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AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION STATUTES IN NEW YORK, NEBRASKA, AND MINNESOTA

NICHOLAS CLARK BUTTINO*

Abstract: States passed agricultural preservation statutes in part to protect their agricultural heritage. Some scholars worry that right-to-farm statutes have not succeeded in achieving this goal. The agricultural preservation statutes of New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota show three different strategies toward agricultural preservation, all of which take different stances on the protections extended to small and large farms. Despite the structural differences among the states’ statutory approach to agricultural preservation, all three experienced similar agricultural demographic shifts since the 1980s—the number of large and small farms has increased while the number of medium-sized farms has decreased. The similarity in demographic trends suggests that none of the statutes are effective. Legislatures may be able to redirect their agricultural preservation statutes by empowering agricultural advisory boards to consider not only the soundness of farming practices but also the cultural and environmental value of individual farms.

Introduction

Since Thomas Jefferson’s conception of a society of middle class farmers, the idea of the small farm has been fixed in America as an essential part of its heritage and economy.1 Responding to population shifts after World War II, every state passed a right-to-farm statute to maintain the economic and cultural importance of farms.2 Right-to-farm statutes3 assist farmers in two ways—they offer protection from

---

* Executive Note Editor, Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, 2011–12.
3 Agricultural preservation statutes, as used in this Note, refer to any statute designed to assist farmers. These statutes include not only right-to-farm statutes, but also tax breaks for agricultural zoning, conservation purchase programs, and limitations on corporate farming. Cf. Sam Sheronick, Note, The Accretion of Cement and Steel onto Prime Iowa Farmland:
nuisance suits and prohibit municipalities from passing burdensome zoning laws that would restrict farming operations.\textsuperscript{4} States passed most of these right-to-farm statutes in the 1970s and 1980s.\textsuperscript{5} Since then, many scholars have questioned the effectiveness and purpose of right-to-farm statutes.\textsuperscript{6} Specifically, right-to-farm statutes can shield businesses from environmental protection laws without offering substantial benefits to economic growth, conservation of open spaces, or cultural preservation.\textsuperscript{7}

In response to such criticism, scholars noted that protections for small farms tend to further the goals of right-to-farm statutes and agricultural preservation more broadly, whereas protections for large farms may be unnecessary subsidies.\textsuperscript{8} Perhaps the problem with right-to-farm statutes is that they do not adequately distinguish between plaintiffs (residents versus developers) and defendants (large commercial farms versus small family farms).\textsuperscript{9} Nevertheless, several states implemented right-to-farm statutes in the hopes of promoting environmental interests and small family farms.\textsuperscript{10}

The agricultural preservation statutes in New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota provide examples of different strategies for protecting all

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{A Proposal for a Comprehensive State Agricultural Zoning Plan}, 76 Iowa L. Rev. 583, 585 n.21, 587–89 (1991) (discussing the different approaches to agricultural preservation as including right-to-farm statutes, zoning, and tax benefits).
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{4} See Hand, \textit{supra} note 1, at 295, 299. \\
\item \textsuperscript{5} See Centner, \textit{supra} note 2, at 94. \\
\item \textsuperscript{7} See Reinert, \textit{supra} note 6, at 1735–38; see also Neil D. Hamilton, \textit{Right-to-Farm Laws Reconsidered: Ten Reasons Why Legislative Efforts to Resolve Agricultural Nuisances May Be Ineffective}, 3 \textit{Drake J. Agric. L.} 103, 118 (1998) (arguing that right-to-farm statutes must be more comprehensive to be effective and fair).
\item \textsuperscript{8} See, e.g., Matt Chester, \textit{Note, Anticorporate Farming Legislation: Constitutionality and Economic Policy}, 9 \textit{Drake J. Agric. L.} 79, 82 (2004); Reinert, \textit{supra} note 6, at 1722, 1736–37; see also Tiffany Dowell, \textit{Comment, Daddy Won’t Sell the Farm: Drafting Right to Farm Statutes to Protect Small Family Producers}, 18 \textit{San Joaquin Agric. L. Rev.} 127, 152–53 (2008–09) (suggesting that nuisance protections in right-to-farm statutes are not strong enough to ensure preservation of family farms).
\item \textsuperscript{9} Reinert, \textit{supra} note 6, at 1736.
\item \textsuperscript{10} See, e.g., Neb. Const. art. XII, § 8 (1982) (banning corporate ownership of farms in Nebraska); \textit{Minn. Stat.} § 561.19 (2010) (defining Minnesota’s right-to-farm law and excluding large concentrated animal feeding operations); \textit{N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law} § 300 (McKinney 2011) (stating the purpose of New York’s agricultural preservation laws). 
\end{itemize}
farms and specifically small farms. New York has a standard right-to-farm statute that provides farmers with protection from nuisance suits and interference from municipalities. Nebraska banned corporate farming from 1982 to 2006 through a constitutional amendment. Minnesota has both restricted corporate farming and removed nuisance protections for certain concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs). Clearly, the states have different perspectives on how to protect small farms.

