programs are independent of the companies they are certifying, which produce less biased results.

An example of successful third-party verification is the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). Illegal fishing and unsustainable harvesting has resulted in concealing the reality of overfishing and distorting the true retail availability of certain species from consumers. This phenomenon results in the mislabeling of fish and seafood products. MSC, an international third-party certification and verification organization, collaborates with scientists, fisheries, seafood producers, and brands to promote sustainable fishing and safeguard seafood supplies.
for the future. The MSC has made significant progress in their attempts to address the problem of unsustainable fishing to ensure the proper labeling of fish and seafood products. Through sustainable fishery management techniques that emphasize oversight, control, surveillance, and enforcement—the MSC has been able to significantly reduce the amount of falsely labeled seafood, while promoting the sustainability of wildlife fisheries.

To be MSC certified, companies must meet the MSC Standard, which consists of three core principles: (1) sustainable fish stocks; (2) minimizing environmental impact; and (3) effective management. Fisheries must be managed to maintain the structure, productivity, and diversity of the ecosystem. Fisheries must also have a system in place to ensure they can respond to declining fish populations. The MSC manages a second standard called the Chain of Custody for traceability. A certification body independent of both the fishery and the MSC performs a traceability audit for each business along every link in the supply chain to ensure they meet the MSC Chain of Custody standard. The Chain of Custody team performs various trace back exercises to make sure that a product sold as certified can be demonstrated to come from a certified source. They follow a product through the supply chain from point of sale to the consumer and then back to the fishery. To ensure businesses remain in compliance with MSC standards, a certification body conducts random, unannounced, and short-notice audits. In addition, third-party consultants perform DNA testing which has shown that less than 1% of MSC eco-labeled product samples have been found to be incorrectly labeled. By comparison, a survey of 1,200 seafood products throughout the United States showed that 33% were mislabeled. Seafood products can only display the blue MSC eco-label if the product can be traced back through the supply chain to a fishery that has been certified under the MSC standard.

The FSIS can develop a model similar to that of the MSC’s model of certification and verification to ensure that products that are labeled as “humanely raised” are independently certified and continuously verified to ensure they live up to their animal welfare claims. The USDA must improve oversight by requiring unannounced, random audits at farms and processing plants. This would minimize inconsistencies, fraud, and discourage retailers from falsely labeling poultry products. In addition, the FSIS should perform unannounced audits on independent third-party certifiers by accompanying certifiers onsite and monitoring the certification and verification process as well as reviewing certification applications to ensure third-party certifiers are enforcing federal standards.

The FSIS’s current process for approving animal welfare and environmental label claims lacks transparency—both in the manner that information travels from producers to the FSIS and how information travels from the FSIS to consumers. Transparency would promote accountability within the poultry farming industry. However, ag-gag laws (laws that criminalize whistleblowers by prohibiting the making of undercover videos) can make it difficult to establish liability and trust within the industry. Third-party verification can facilitate transparency between interested parties and poultry producers asserting animal welfare claims on their label. For example, consumers can evaluate the details of The Global Animal Partnership’s five-step animal welfare rating program on their website or that of any partnering third-party certifier.

D. Develop Incentives and Enforce Penalties to Encourage Compliance

Compliance can be promoted when companies are evaluated and rewarded for their positive compliance performances. When coupled with strict governmental enforcement of penalties, compliance incentives would further reinforce the USDA’s effort to require the humane handling of live birds. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) based on sound ethics and core values can be a valuable tool in helping companies gain a competitive advantage. Food companies are prime targets for public concern over perceived CSR deficiencies, particularly regarding animal welfare, health, safety, and labor. As demonstrated by the substantial growth in the humane farming industry, the social behavior of companies influences consumer purchasing decisions, which can directly affect a company’s bottom-line. Consumers often exercise their economic vote by refusing to purchase items from companies that have a poor reputation. Whereas conscious companies that have a reputation for being socially responsible attract conscious consumers.

Poultry producers are essentially agents of trust. Trust assures consumers that the premium prices paid for “humanely” labeled poultry products reflect the cost of operating a humane farm and contribute to the improved welfare of animals. Consumers expect that labels are truthful and reliable. A breach of trust often results in lawsuits, consumer protests, and product boycotts. CSR helps establish, or in some cases re-establish, trust in a company and their products.

Poultry farmers are able to revamp their reputations through reforming farming practices that result in the humane treatment of birds. This beneficial measure is capable of increasing a company’s popularity while establishing a positive relationship with the public. For example, Tyson Foods, Inc., a world leading poultry producer, received an “A” from the Global Reporting Initiative, a world-recognized organization that promotes economic, environmental, and social sustainability. As a result, there has been a positive correlation between the company’s CSR efforts and the public’s perception of the company. The company has since experienced an increase in profits and an improvement in the company’s reputation.

Implementing a Cost Share Program similar to the National Organic Certification Cost Share Program (NOCCSP) and the Agricultural Management Assistance (AMA) to reimburse farmers for the cost to become “Certified Humane” is a great way to encourage poultry producers to implement more humane farming practices. Many producers are not “Certified Humane” because of the associated cost with becoming certified, which consists of: an application fee, the cost to make the necessary changes to
enhance the farm to qualify as humane, and the cost of annual inspections.\textsuperscript{289} Once certified, eligible humane operations can be reimbursed a percentage of the certification cost.\textsuperscript{290} Since there are costs associated with operating a certified humane farm, certified humane producers, like certified organic producers, are justified in charging premium prices to recuperate the cost of enhanced animal welfare standards.\textsuperscript{291} For example, conventional chicken can cost around $2.48 per pound, while the cost of organic chicken can range around $4.42, a 78% price increase.\textsuperscript{292}

The existing procedure for evaluating and penalizing companies for GCP violations does not effectively deter inhumane handling of poultry during processing.\textsuperscript{293} Although the FSIS’s policy is to review all processing plants, “oversight of GCP in plants that handle birds is infrequent and uneven among [the] USDA field offices.”\textsuperscript{294} The USDA must take major enforcement actions demanding that food companies comply with GCP or otherwise, be penalized for noncompliance.

One of the key problems in determining whether a facility is following GCP results from the lack of clear and precise GCP guidelines.\textsuperscript{295} The FSIS never officially recognized a set of clear-cut guidelines to assess whether a producer’s GCP records or actions throughout the predetermined areas of the plant coincide with GCP standards.\textsuperscript{296} Per the directive, processors are required to handle all live birds humanely.\textsuperscript{297} The directive requires that poultry slaughter be done in accordance with good commercial practices (GCP).\textsuperscript{298} Because of this deficiency, producers are left to simply comply with discretionary industry standards set by the NCC.\textsuperscript{299} The FSIS simply addressed the verification process.\textsuperscript{300} Moreover, not requiring establishments to keep or maintain accurate GCP records is detrimental to the verification process and indicative of the insignificance of poultry welfare in the food industry.\textsuperscript{301} Establishing clear criteria specifying precisely what GCP entails will not only aid in accurately verifying a producer’s claims, it will also formally establish a minimum standard for the humane handling of live birds throughout the agricultural process.\textsuperscript{302}

In recognition of the causal connection between humane handling and adulterated products, the FSIS must use its regulatory authority to revise the directive to first specify what GCP entails and then require establishments to keep and accurately maintain GCP records for proper verification. In addition, inspectors should also be required to observe the predetermined areas of the plant to reinforce compliance.\textsuperscript{303} The PPIA reinforces the purpose behind enacting GCP, which is to eliminate adulterated poultry products from entering interstate commerce.\textsuperscript{304}

The directive requires poultry processors to handle chickens humanely, suggesting that even if the FSIS did not have the authority to include chickens under the term “other livestock,” it nonetheless had the authority to require the humane handling of chickens during processing derived from the authority granted by the PPIA.\textsuperscript{305}

Based on the conditions of J. Craig Watts’ farm, Perdue Farms’ Harvestland chickens were not “humanely raised.”\textsuperscript{306} This label was false, deceiving, and misleading, yet the FSIS has not imposed any of PPIA’s penalties against Perdue Farms.\textsuperscript{307} In order to effectively deter the use of misleading labels, the FSIS must utilize the enforcement provisions of the PPIA to deter the use of misleading labels and protect consumers from misbranded poultry products.

## VI. Conclusion

The lack of existing legal protections for poultry under current animal welfare legislation facilitates the abuse of birds used in food production. Loopholes in existing poultry labeling laws along with inadequate oversight of the certification and verification of “humane” labeling allows companies to mislead consumers with little consequence. It is necessary to first define an animal welfare standard and then implement specific guidelines for producers to abide by.

The USDA must exercise its authority to prevent adulterated poultry products from entering interstate commerce by establishing clear animal welfare standards for poultry. The establishment of separate and distinct laws specifically designed to enhance poultry welfare would be ideal. However, the USDA could utilize existing federal laws to advance the treatment of poultry while protecting consumers. By reforming the AWA and the HMSA, along with the application of the PPIA, the USDA can improve the welfare of chickens used in agriculture and also protect consumers from companies that choose to falsely advertise their products as humane.
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This is Not the Bee’s Knees: A Critical View of the Government’s Lack of Policy to Conserve the Pollinators

By Savannah Pugh*

Fifteen billion dollars of the food industry comes from plants pollinated by honeybees—that’s about one-third of the food industry.¹ Though unwelcome visitors at picnics, bees are vital to the ecosystem.² Honeybees act as predictors to the health of the planet. More bees mean more pollination, greater crop yields, and a healthier ecosystem; whereas, a decline in bee populations is a sign of a sick earth. There has been a 90% decline in bee populations in the last twenty years.³ Ninety percent of the plants on our planet require pollinators to transfer pollen and help them reproduce.⁴ Some flora even require a certain bee species for pollination,⁵ and with the common honeybee entering the list of endangered species in 2016,⁶ the outlook is grim. Bees are dying at an alarming rate due to pesticides, mites, global warming, and a plethora of other issues.⁷ To correct the plight of the bees, legal solutions must be considered. The protections created by Article Seven, Chapter Eleven of the United States Code—which make the importation of sick bees or at-risk bees illegal—and the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Actions to Protect Pollinators report, are insufficient.⁸

Forty-two percent of beekeepers report that their bees have been affected by mites.⁹ The Varroa mite came from China, and bees in the United States have no immunity to it.¹⁰ The mite is an apex predator to the pollinators. The mite sucks the blood from adult bees, and when it comes into contact with larvae, the mite sucks the nutrients from the larvae and causes the baby bees to be born without wings or legs.¹¹ The mites spread from colony to colony by attaching to worker bees, who lose their way due to the interference of pesticides, and end up at different colonies than their home.¹² While colonies were once able to fight off infestation of the mites, the addition of insecticides weaken the bees to the point that they cannot keep the mites at bay.¹³

Thirteen percent of beekeepers noted that their bees were being threatened by pesticides causing bee die-offs to reach up to 50% of the colony per year in 2015.¹⁴ These pesticides are hard for bees to detect, and once exposed to them, the bees develop physiological effects that make their survival far more difficult.¹⁵ These chemicals cause the pollinators to suffer from slow development rates to the extent that they do not reach maturity at their regular rate, and the pesticides further interfere with feeding behavior. Additionally, the chemicals perturb the bees’ foraging patterns—the bees who have come in contact with the insecticides cannot remember their normal pollination routes, and never make it back to their hive.¹⁶ Neonicatoids have been outlawed in Europe, and European bees seem to be faring better than U.S. bees in 2017.¹⁷ While the pesticides do not directly kill the bees, they are sub-lethal stressors that make their lives almost impossible.¹⁸

Temperature changes throughout the globe have caused and will continue to cause a myriad of problems. Global warming increases the temperature, changes rainfall patterns, and increases extreme weather patterns. These changes are major stressors for honeybees, which are susceptible to climatic changes.¹⁹ With cold weather coming at different times in the year than centuries before, hibernation patterns have been disrupted, in some cases causing bees to miss out on valuable spring time pollination.²⁰ Climate change has also disrupted the flight patterns of many bee species.²¹ The combination of climate change with industrial agriculture has led to the destruction of many habitats and species of flora.²² Bee diversity has dropped 23%—even the common honeybee is endangered today.²³

On June 20, 2014, President Barack Obama published a memorandum calling for the creation of a federal strategy to promote the health of pollinators.²⁴ The plan called into action a task force to be co-chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, that was charged with developing a strategy with explicit goals to measure progress.²⁵ However, the plan reduced the honeybee problem to a seven-page document with no real goals. It states that the government will work in-house to solve the problem and will allow the Agricultural Research Service to convert four laboratories into specialized bee labs.²⁶ These labs may enter into formal agreements with non-Federal entities for grants and agreements for bee research.²⁷ The main goal of these research facilities will be to develop new miticides to interrupt the lifecycle of the Varroa mite.²⁸

The Health of the Honeybee plan does not create any new laws or standards; rather, it calls on honeybee keepers to voluntarily send tracked losses of their hives to the EPA.²⁹ It also implores each state to create a pollinator plan, but gives no deadline or incentive for the states to do so.³⁰ The only legal solution for honeybees to date is Title Seven of the United States Code, which merely restricts the importation of foreign honeybees into the states in an effort to halt the spread of Varroa mites.³¹ Rather than calling for a ban on the neonicatoid pesticides that are known to make bees sick, the plan instead requires companies to

* J.D. Candidate 2020, American University Washington College of Law
label pesticides with a warning to consumers that the pesticide has been proven to be dangerous to pollinators. The government’s legal involvement has done nothing to hold any state or federal entity responsible, and instead pleads that private citizens volunteer and make choices for their community. Instead of creating a comprehensive plan to combat the problem, the document reads as a petition to the public to act. This implies that the government is not going to do more to protect the honeybee or other pollinators. The problem of bee die-off is catastrophic. Bees pollinate most of our planet—they are a keystone species, and they are what hold most ecosystems together. The United States needs to ban the pesticides known to cause bee illness—only then will the honeybees be able to fight off the mites that are decimating their population. The Federal Government must draft a comprehensive plan to combat the problem with serious consequences for offenders and manufacturers of dangerous pesticides. With human development accelerating at an exponential rate, international trade and industrial farming pose some of the biggest risks to bees via the spread of invasive predatory species and overuse of pesticides. Every beekeeper should be entitled to relief; therefore, farmers should not have to volunteer their information to the government research facilities to be eligible for help. Additionally, manufacturers should be held responsible for the consequences of their actions, or their products should be outlawed entirely. To save the bees we cannot sit back and hope that the problem will solves itself—we must act aggressively and with purpose because their lives, and ours, depend on it.
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The Farts Heard ‘Round the World: Where Cow-Tapping Falls on the International Agenda of Sustainable Development

Alexandra C. Nolan*

To meet sustainable development goals, countries have developed innovative technologies to create a cleaner environment. One technology developed in Argentina for cleaner methane extraction entails the entrails of cows. A cow’s diet and biological disposition is made up of “rumens,” which creates the perfect chemical birthplace for methane gas.\(^1\) The methane emissions from one cow’s burps and farts are harmless.\(^2\) However, cows’ collective methane emissions can be lethal.\(^3\) Recently, a barn housing ninety cows exploded in Germany because of the cows’ collective methane emissions, suggesting that methane can be inherently dangerous.\(^4\)

Methane also has long-term consequences for the environment, as it is expected to negatively affect the environment twenty to twenty-three times more than carbon dioxide in the next 100 years.\(^5\) Methane emissions from cows account for a quarter of the world’s total methane emissions.\(^6\) With these statistics in mind, it is evident that cow burps and farts significantly contribute to the deterioration of our environment.

To address the methane challenge posed by cows, Argentina’s National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA) developed the cow “fart-pack.”\(^7\) The process of using the “fart-pack” is called “cow-tapping.”\(^8\) The “fart-pack” extracts methane through a tube inserted into the cow’s stomach, stores the methane in containers, and uses it as an alternative fuel source.\(^9\) By utilizing “fart-packs,” 300 milliliters of methane a day can be extracted from the cow to power a 100 milliliter refrigerator for one day.\(^10\) While INTA perfected the “fart-packs,” they are not unique to Argentina—Englad also uses “fart-packs.”\(^11\)

Despite the “successes” of “fart-packs,” they raise imperative ethical questions regarding animal welfare.\(^12\) Is there international law that adequately addresses animal welfare? Are the values of clean energy prioritized over values of animal protection?

Cow-tapping exemplifies the compromise of animal welfare for a scientific procedure of innovation. As to date, there is only one ratified international agreement adequately addressing the use of animals in scientific procedures of innovation, and it pertains only to Europe. It is called the European Convention for the Protection of Vertebrate Animals Used for Experimental and Scientific Purposes (“Convention”).\(^13\) Does the Convention approve cow-tapping?

Article One of the Convention calls for the main purpose of a procedure to be for the protection of the environment.\(^14\) The main purpose of cow-tapping is trapping methane gas, and thus can be seen as environmentally beneficial.\(^15\) Another purpose for such procedures under Article One is research.\(^16\) Another purpose of cow-tapping is to research how methane can be used as an alternative energy producer.\(^17\) A third acceptable purpose for such a procedure under Article One is forensic inquiry.\(^18\) Cow-tapping is a process of forensic inquiry because it reveals the natural process of methane production. Therefore, cow-tapping is a justified procedure under the Convention.

The Convention outlines requirements to ensure animals experience the least amount of pain possible.\(^19\) Such requirements include the animal’s freedom of movement and that the animal be given food, water, proper healthcare, and proper supervision.\(^20\) Cow-tappers may meet these requirements.\(^21\)

The Convention also calls for the use of animals in scientific procedures as a last resort.\(^22\) Article Four expressly states the Convention cannot inhibit liberties of signatories to adopt stricter animal welfare measure involved in the procedures.\(^23\) The Convention further states in Article Six, “[a] procedure shall not be performed for any of the purposes . . . if another . . . method, not entailing the use of an animal, is reasonably . . . available” and calls for active research into alternative methods.\(^24\)

Under Article Six, cow-tapping is legal in Europe. While alternative methods for methane extraction, not including the use of cows, are reasonably available, there is not currently an alternative method to extract methane from cows. The challenge faced is not how to extract methane, but how to specifically reduce cows’ methane emissions. Currently, the only way to address this threat is to cow-tap.

Multiple international agreements governing animal welfare are awaiting ratification.\(^25\) For now, only the Convention adequately approves cow-tapping in Europe.\(^26\) The lack of international law governing cow-tapping indicates the international community values clean energy over animal welfare. While there are several international agreements governing clean energy, animal welfare agreements have taken a back seat.\(^27\) One thing is clear: the time for international consensus on animal welfare is long overdue.
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Cruelty to Human and Nonhuman Animals in the Wild-Caught Fishing Industry

Kathy Hessler, Becky Jenkins, and Kelly Levenda*

I. INTRODUCTION

The welfare of animals killed for our consumption, and the treatment of agricultural workers involved in this industry, are pressing ethical issues not sufficiently discussed in the context of the fishing industry. While concerns about the welfare of terrestrial farmed animals gain some prominence in discussions about sustainability and food policy, concern for the welfare of fish killed for food lags far behind. This lack of concern for their welfare is in spite of considerable scientific evidence showing that fish experience pain, fear, and suffering. The fishing industry also has grave impacts on humans, which include health and safety issues, labor law violations, and even human rights abuses such as human trafficking, child labor, and slavery. Incorporating these less publicized concerns into our conversations about fishing is necessary in order to improve law, policy, and consumer awareness in this area.

II. BACKGROUND

A. TYPES OF ANIMALS INVOLVED

When we talk about the types of aquatic animals used in capture and farmed fishing, it is important to note that the list is very broad. It includes: finfish, crustaceans (e.g., shrimp, crab, lobster, oyster, crayfish); mollusks (e.g., snails, clams); pinnipeds (i.e., seals and sea lions); cephalopods (e.g., octopuses, squid, cuttlefish) and cetaceans (i.e., whales and dolphins). Each of these categories of animals may be treated somewhat differently according to the laws or customs of different nations, and as a result, are more or less involved in the fishing industry.

The narrowness of our conception of “fishing” needs to be broadened in order to make conscious and reasoned policy decisions. For example, although most people do not think of whaling when they think of fishing, perhaps because they are mammals, it is a part of the fishing industry. Whales are still killed for food (and for scientific purposes) in a number of countries. The killing of whales has been the source of significant controversy as it pertains to treaty rights, national sovereignty, culture and tradition, sustainability and ecosystem protection as well as the welfare of the animals themselves. Whaling is more widespread than is generally known. Notably, Japan, Norway, and Iceland argue for increased whaling quotas, relaxed regulation, and an end to the 1982 whaling ban imposed by the International Whaling Commission (IWC)—suggesting the need to protect fishing stocks by reducing the numbers of whales. But other countries are also involved. Indonesia continues whaling on a small scale using non-industrial methods, and in 2012, South Korea said it would undertake scientific whaling in its own waters. Russians in Chukotka Autonomous Okrug and natives of Bequia (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) are permitted by the IWC to take certain numbers and types of whales each year. Under an exception for indigenous populations, the United States, Canada, and Greenland allow whaling for species covered by the IWC. The Faroe Islands is a semi-autonomous country and not a party to the international whaling ban; as such, it conducts hunts not covered by the IWC. Some think the Filipino whaling industry continues underground operations even after it became illegal in 1991. Between the 1985 ban and 2014, 1,355 whales were killed legally in the United States, not accounting for illegal killings. The conversations we have about whaling—with its cultural, environmental, and animal welfare concerns—also apply to other forms of fishing.

B. USES OF AQUATIC ANIMALS

Aquatic animals are fished or farmed for multiple purposes. These uses include pet food, livestock and fish food, fertilizer, glue, oil, and by-products (oil and by-products are also sometimes used in human food). Indications are that all of these uses are increasing. Between 2010 and 2021, the anticipated growth of world aquaculture is 33%. By 2025, the estimated growth of global fisheries and aquaculture production is 17%. Total fishery production is also expected to rise from 167 million tons in 2013-2015 to 196 million tons by 2025, with aquaculture moving from 44% of that total in 2013-2015 to 52% in 2025.

Putting aside the non-food reasons these animals are killed, and any conversation about the value, necessity, or utility of those actions, it is clear that even the nutrient-based uses of aquatic animals, particularly finfish, has changed significantly. In 1960, agricultural use of fish meal was predominantly, and almost evenly used for pig and chicken feed. But by 2010, 73% of fish meal was used for aquaculture, 20% for pigs, 5% for chickens, and 20% for other uses. A similar change has occurred in the use of fish oil. In 1960, 80% of fish oil was used for hardened edible use, and 20% was for industrial use. By 2010, 71% was used for aquafeed, 24% was used for refined edible use, and only a small percent was used for hardened edible and industrial uses.

* Kathy Hessler is a Clinical Professor of Law at Lewis & Clark Law School, Director of the Animal Law Clinic and Director of the Aquatic Animal Law Initiative. Rebecca Jenkins is the Aquatic Animal Law Fellow at the Aquatic Animal Law Initiative at Lewis & Clark Law School. Kelly Levenda is the Student Programs Attorney at the Animal Legal Defense Fund and the Founder of Let Fish Live.
C. Types of Fishing

Different methodologies of fishing present different concerns. Wild-caught fishing is often called capture, and “farmed” fishing is often called aquaculture. Operations conducted entirely on land are sometimes called on-shore facilities. Hatcheries are on-shore facilities that breed fish or aquatic animals in tanks for households or to release into streams and lakes. Aquaculture operations can be both close to a shore or in the deep ocean. Each jurisdiction has its own rules and regulations regarding these operations. Large scale and industrial operations have the potential to create the most harm to oceans, animals, and workers. Oversight and enforcement of the existing laws are often lacking due to political will, limited resources, or the challenges of policing either the open sea or private property. While this article will focus specifically on the wild-caught fishing industry, it is important to note that the aquaculture industry also presents significant concerns, and in recent years it has eclipsed the scale of the wild-caught fish industry because of human consumption. In 1974, aquaculture accounted for only 7% of fish consumed by humans, but by 2004 it had increased to 39%. A 2016 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) report estimates that by 2020 over 50% of all (human and non-human) food fish will come from aquaculture, and by 2030 that number will be 62%.

D. Scale of Fishing Operations

The 2016 FAO report also indicated that in 2014, 49.8 million tons of finfish and 30.3 million tons of other aquatic species were produced globally via aquaculture, and the FAO forecasts the 2017 total to reach 82.5 million tons. For 2014, wild-caught fishing accounted for an additional 93.4 million tons of animals, and it is projected to reach 91.2 million tons in 2017. This compares with 311.6 million tons of meat and poultry produced globally in 2014, which reached 322 million tons in 2017. Official statistics on the amount of fish caught each year are not available because the FAO statistics are in tonnages, not individual animals. A 2010 Fish Count Report estimated that humans catch and kill 0.97 to 2.74 trillion finfish every year. This estimate may be too low since the FAO fisheries calculate the amount of fish captured via tonnage. This estimate does not include fish who escape from fishing gear and die, fish caught illegally (i.e., poaching), animals caught unintentionally in nets or gear as by-catch, animals who are injured or killed by discarded fishing gear (i.e., ghostfishing), or any other unreported capture. Removal of this many animals has a significant impact on the ecosystem and can result in food chain imbalances and the impairment of a species’ ability to reproduce.

The FAO reports suggest that the global fish trade in 2017 is worth $141 billion dollars annually with 152.5 million tons used for food, 14.7 million tons used for feed, and 5 million tons used for other purposes. The FAO also notes that in 2014, 56.6 million people globally were directly employed in capture or aquaculture, with 84% of these workers in Asia, and 94% of the fish farming occurring in Asia. Recent estimates for the United States suggest that the wild-caught fishing industry takes about 5 million tons of aquatic animals, with another half a million coming from aquaculture.

E. Scientific Understandings of the Capacities of Aquatic Species

Scientists now know far more about the capacities of aquatic animals, which include their capacity to feel pain and suffer. Studies have shown that certain aquatic species have the following capacities: (1) sentience—fish, and other aquatic animals; (2) physical feeling and pain and adrenal systems; (3) consciousness; (4) self-awareness; (5) awareness of time and long and short-term memory; (6) emotional responses; (7) complex cognition; (8) recognize human faces; and (8) tool use. Additional science addresses the ability of some aquatic species to cooperate across species, protect their young and each other, and engage in social learning and deception.

These new scientific understandings require a shift in our approach to fish and other aquatic species as well as a reassessment not just of our uses of them, but also of the laws that affect and fail to protect them. We recognize that not many people want to forgo traditional practices in order to protect fish and other aquatic animals, but we suggest that better animal welfare practices results in better human welfare practices. Therefore, calls for improvements should be considered.

III. The Welfare of Wild-Caught Fish

Humans catch and kill trillions of fish every year. Because of this staggering number, their suffering is a major ethical concern. As noted above, physiological and behavioral studies show that fish have the capacity to feel pain. Fish welfare is harmed when they are in pain. Fish are capable of learning and remembering complex information, which suggests they are capable of suffering. Being caught on a hook, being crushed under other fish, and being gutted while alive are all instances where fishing practices produce painful situations; therefore, the suffering of fish must be considered. Like other sentient animals that humans exploit and kill, humans are morally obligated to protect fish from unnecessary pain and suffering.

A. Fishing Methods

The major fish capture methods are: trawling; purse seining; Gill, tangle, and trammel nets; rod and line fishing; trolling; pole and line fishing; and longline fishing. Many fish are injured in the process of being captured. By-catch—the capture of non-target animals, who are usually thrown back into the sea as dead or dying back—is also a concern with most fishing methods.

1. Trawling

In trawling, a large net is dragged through the water or along the ocean floor to catch fish. Fish caught by trawling are chased to exhaustion (the time varies considerably depending on species), panic, and are scraped and injured by the net. Some suffocate or are crushed to death under the weight of other fish. One study showed a 29% to 61% mortality rate for fish caught when trawling. One study showed a 30% to 72% mortality rate (usually from injuries or exhaustion) of fish who escape...
trawling. Additionally, when pulling fish up from deep water, they suffer decompression injuries—that is, parts of their gut are forced out through their mouths and anuses, their swim bladders burst, and their eyes bulge out of their sockets.

2. Purse Seining

In purse seining, a large net slowly surrounds fish and is closed at the top like a drawstring bag. Fish panic and violently try to escape as the net gets smaller. During capture, fish may be attacked by predators, and they may experience severe exhaustion and injury from other fish, the net, and when brought on board. If the net is lifted out of the water to bring the fish on board, many are crushed to death. Fish that are deliberately let out of the net experience high death rates up to 90%. Fish caught through purse seining may also experience decompression injuries.

3. Gillnetting

A gillnet hangs in the ocean and ensnares fish who swim into it by their gills. Fish caught in gillnets panic and feel afraid. They experience severe exhaustion during a long duration of capture spanning hours or even days (it is more stressful the longer it takes), and considerable injury is done to their skin and scales, thus interfering with their ability to breathe properly, and causing them to suffocate. Some fish are attacked by predators when ensnared in the net. When the net is brought onboard and the fish are taken out of it—they can suffer further injury. Escapees are impaled on a gaff (i.e., iron hook).

4. Tangle and Trammel Netting

Tangle and trammel nets catch fish by entangling them instead of snaring their gills. Fish caught by these methods likely suffer similarly to those caught by gillnets, except that that with tangle and trammel nets, fish can breathe normally and suffer less severe physical injury. One study showed that 28% of fish died in trammel nets, and this increases with the duration of capture process.

5. Rod and Line Fishing & Trolling

In rod and line fishing, fish are caught individually on a hook and line. In trolling, baited lines are towed through the water. Fish caught on hooks experience fear, panic, stress, and pain (most fish are hooked in or around their mouths or through their eyes). The fear and pain that fish experience increases when the line that they are hooked to is pulled. Fish caught by trolling experience severe exhaustion. Fish may be impaled on a gaff to bring them onboard.

6. Pole and Line Fishing & Longline Fishing

In pole and line fishing, bait (i.e., live fish) is used to stir up a feeding frenzy. Fish are then caught on hooks, swung aboard, and slammed onto the deck, which disengages them from the hook. In longline fishing, hundreds to thousands of baited hooks (sometimes with impaled live fish) are on one line to catch fish. There is a long duration of capture, ranging from hours to days. Fish caught on hooks may be attacked by predators. Baited cages are also used to capture fish. Fish do not experience much physical injury from this method of fishing, but they may be stressed from confinement or may be attacked by predators during the process.

Live bait fish are sometimes used when catching fish. Bait fish suffer fear and distress from capture, confinement (it may be for days or weeks), hook impalement, being dropped into the water (an unfamiliar environment), and being unable to escape predators.

B. The Slaughter of Wild-Caught Fish

The majority of wild finfish who are caught die by suffocation or live gutting. These are prolonged ways to die. How quickly fish lose consciousness depends on their species, how well they are adapted to tolerate low levels of oxygen, their escape response (activity burns up their oxygen reserves), and the air temperature. One study showed that fish who are suffocated and eviscerated (disemboved) become unconscious in 25 to 65 minutes, and fish who are suffocated lose consciousness in 65 to 250 minutes. Another study found that it took 2.6 to 9.6 minutes for fish who are suffocated to lose consciousness, and it took 4.5 minutes for fish who are exsanguinated (have their guts cut) to lose consciousness. Fish are also sometimes put on ice as they suffocate, which prolongs the time to lose consciousness in some species, but decreases it in other species.

Additional slaughter methods include, stunning (i.e., percussive and electrical); CO₂ suffocation; baths (i.e., salt, ammonia, or ice); decapitation; asphyxiating; live chilling; gutting while alive; pithing; shooting; use of dynamite to stun or kill. Methodologies and legal restrictions vary by jurisdiction. No humane slaughter laws apply to fish or aquatic animals in the United States.

C. Reducing Suffering Caused by Fishing

The suffering of fish can be reduced in many ways. First, the use of live bait fish should be banned, as it is unnecessary, and they suffer greatly. Second, the duration of capture should be reduced by requiring lines and nets to be checked more often, as fish suffer more the longer they are caught on a line or in a net. Gillnets, which ensnare fish, should be checked every thirty minutes, as fishes’ stress levels are higher the longer they are ensnared in the net. Third, the use of gear and equipment that causes less injury to fish should be required (e.g., circle hooks instead of traditional j-shaped hooks should be used), and the better handling of fish and the careful removal of the hook from the fish should also be required. Fourth, gillnets should be banned, and tangle nets should be used instead. Tangle nets cause less suffering because they only entangle fish, and they do not ensnare their gills. Fifth, fishers should be required to catch fish from shallower depths (under twenty to thirty meters) to reduce decompression injuries. Sixth, methods of handling and landing fish that are less painful than gaffing, and that minimize their time outside of water should be developed and required, so that they are not suffocating in air—for instance, fish pumping systems can be used.
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This would require that fish be rendered unconscious soon after being taken out of water, so they do not experience the
(minutes to hours of) pain of being suffocated or gutted alive.127 Methods that cause immediate loss of consciousness that lasts
until death (so they do not feel themselves being killed) should be
example include percussive stunning (i.e., a blow
to the head), spiking (i.e., inserting a spike into the brain), and
electrical stunning.128 Immediately after stunning, fish should be
bled out or killed with an electrical current.129 Additionally, the
wild-caught fishing industry should adopt automatic percussive
and electrical stunning, which are devices sometimes used on
boats for farmed fishing.130 Lastly, a system for using food grade
anesthetics in water, like AQUI-S, to anesthetize fish before
stunning and killing should be developed so as to further reduce
the pain and trauma associated with being taken out of the water
(if the stunning method requires this) and stunned.131

D. MAKING LEGAL CHANGES

Globally, 93.4 million tons of fish were captured in 2014.132 The countries with the highest captures were China, Indonesia,
the United States, and the Russian Federation.133 Most fish were
captured in the Northwest Pacific, Western Central Pacific,
Northeast Atlantic, and Eastern Indian Ocean.134 Many countries
need to adopt new laws to provide meaningful protection for
wild-caught finfish. For instance, fish welfare laws could be
adopted by adding protection of their welfare to: (1) the 2030
Agenda for Sustainable Development;135 and (2) the Code of
Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.136

1. THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

In September 2015, United Nations’ Member States
adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.137 The Agenda’s goal is to end poverty and hunger while sustainably
managing natural resources (which includes wild animals
killed for consumption).138 The Agenda includes seventeen
Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a set of “aspirational
objectives with 169 targets expected to guide actions of gov-
ernments, international agencies . . . and other institutions over
the next 15 years (2016–2030).”139 The SDGs set out specific
objectives for countries to meet within a given time frame,
with periodic monitoring to measure progress towards the
objectives and ensure that no country is lagging behind.140 The
FAO is working with countries to ensure SDGs are integrated
in national and regional policy.141

Many of the SDGs focus on justice. They include ending
inequality, poverty, and hunger, ensuring inclusive quality
education, gender equality, and access to food, water, and
sustainable energy.142 One goal, SDG 14, expressly focuses on
the oceans: to “conserve and sustainably use the oceans,
seas and marine resources.”143 Justice for all, not just humans,
should be included in these goals. In the context of our food
system, justice for animals should mean, at the very least, not
causimg them unnecessary suffering.144 Therefore, SDG 14
should be expanded with this suggested text to include the
objective of protecting animals: “to protect the welfare of fish
and other sentient aquatic animals who are used and killed for
consumption.”

The FAO helps countries meet the SDGs through the cre-
ation of targets and indicators, and provides advice on how to
meet these in the United Nations Development Programme
(UNDP) Support to the Implementation of the SDGs.145 The
FAO could create a target for reducing the suffering of fish, and
an indicator to measure progress toward that goal, such as the
number of countries that have adopted more humane fishing
and slaughter methods. The concrete suggestions to reduce the
suffering of wild-caught finfish could be included in the UNDP
Support to the Implementation of SDG 14 and would make a
meaningful impact in helping countries regulate their fisheries in
ways that could reduce the suffering of sentient aquatic animals,
like fish.146

2. THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES

In 1995, more than 170 Members of the FAO adopted
the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.147 The Code
includes goals, principles, and practical steps that Members can
take to implement the principles in its national policies, such as
in industry codes of good practice or legislation.148 It represents
a global consensus on a wide range of issues and was created
by many different stakeholders in the aquaculture and fishing
industries, including governmental and non-governmental organ-
izations, fishers, aquaculturists, and the FAO.149

The Code establishes principles and standards for con-
servation, management, and development for all fisheries, in
accordance with relevant international laws.150 It provides
guidance to Members on how to establish or improve their
legal framework regarding fisheries and guidance in creating
and implementing new international agreements.151 One objec-
tive of the Code is to “promote protection of living aquatic
resources . . . .”152 The protection of “aquatic resources” who
are sentient animals,153 like fish, should include protecting their
welfare. The Code states as a general principle that, “[t]he right
to fish carries with it the obligation to do so in a responsible
manner.”154 Responsible fishing should mean giving consider-
ation to fishes’ welfare and reducing their suffering. The Code
also states that “management decisions for fisheries should be
based on the best scientific evidence available.”155 This should
require Members to take into account the scientific consensus
that finfish can feel pain and suffer in deciding how to manage
their fisheries. The management of fisheries includes where to
fish, what animals to target and kill, and what equipment and
methods to use.156

The Code also states that, “fisheries management organiza-
tions should apply a precautionary approach widely to conserva-
tion, management and exploitation of living aquatic resources
in order to protect them . . . taking account of the best scientific
evidence available.”157 This may mean that even if Members
disagree on the strength of the evidence for pain in finfish
(which many scientists believe is strong), they should apply a
precautionary approach to protecting fish welfare, and take steps to reduce unnecessary suffering.

The Code should also adopt, as a general principle, the protection of fish welfare. We suggest adding the following language to Article 6: “The right to fish carries with it the obligation to do so in a humane manner. Fishing methods and equipment should not cause unnecessary suffering to fish and other sentient animals. Fish caught for consumption should be given a swift and a humane (as possible) death, by rendering them unconscious before they are killed.” This language should be expanded, using the recommendations for decreasing the suffering of fish through the regulation of methods and equipment, in Article 7, Fisheries Management, and Article 8, Fishing Operations.

IV. AN OVERVIEW LABOR & HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES IN THE GLOBAL FISHING INDUSTRY

The current state of wild fish stocks around the world is a hotly discussed topic in both popular media and academic writing. As was discussed above, the welfare of the individual animals caught up in this system often gets overlooked. Similarly, in comparison to the environmental impacts, the welfare of the people working in this industry has received little attention until recently. This section will provide a brief overview of some of the most pressing issues facing fishers around the world.

Despite the existence of general international labor conventions, and even conventions specific to fishing, such as the 2007 “Work in Fishing Convention,” commercial fishing remains one of the most dangerous professions in the United States (and the world) today. Due to the fact that approximately 80% of seafood eaten in the United States today is imported, we must pay close attention to the labor and human rights issues associated with our imported seafood. To complicate matters further, both practically and legally, a significant portion of the United States’ imported seafood is caught in the United States, exported overseas for processing, and then reimported into the United States. This creates a very complex supply chain because it involves multiple legal jurisdictions, and it makes traceability and enforcement difficult.

Currently, most imported seafood in the United States comes from China, Thailand, Canada, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Ecuador. As discussed below, many of these top exporting countries have well documented issues with general occupational hazards and working conditions as well as other more egregious human rights abuses.

A. OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS & POOR CONDITIONS

The International Labor Organization (ILO) identifies fishing as a highly hazardous sector. Working conditions aboard fishing vessels are amongst the worst working conditions in any industry in the world. At sea, vessels can often operate without scrutiny depending on the flag they carry, and whether they operate in areas with limited monitoring, control, surveillance, and enforcement (MSCE)—such as the high seas. While the subsequent sections will discuss some of the more egregious labor and human rights issues in the global fishing industry, it is important to note that the general conditions aboard fishing vessels across the world are often substandard. Well documented issues aboard vessels, especially in “developing” countries, include insufficient building standards, small unsuitable boats venturing far out to sea, a lack of safety equipment and training, infrequent inspections, and much more.

B. HUMAN TRAFFICKING & SLAVERY

According to the ILO, while the transatlantic slave trade has been abolished for two centuries, at least 21 million people continue to work under coercion. Today it is estimated that approximately 90% of the world’s forced labor is extracted by private agents in labor-intensive industries like fishing. Human trafficking in the fishing sector is extremely prevalent. In 2014, the United States Department of State Trafficking in Persons Report found indications of human trafficking in both the wild-caught and aquaculture sectors in the following countries around the world: Angola, Bangladesh, Belize, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Ghana, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mongolia, Namibia, Federated States of Micronesia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom, and Vietnam. In 2016, a single Associated Press investigation in South East Asia led to the release of more than 2,000 slaves. This is one isolated instance, but it may help to give perspective as to the scale of this issue globally.

C. EXPLOITATION OF MIGRANT WORKERS

Sadly, many people who fall victim to human trafficking and slavery in the fishing industry are migrant workers. Lack of documentation, debt from trafficking fees, and language barriers make migrants particularly vulnerable to coercion and slavery. Thailand is one of the countries that has received the most media attention in relation to this particular issue. While it is inherently difficult to find records of how many people are enslaved on Thai fishing vessels, the Thai government itself estimates that up to 300,000 people work within its fishing industry—90% of whom are migrants. Lured by Thailand’s more prosperous economy and large pool of unskilled jobs, the vast majority of these migrants come from neighboring countries such as Cambodia and Burma. Often times, these migrants pay brokers to help traffic them over the border and find them work in factories, on plantations, or at construction sites—but many of them will be sold onto boats instead to fill a massive labor shortage in Thailand’s fishing sector.

D. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING INTERNATIONAL LABOR & HUMAN RIGHTS

Labor and human rights abuses in the fishing industry continues to be a huge problem around the world. There are many reasons why this problem persists. First, there are the practical
concerns such as the difficulty of monitoring seafood imports to determine their origin, which is something the illegal fishing industry benefits from. Second, global climate change and fish stock depletion are forcing vessels to go further out to sea, thus spending longer periods away from the shore. This can negatively impact the welfare of employees while simultaneously making policing these vessels more difficult. Third, the abuse of migrant workers is prevalent in this industry. A current example of this issue is the mass exodus of the Rohingya people from Myanmar. It is estimated that at least 400,000 of this minority Muslim group have fled Myanmar in 2017 alone. These refugees, and others in different parts of the world that heavily depend on fishing, are often stateless or working without documentation. Increased pressure from climate change and fish stock depletion, along with a high demand for cheap seafood makes migrant workers with a fragile financial and legal status vulnerable to coercion into human trafficking and slave labor—which creating a market for cheap or free labor in an already under-policed industry.

Labor and human rights issues in this sector are a complex international problem. Addressing this problem successfully will be difficult without cooperation from national level governments, the international community, and the private sector.

This complex and multifaceted issue requires a multipronged approach including: (1) integrating human rights and labor concerns into the broader fight against illegal, unregulated and underreported (IUU) fisheries; (2) combatting human trafficking; and (3) combatting the global refugee crisis and exploitation of migrant workers.

Tackling IUU fishing more broadly requires increased funding from the international community and the increased use of technology to facilitate greater tracking and transparency in the seafood supply chain. Specifically, the Environmental Justice Foundation has recommended that the FAO proceed with the development of a comprehensive Global Record of shipping vessels that will assign each industrial vessel a Unique Vessel Identifier (UVI) and contain information on vessel ownership and fishing activities. This could also be used as a method of monitoring working conditions on vessels and compliance with fisheries law.

The current international legal structure gives the United States, European Union, and other major seafood importers room to tackle human trafficking more seriously via trade law. For example, the U.S. Department of State can move countries with evidence of human trafficking to a lower tier in their annual Trafficking in Human Persons Report—so that they bear the consequences of poor human rights enforcement. The European Union has a similar program. This means that it is not just the responsibility of the exporting countries to combat this problem, but also the countries importing the products of, and benefiting from, this abuse. These mechanisms need to be used robustly, i.e., by introducing a complete boycott of countries using slave labor in their fishing industry. As outlined above, because so many countries violate labor laws in this context, some would argue that adding enforcement mechanisms are not practicable if people in the United States and Europe wish to continue eating seafood at the current rates.

Unfortunately, many of the reasons underlying the labor issues in fishing are hugely complex and multifaceted. One such underlying issue is the global refugee crisis, which often results in the exploitation of migrant workers. While many of these refugee crises issues remain outside of the scope of this paper, it may be worthwhile to consider the very current Rohingya example to help us understand this problem. As mentioned above, Rohingya people have been fleeing Myanmar for many years. Other South East Asian countries along with the international community have been grappling with this crisis for some time. One suggestion, which has been raised by commentators, is the possibility of adopting a European Union type approach to this migration issue. Europe is also dealing with a migration crisis, though it is not an identical situation by any means. The European Commission devised a plan for resettling refugees that would divide migrants up based on an European Union member country’s economic prosperity, number of refugees already taken in, unemployment rate, and other factors. Southeast Asian countries could establish a similar formula, based on gross domestic product (GDP), unemployment rates, and other factors to determine how many refugees should be resettled and where. A commentator writing for The National also suggested that international powers could make promises to resettle a certain number of the Rohingya each year for the next decade. “Washington [State] has taken in large numbers of migrants from vastly different cultures before—the Hmong in the 1970s and 1980s, or the Bhutanese in the past 10 years.” During these types of refugee crises, it is difficult to focus on other human rights violations that are occurring in the fishing industry, or even to notice the overlap in issues. But it is important to look at the local and global factors in human rights violations affecting the fishing industry in order to tackle them directly and broadly.

In an increasingly interconnected international trade community, marketplaces benefiting from trade relationships and labor from the countries mentioned above should take responsibility to support these countries’ efforts to address human rights issues in the fishing industry. The nature of this industry is internationally interdependent; therefore, any solutions to this problem will need to be addressed at the national and international level as well as by the public and private sectors. In the context of overfishing, the international community has made some progress on collaborating for internationally beneficial solutions. Now we need to take a closer look at this industry and its impacts on human and non-human animals.

V. AN OVERVIEW OF LABOR ISSUES IN THE DOMESTIC FISHING & AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY

In addition to human rights concerns, workers in the fishing industry face many health and safety issues. Some of these problems are the same as their terrestrial animal agricultural worker counterparts, and some are unique. The focus here
will be on the capture segment of the fishing industry, with a brief mention of related problems in the aquaculture segment.

A. HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES

Discussions of fishing tend to conjure placid images of a small boat and a few friends fishing comfortably for pleasure or business.\textsuperscript{207} In reality, the hazards facing workers in this industry are some of the worst of any industrial sector in the United States.\textsuperscript{208} They include: noise; chemical exposure; fishing gear and mechanical accidents; boating accidents; musculoskeletal injuries; respiratory and immune issues; injuries cause by extreme weather; sleep deprivation; physical and psychological injuries from stress and challenges of the work, and; the lack or malfunctioning of protective equipment.\textsuperscript{209} Some of these injuries result in death or permanent disability.\textsuperscript{210}

In other industries, especially in the United States, accidents on the job can be responded to quickly by emergency personnel.\textsuperscript{211} Even on remote farms, medical assistance may not be terribly far away.\textsuperscript{212} However, for a worker injured at sea, or even on a large lake or remote river, getting attention for emergency medical conditions can be a significant hurdle.\textsuperscript{213}

Additional hurdles to safety include the age of fishermen in this labor market. In the United States and elsewhere, some are very young,\textsuperscript{214} and some are considerably older individuals.\textsuperscript{215} These factors lead to additional health and safety concerns.\textsuperscript{216} There are further hurdles to maintaining a safe working environment for those workers who do not speak English well because employers may not translate safety information, or there may be delays or confusion around communicating injuries.\textsuperscript{217}

Some of the work of the fishing industry takes place in production facilities that are prone to their own set of harms, including: repetitive motion injuries; physical injuries; psychological injuries from working long hours or days at a time, especially for those whose work focuses on killing rather than capturing animals; and zoonotic or other disease transfers.\textsuperscript{218} Though not often calculated in industrial harm, low wages, contract work and job insecurity,\textsuperscript{219} especially when coupled with immigration status insecurity,\textsuperscript{220} are also significant forms of harm that need to be addressed and remedied.

Agriculture and fishing are two of the deadliest jobs in the United States.\textsuperscript{221} In 2014, fishing was the second worst industry in terms of health and safety, behind only logging, with a fatality rate of 110.9 per 100,000 workers.\textsuperscript{222} The fishing industry is also poor at dealing with the economic cost of lost work and health costs because laborers in this industry had an average annual salary of only $37,640.\textsuperscript{223} By comparison, terrestrial agriculture was listed as the sixth worst industry with a death rate of 26.7 per 100,000 workers (though they were somewhat better off economically with an average annual salary of $69,880).\textsuperscript{224} In 2015, data for the agricultural, fishing, hunting, and forestry industries were merged and had the third highest count and rate of fatal work injuries.\textsuperscript{225}

In addition to dangerous working conditions and low pay, laborers in the fishing industry also face incidences of unpaid wages with no clarity about who to make complaints to.\textsuperscript{226} They face layoffs and interruptions to work based on weather conditions and overfishing.\textsuperscript{227} They also have to work harder, longer, and further from home to catch the same numbers of fish because stocks have been depleted and competition has increased.\textsuperscript{228} Some workers report additional problems on the job, such as harassment and concerns for their safety that stem from their gender or cultural backgrounds.\textsuperscript{229}

Because some laborers in the fishing industry are independent contractors rather than employees, they face additional problems.\textsuperscript{230} They do not receive health or unemployment insurance, nor do they receive sick-leave or vacation days from their employers.\textsuperscript{231} They do not always know whether they will be employed through the season, and they do not know how much work they will have from season to season.\textsuperscript{232}

Though we are not focusing on the aquaculture segment of the fishing industry, it is useful to note some of the particular safety concerns those workers face. These include heavy metal toxins, such as lead and mercury and acute toxicity that may result from copper sulfite used as algicide, net or wood preservatives, or copper pipes.\textsuperscript{233} Additional concerns include closed-loop, indoor, water-recirculating production systems; harmful algal blooms in marine environments, which can cause paralytic, neurologic, amnesic, and diarrhetic shellfish poisonings and ciguatera fish poisoning; bacteria (such as Mycobacterium marinum and Streptococcus iniae) and nematode, cestode, trematode, and protozoan parasites found in fish that cause human infections; and infections, such as the shellfish origin of Norwalk virus infection.\textsuperscript{234}

B. LEGAL PROTECTIONS

Policy and regulatory approaches can address dangerous working conditions to ensure the protection of the workers who are not in positions to protect themselves. However, the fishing industry has fewer health and safety regulations than most might assume along with a tangled web of oversight that leaves significant room for confusion and lack of enforcement.\textsuperscript{235}

Some legal protections do exist. These include state or federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations;\textsuperscript{236} Labor Department rules (including the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as Amended);\textsuperscript{237} and the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, (the Jones Act), which allows injured people to make claims.\textsuperscript{238} For certain problems, state criminal laws or regulatory protections might apply, and in some cases, transportation rules could also be helpful.

Agencies with enforcement authority for issues relating to workers in the fishing industry include: OSHA, through the Department of Labor; the Coast Guard via the U.S. Armed Forces; U.S. Department of Homeland Security in peacetime; U.S. Department of Navy in wartime; and the local police when state or local criminal offenses are involved. Other agencies have oversight of non-worker related aspects of the fishing industry, such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) via the Department of Commerce; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) via the Department of Interior; and the
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) via the Department of Commerce. There may be additional regulations from these agencies that workers can rely on if their employers fail to follow applicable rules.

Health and safety standards for workers are set by OSHA or delegated to state authority when plans have been approved by OSHA. Twenty-two states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have OSHA-approved state plans. These plans are required to be at least as effective as federal OSHA standards and may go further than the federal guidelines. States may adopt their own standards and enforcement policies, though most have adopted standards that are identical to the federal OSHA standards. OSHA has foreign language guidance that mandates safety instructions be offered in different languages where applicable—some states have created versions of these as well.

OSHA does not address fishing in a separate sub-part of the regulations, so it is only covered by the general duty clause, the general industry, and the agricultural sections (which may potentially apply to aquaculture operations). There are shipyard and marine terminal standards as well. These sections include specific standards need to apply the general duty clause where those specific standards are silent.

OSHA generally addresses some of the issues fishers may face including: noise; ventilation; air quality; equipment and protective gear; emergency action plans; work surfaces; ladders; stairways; workplace hazards; and medical and first aid. However, some of the guidelines are not helpful for workers on fishing boats where surfaces are routinely slippery, and air quality cannot be improved by proper ventilation or temperature regulation. The commercial diving and logging industries have their own sub-parts to address industry specific concerns. The fishing industry does not, and it should. The Coast Guard also implements some safety regulations through the Department of Homeland Security. The Coast Guard published a notice of rulemaking in 2016 to align its work with recent legislation.

Congress passed the Fishermen’s Protective Act of 1967 (enacted in 1971), which sounds like it should protect the safety of fishers, but it focuses on vessel rights, compensation for seizure, and other economic aspects of the trade. The largest work of Congress is the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which relates to and regulates the heath and use of fisheries, but not the health of the workers. Congress is currently working on the Honest Fishermen Act of 2017 for consumer protection and product traceability. Even when there are stories in the news about safety issues facing fishers, they often neglect U.S. workers. Reports about the fishing industry from those tasked with protecting it give short shrift to worker safety issues. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) developed a manual called, Safety Training for Fishermen. They have also, through the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), made recommendations in order to reduce risks. But it is unclear how many fishers have access to this material from their employers or how many employers are in compliance with the recommendations and requirements. NOAA has a specific safety program for its observers, who are increasingly at risk when doing their jobs.

C. POTENTIAL REFORMS

Some relatively simple regulatory reform is possible. OSHA could adopt a specific set of guidelines that apply to the fishing industry. Given the differences between fishing for trout, salmon, lobster, crabs—to name a few—this would be a significant undertaking. But it would be worth the effort to protect workers from the poor conditions they have in common, and it could leave room for some additional regulatory requirements that relate to specific segments of the industry. In addition to looking at other industry specific models for this type of regulation, OSHA could also look to the United Kingdom and the European Union for examples of their regulations in place to protect workers.

In addition to new regulations, attention must be paid to enforcement of the regulations that currently exist and to removing barriers facing workers who wish to exercise their rights. More resources need to be spent in enforcement and more clarity is required in informing workers of their rights and assisting them in exercising those rights. Legal and health services should be more readily available for workers in terms of affordability and numbers of service providers.

Consumer awareness campaigns could be effective tools to educate workers about harms, ways to protect themselves from harm, and remedies available after harm occurs. One driver of change is information, which is greatly needed in this sector to understand and assess current realities and to inform efforts to improve the industry. The FAO has made this one of its focal points. It has also produced reports that are helpful to understand the problems faced by fishers in developing countries.

VI. ADDITIONAL ISSUES BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THIS ARTICLE

There are of course significant environmental concerns related to both capture and aquaculture fisheries with regard to their impacts and their inputs. Though addressing environmental and environmental justice impacts is beyond the scope of this article, it is important to note, and to indicate that there are differing approaches to the conversation as well as some important controversies to consider.

Tribal issues also complicate and inform conversations about fishing. Tribal treaty rights need to be recognized and supported because they are relevant in terms of competition for scarce resources. Tribal fishing also tends to offer alternative methodologies and concepts of sustainability that may offer more protection for fishers, the ecosystem, and the fish themselves. Another issue that is very important but beyond the scope of this paper is the impact of poverty on food security and the impact of related decision-making on the use of fisheries—both capture and aquaculture. It is also crucial to be mindful of how these conversations and policymaking decisions both impact and exclude native people, foreign workers,
and gender issues so that these problems can be alleviated. Doing so, we believe, will inure to the benefit of people, animals, and the environment.

**VII. CONCLUSION**

Much work needs to be done to protect workers and aquatic animals from the harms resulting from the fishing industry. Legal, health, and social development as well as increased legal regulation will help alleviate the problems discussed in this article. More far-reaching solutions are also possible. Alternatives to the use of aquatic animals as food for humans or feed for other animals, or for industrial uses are possible. Increased venture capital funding would spur and hasten development of these alternatives, which would protect humans, animals, and the environment. In the meantime, outdated capture and aquaculture methods can be replaced by new technologies that are safer for people and less harmful to aquatic animals. The law plays an important role in responding to and preventing harms. The fishing industry is an area that is in dire need of the attention of legal reformers.

**ENDNOTES**
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HOW FAST IS TOO FAST? OSHA’S REGULATION OF THE MEAT INDUSTRY’S LINE SPEED AND THE PRICE PAID BY HUMANS AND ANIMALS

By Israel Cook*

In 2016, the United States employed more than 491,000 workers in the meat industry, thereby feeding more than 318 million Americans, and processing over 9 billion animals per year. The growth of the meat industry has placed pressure on slaughterhouses to increase the pace of their line speeds in order to produce more meat and satisfy consumer demand. Due to the faster pace of production, workers are suffering high rates of injury, and animals are being mistreated while still alive. The fast pace of line speeds in slaughterhouses adversely affects worker safety and animal welfare; therefore, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) should regulate line speed in meatpacking plants.

Dangerously fast slaughter line speeds are the leading cause of worker injuries due to the pressure to kill more animals in less time. It is estimated that every year, almost 25% of all meatpacking employees are injured or ill, and the high speed of production lines has increased the industry’s already abundant amount of injuries. The pace of the line affects the employee’s ability to perform tasks safely, making the speed of production an important factor in the health and safety of workers. The physical efforts required for sawing, cutting, slicing, lifting thousands of animals each day is the major source of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs), which is endemic in the meat and poultry industry. Workers in the meatpacking industry “have the highest rate of MSDs, seven times the average incidence rate in manufacturing,” yet the government is not required to track the growing number of MSDs diagnosed in slaughterhouses. The meat industry claims that the rise of injuries related to fast-moving line speeds is untrue, stating that workers’ injuries have declined over the years. However, inspectors, often employed by the meat industry have little incentives to investigate injuries because the injuries could halt the line and affect production margins. OSHA argues that it does not have authority over production speeds and that MSDs cannot solely be attributed to the fast-moving line speeds.

Not only does the line speed affect the safety of the meat industry employees, it significantly contributes to discrimination of individual employees and violates workers’ rights. The majority of laborers in the meatpacking industry are at-will employees and are less likely to report a workplace hazard out of fear of losing their jobs. A number of laborers in the meatpacking industry are undocumented or do not speak English, making them more vulnerable and fearful of reporting workplace hazards. Despite the growth of meat production, slaughterhouse workers’ wages have been rapidly declining. The salary of meatpacking employees barely keeps workers above the poverty line, thus affecting their access to health services as they cannot afford proper transportation to and from doctors, much less healthcare. Furthermore, many slaughterhouses operate twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, requiring employees to work grueling hours—often without approved time off. Additionally, laborers are not allowed unionize, thus facing barriers to exercise their freedom of association.

Consumption of animal products results in the unnecessary suffering and death of billions of animals. Despite having some regulation, like the Humane Slaughter Act, animals are still subjected to inhumane acts of cruelty during processing. While some states have anti-cruelty statutes that work to prevent such conduct, they focus on the individual violations rather than the overall industry violations. The Washington Post reports that “nearly 1 million chickens and turkeys are unintentionally boiled alive each year in U.S. slaughterhouses” due to the increasing pace of production lines.

Currently, line speed is regulated by the USDA based on Food Safety standards and it is only limited by federal sanitation laws. That is, the only time the speed of the line is slowed down is when a USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) inspector halts the line because she or he identifies an animal carcass that appears contaminated (e.g., fecally, bruised, and hemorrhaged). Otherwise, line speed can increase without any concern for a worker’s safety. Under the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA), the regulation of line speed by the USDA for sanitation concerns does not preclude OSHA from regulating line speed for worker health and safety concerns. Though previous attempts by OSHA to regulate line speeds have been blocked by Congress, OSHA must regulate line speed to not only ensure a safe and healthy working condition for workers but to also curb animal cruelty in the meatpacking industry.

Endnotes on page 63
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SERVING PETS IN POVERTY: A NEW FRONTIER FOR THE ANIMAL WELFARE MOVEMENT

By Amanda Arrington and Michael Markarian*

This article is dedicated to JC Ramos who meant so much to the Pets for Life (PFL) program. He not only inspired PFL to do more in the fight against injustice and discrimination, but he served his community with extreme dedication and compassion. There will never be another person like JC, and the PFL team was lucky to call him family.

Most people are aware of how poverty and structural inequality create challenges and barriers to accessing healthy food, education, jobs, health care, and housing. There is less awareness of how limited affordable veterinary and pet wellness services create similar obstacles and how that lack of access disadvantages millions of people and their pets across the United States. Currently there are at least 19 million pets living with U.S. families whose income level is below the poverty line, which is triple the number of dogs and cats who enter animal shelters each year, and there are millions more in working poor and middle-class families struggling with the cost of caring for their pets.

With 78 million dogs and 86 million cats in 80 million American households, pet ownership transcends geographical, racial, religious, and socio-economic boundaries demonstrating that love for pets is a consistent societal value. However, lack of access to information, advice, and direct animal care services produces hardships and heartaches for many pet owners in underserved communities. This denial of access to knowledge, counsel, and support generates a social justice issue in its own right.

Perpetuated by a lack of access to fundamental resources, race and income-based segregation is a centuries old problem. For example, food deserts are impoverished parts of the country with little or no access to fresh produce or full-fledged grocery stores. While they lack fresh fruit, vegetables, and whole foods, they are overrun with fast food chains and processed foods heavy in fat and sugar that contribute to the nation’s obesity and disease epidemic—causing people in underserved communities to suffer at disproportionate rates.

Similarly, there are animal resource deserts—entire neighborhoods with no veterinarians, no pet supply stores, no groomers, and no animal welfare infrastructure. When there are no veterinarians in a community, standard wellness care is not the norm—and familiarity, experience, and knowledge concerning common pet health concerns do not exist. When there are no pet supply stores or big box retailers, simple items like pet food or a collar and leash are out of reach. Pet owners end up spending more, thus experiencing disproportionate financial burdens because prices are higher and selections fewer at small corner stores, and many must wait until situations are dire to address a pet’s medical needs.

Additionally, the majority of people who live in poverty have to work extremely hard to provide even the most basic pet care, yet are frequently accused of being irresponsible with their pets or even punished with fines and criminal charges because of access issues that are largely out of their control. Many people in low-income neighborhoods rely on public transportation, and they cannot take their pets across town on the bus or subway. An animal may be unaltered because there are too many barriers to having the surgery done. A dog may live outside because a landlord does not allow indoor pets, and affordable housing with pet-friendly options is hard to come by.

In some cases, animal welfare professionals have formed negative opinions about people based on the location of their residence or perceived economic status with misperceptions and stereotypes of being cruel toward animals. Too often, these opinions exist without much understanding of the impact of poverty and systematic bias, which frequently isolate certain demographic populations and diminish or completely remove options and choices when it comes to pet care.

This physical divide creates negative assumptions and little to no positive engagement on the part of animal care agencies and service providers. Stereotyping entire communities of pet owners is not uncommon, both within and outside of the animal welfare movement, and it creates an “us versus them” mindset that furthers the trust gap between service providers and the community. Fear and judgment lead to continued lack of engagement, which creates further segregation and inaccessibility to resources. This in turn spreads more misconceptions among people outside of the affected groups.

In a lasting insight gained in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) saw that the poorest communities of Louisiana and Mississippi were places where people loved their pets but simply did not have access to basic services. Nationally, about 86% of dogs and 90% of cats are spayed and neutered. The HSUS vowed to rebuild and strengthen the animal welfare capacity of the Gulf Coast and brought these critical spay and neuter and wellness care services to underserved pet owners.

Using these same insights, The HSUS launched its Pets for Life (PFL) program in 2011. PFL embraces the human in humane, extends compassion and respect to all audiences of pet care, and familiarizes communities with the services they need.

* Amanda Arrington is the Director of the Pets for Life Program at The Humane Society of the United States and Michael Markarian is the Chief Operating Officer at The Humane Society of the United States (humanesociety.org).
owners, and promotes the understanding within the larger animal protection movement that a lack of financial means does not equate to lack of love for a pet. The program not only delivers direct care to thousands of pets in underserved communities each year, but it also works to promote greater recognition within the animal welfare movement of how institutions produce and perpetuate unjust systems and policies..Today, The HSUS operates PFL programs in underserved areas of Los Angeles and Philadelphia, and partners with and trains local animal welfare groups, shelters, and animal control agencies in thirty-two other communities—from major metropolitan cities to extremely rural regions—to share these ideas around the country.

Nationwide, the Pets for Life program has served more than 130,000 pets in underserved areas, and of those, 88% were unaltered—showing the much lower prevalence of spaying and neutering in underserved communities compared to the national rate of only about 10% of owned pets being unaltered.

The program has also helped to overcome a long-held misconception that people in low-income communities or communities of color are opposed to spaying and neutering—that the reason for low sterilization rates. Free spaying and neutering services combined with transportation to and from veterinary appointments and positive engagement has resulted in almost 90% of these pets sterilized through the program. This proves that high percentages of unaltered pets is due to lack of access and not because of differing belief systems or how much people care for their pets. Race and ethnicity are not primary determinants in utilizing veterinary services. In fact, decision-making by pet owners who are Latino and African-American is consistent with that of the behavior of non-Hispanic white pet owners around spay and neuter.

A large majority of people in underserved areas do not know animal welfare agencies exist as a potential resource because information is simply not being shared by service providers in an effective way or with the community’s perspective in mind. Also, some people are apprehensive to reach out to service providers for fear of unfavorable outcomes, such as having their pets taken away from them or being punished for not having the resources to provide medical care.

Additionally, 84% of pet owners served by PFL had never reached out to the local shelter or animal control agency. However, 89% of pets came from sources within the pet owner’s immediate area. There are many reasons for this connection deficiency. For instance, many in the animal welfare field have discussed and treated the issue of companion animal cruelty and neglect the same way for decades, resulting all too often in underserved neighborhoods being stigmatized as places where cruelty is prevalent. Therefore, the experience that many of these pet owners have is negative either because they are insulted and belittled by service providers, or at times even punished with fines or criminal charges for neglect or cruelty. There is an immense need to repair distrust and show that animal welfare extends compassion beyond animals, to include treating people with dignity, respect, and understanding.

The story of Kevin and Boss Lady illustrates how people and pets suffer the injurious consequences of complex societal issues and then see their difficulties compounded by the animal welfare system. Kevin was walking his dog, Boss Lady, down the street one day when a police officer, in a case of mistaken identity, shocked him with a stun gun. Kevin was taken to a hospital and Boss Lady was taken to the local animal control agency. When authorities realized their error and released Kevin, he went to retrieve Boss Lady only to find there were expensive fees that he had to pay to get her back. The police department and shelter denied Kevin’s requests for help even in light of the police department’s error.

On his own, Kevin would not have been able to pay the fees to take his dog home, and the two would have been unfairly separated. Kevin would have lost his companion and Boss Lady would have entered the shelter system with her fate unknown. The sad circumstances involving Kevin and Boss Lady are not rare or extraordinary, but rather are representative of discriminating processes and policies that some people must face on a regular basis, and that ultimately tear families apart.

Keeping people and pets together is a much better outcome than adding to the intake of overburdened shelters that are already working hard to increase adoptions and reduce euthanasia rates. Strengthening the options for animals can also be a pathway to connect people with other social benefits and services. In one example, caseworkers with a needle exchange program had been trying to provide services to a group of drug users squatting in an abandoned building, but the inhabitants rebuffed them at every turn. The drug users were taking care of a colony of cats nearby, and PFL staff members were able to gain their trust by providing services to the cats. This relationship in turn made the clients more open to being introduced to the needle exchange program.

Recognizing the barriers to services that exist for many pet owners and taking a deeper look at the system’s imbalances is not only the right thing for animal welfare but also the way to achieve long-term, sustainable change in countless communities. The driving force behind the PFL program is to provide services that people want and need for their pets and to be a catalyst for widespread availability to veterinary care, supplies, and information. There is a cumulative effect from long-standing practices and prejudices that requires patient, consistent, proactive outreach, and careful listening to all perspectives. However, no short cut will instill faith in the system and build bridges to underserved communities. Nothing will replace face-to-face, positive connection, and empathy in the effort to create sustainable, long-term access to resources, and to guarantee their effective use. The social, psychological, and medical benefits of having a pet should not be available or viable only for select groups or classes of households.

Even when backgrounds and current circumstances are diverse, there is an ease in building relationships and finding commonalities around pets. Animals provide a very natural way for people of different backgrounds to connect and they serve as a critical reminder that all people are more alike than
different. Because of this, animal welfare outreach presents a special opportunity in underserved communities and can provide a bridge to other social issues. A fundamental shift in industry philosophy and policy will position animal welfare as a thought leader and actor in social justice and will distinguish it as a more just and inclusive movement.

For decades, the animal welfare movement as a whole has been making progress on companion animal issues, specifically the reduction in euthanasia of healthy, adoptable animals. In the 1970’s, about 15 million healthy and treatable dogs and cats were euthanized in shelters each year, but today that number has declined to 2.4 million. Popularizing pet adoption, aggressive spay and neuter programs, community partnerships with rescue and foster groups, retention programs to keep pets and families together, and other innovative efforts have driven down euthanasia rates.

With an average of 6.5 million dogs and cats entering animal shelters every year, our movement still needs to provide vital services for the homeless and stray populations, but the time has come to shift resources to focus more attention on pets living in poverty outside the shelter. There is more work to be done, and we need to open up new fronts of activity to help companion animals, including the 19 million pets currently living in poverty. Celebrating the human-animal bond and eliminating the barriers that hamper the broadest possible promotion of companion animal welfare can ensure a future that takes into account all pets in a community, not just those who end up at a shelter.

The Pets for Life program has demonstrated that a deep care and respect for animals transcends social and economic boundaries and is a tie that binds us all. Everyone who wants to provide a loving home to animals deserves access to the resources that make pet keeping possible. The animal welfare movement’s efforts to address lack of access to animal services in underserved communities should be strengthened as a critical priority nationwide. As this happens, entrenched social prejudices will diminish, with tangible benefits for humans, animals, and the larger society. Pets enhance the lives of humans and everyone who so chooses should have the opportunity to experience the unconditional love and meaningful relationship a pet brings. The bond people have with their pets should not depend on income, which ZIP code someone lives in, or the language they speak.
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Friedrich, supra note 140, at 258.
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See Treatment of Live Poultry Before Slaughter, 70 Fed. Reg. at 56,624 ("[P]oultry products are more likely to be adulterated if, among other circumstances, they are produced from birds that have not been treated humanely, because such birds are more likely to be bruised or to die other than by slaughter"); see also Definitions, 7 U.S.C. § 2132 (g) (2012) (explaining the term “animal” in the statute).
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Id.
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\(^{181}\) Id. at 22.

\(^{182}\) Id. at 8-9.
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\(^{218}\) U.S. Dep’t of Agric. Food Safety & Inspection Serv., Food Safety and Inspection Service Labeling Guidelines on Documentation Needed to Substance Animal Raising Claims for Label Submissions 2016 (Sept. 2016), https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/wcm/connect/6fe3cd56-6809-4239-b7a2-bcc82a30588/RaisingClaims.pdf?MOD=AJPERES [hereinafter SERVICE LABELING GUIDELINE] (noting “[The Food Labeling Compliance Guideline] is for establishments that are designing or modifying meat or poultry product labels with animal raising claims.” And therefore they do not apply to those producers who do not raise such claims).
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\(^{222}\) Levine v. Vilsack, 587 F.3d 896, 989 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[The [P]PA] . . . among other things, gave USDA authority to inspect poultry producers for compliance with health and sanitary requirements, required inspection of poultry after slaughter, established labeling requirements for poultry products, and allowed for withdrawal of inspections for noncompliance and the imposition of civil and criminal penalties for the sale of adulterated products.”).
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Controlled Atmosphere Killing (contrasting controlled-atmosphere killing with electric immobilization).
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Id. (commenting on the importance of improving the AWA’s definitions of important terms).
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Shouldn’t “Humane” Labels be Accurate?, ANIMAL WELFARE INST. (May 14, 2014), https://awionline.org/archived-action-ealets/shouldnt-humane-labels-be-accurate (describing AWI’s work to allow companies to place humane labels on products only if they support their claims by meeting standards).
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MSC Chain of Custody Standard, MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL, https://www.msc.org/about-us/standards/chain-of-custody-standard (last visited Dec. 13, 2017) (“The MSC Chain of Custody Standard is a traceability and segregation standard that is applicable to the full supply chain from a certified fishery or farm to final sale. Each company in the supply chain handling or selling an MSC certified product must have a valid MSC Chain of Custody certificate. This assures consumers and seafood-buyers that MSC labeled seafood comes from a certified sustainable fishery.”).
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What Does the Blue MSC Label Mean?, MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL (Aug. 15, 2011), https://20.msc.org/what-we-are-doing/our-approach/what-does-the-blue-msc-label-mean (explaining the blue label is based on a scientific set of requirements and is only applied to wild fish or seafood from fisheries that have been independently assessed and separated from non-certified seafood).

Petition to Amend Labeling, supra note 177, at 19.


The 5-step Animal Welfare Program, supra note 246 (providing a third-party verification of transparency through a rigorous process of setting and approving standards).


See 7 C.F.R. Part 205 (2000) (codifying that making false statements or knowingly selling or labeling products as organic that are non-compliant with the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 may be subject to criminal prosecution and fines); EQP Organic Initiative, U.S. Dep't of Agric., https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1047337.pdf (last visited Dec. 13, 2017) (discussing how EQP Organic Initiative offers financial aid and helps producers implement conservation practices to support the environmental sustainability of their organic operations).


Michael J. Maloni & Michael E. Brown, Corporate Social Responsibility in the Supply Chain: An Application in the Food Industry, 68 J. BUS. ETHICS 1, 44 (2006) (discussing the importance of larger food companies backing up their CSR claims).
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Sandro Castaldo, The Missing Link Between Corporate Social Responsibility and Consumer Trust: The Case of Fair Trade Products, 84 J. BUS. ETHICS 1, 7 (2009) (investigating the link between consumer perception and intention regarding a company’s CSR).

Perdue Farms Announces Animal Care Improvements and Commits to Future Advancements, Perdue Farms, FOOD MRS. (July 17, 2017), https://www.foodmanufacturing.com/news/2017/07/perdue-farms-announces-animal-care-improvements-and-commits-future-advancements (“We know that trust is earned by responding to consumers and other stakeholders, and that includes a willingness to make significant changes,” said Jim Perdue, chairman of Perdue Farms. “It’s not easy, and it requires commitment, resources and time. But people expect more from Perdue, and we have to keep improving”).
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See Treatement of Live Poultry Before Slaughter, 70 Fed. Reg. 56624, 56625 (Sept. 28, 2005); Jones, supra note 293 (noting that the USDA encouraged the poultry industry to adhere to Good Commercial Practices (GCP), which it defined as the poultry industry’s voluntary, minimal animal handling guidelines).

See Treatment of Live Poultry Before Slaughter, 70 Fed. Reg. at 56,624-25 (stating that the PPIA claims a bird is more likely to become adulterated if it is slaughtered inhumanely, despite the fact that the FSIS provided no related statutes).

See Instructions, supra note 165 (providing notice of instructions of inspection standards for poultry GCP).
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See Instructions, supra note 165.
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Id., supra note 56.

See 21 U.S.C. § 461(a); see also 21 U.S.C. § 676 (stating that distribution of adulterated chickens subject the culprit to imprisonment and/or fines).
utilized); Fish Meal, FAO, http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/tan/x5926e/x5926e01.htm (last visited Dec. 20, 2017) (describing the manufacture, storage, composition, and use of fish meal as well as the problem of air pollution from fish meal plants).
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27 See id.
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ing tuna or sharks, could lead to an abnormally large amount of marine prey
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FAO, FOOD OUTLOOK: BI-ANNUAL REPORT ON GLOBAL FOOD MARKETS 8 (June 2017), http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7343e.pdf (predicting increase in output of farmed finfish and other fish) [hereinafter FOOD OUTLOOK].
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STATE OF WORLD FISHERIES 2016, supra note 19, at 5.

Id. at 11, table 2.
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See Mood, supra note 48, at 71 (explaining that about one trillion fish are caught each year).


See supra, note 77 (explaining that fish may feel suffering based on the findings that: fish and mammals respond to aversive stimuli in similar ways; and fish have the ability to remember and anticipate aversive stimuli); see infra Section II (discussing the abilities of fish).
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