Empirical analysis indicates that despite their different approaches to agricultural preservation, all three states show similar changes in farming trends. For example, in all three the number of large and

12 N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 305-a, 308.
13 Neb. Const. art. XII, § 8 (1982); see Jones v. Gale, 470 F.3d 1261, 1271 (8th Cir. 2006) (striking down the amendment as unconstitutional under the dormant commerce clause).
15 See Neb. Const. art. XII, § 8 (1982); Minn. Stat. § 561.19; N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 300.
small farms has increased, while the number of medium-sized farms has decreased. Similarly, the number of farms with very high and low gross sales has increased in all three states, while the number of farms with moderate gross sales has decreased. Thus, despite their different approaches, all three states have experienced similar changes in farming demographics.

Part I of this Note provides an overview of the design, function, and criticisms of right-to-farm-statutes. Part II discusses the specific statutes and cases that govern agricultural preservation in New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota. Part III offers a visual and numeric comparison of demographic shifts in the three states between 1987 and 2007. Finally, Part IV analyzes these trends and suggests that legislatures should pass statutes that bolster medium-sized farms, rather than punishing large or corporate farms. It further argues that legislatures should delegate authority to agricultural advisory councils to favor the farming practices of small farms.

I. DESIGN, USES, AND LIMITATIONS OF RIGHT-TO-FARM STATUTES

A. Development and Use of Right-to-Farm Statutes

Most states passed right-to-farm statutes in the late 1970s and early 1980s in response to population shifts in the American countryside after World War II. During this period, people moved out of cities and into suburban and exurban areas. The growing suburbs caused developers to convert about 3 million acres of farm land for residential purposes each year. Through right-to-farm statutes, states sought to

ence between the statistics in each case, despite the labeling change. Compare id. at 9, with 1997 Minn. Data, supra, at 12.


20 Hand, supra note 1, at 290; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1696.

21 Hand, supra note 1, at 290.

22 Id. at 289.
slow the rate of land conversion by protecting farmers from nuisance and zoning laws. They reasoned that nuisance suits and zoning laws could make farming unprofitable. Early writings on right-to-farm statutes questioned their constitutional soundness but were hesitantly optimistic that such statutes could preserve farmland.

Right-to-farm statutes typically protect farmers in two ways: (1) by offering protection from nuisance suits, and (2) by limiting the authority of local governments to pass laws that inhibit farming. Typically, nuisance protection varies from state to state. Some states protect farmers if their nuisance-causing activities have priority in time—the “coming to the nuisance” affirmative defense. Other states, such as Minnesota, disqualify potential nuisance claims by imposing a rather brief statute of limitations. These states, however, generally allow nuisance claims arising from the farmer’s negligence. Bans on nuisance claims provide the first line of protection to farmers. They are often more effective in the early stages of land conversion projects because of the time it takes for new suburbs to develop sufficient political clout to alter zoning regulations.

Restrictions on unfavorable zoning laws are the second form of protection offered by right-to-farm statutes. Some states restrict municipalities from passing laws that limit farm use. For example, a town in New York could not pass zoning laws that would limit a farmer’s ability to construct mobile homes for migrant workers. Conversely, a state may encourage agricultural zoning to preserve farms. Agricultural zoning offers the added advantage of separating land by use. Some scholars fear that differences in cultural expectations concerning land  

---

23 See Centner, supra note 2, at 88; Hand, supra note 1, at 295.
24 See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1697, 1704 n.66.
26 See Centner, supra note 2, at 88; Hand, supra note 1, at 295.
27 See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1695.
28 See Hamilton, supra note 7, at 106; Hand, supra note 1, at 306–07.
30 See id.
31 See id. at 1697.
32 See id.
33 See id. at 1703.
34 Id. at 1705; see also N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 305-a (McKinney 2011) (forbidding municipalities from “unreasonably restrict[ing] . . . farm operations”).
36 See, e.g., N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 304–305 (discussing the use of tax incentives in agricultural zoning).
37 See id.
use cause many of the conflicts between established farming communities and new suburban residents.\textsuperscript{38} Separating land by use can minimize cultural conflicts between farmers and new residents before either party experiences harm.\textsuperscript{39}

Some states also use other techniques to encourage agricultural preservation.\textsuperscript{40} Agricultural preservation statutes include not only right-to-farm laws but also tax incentives, development rights purchasing programs, and other laws designed primarily to protect farmland as open space.\textsuperscript{41} To illustrate, both Massachusetts and New York purchase conservation easements that restrict future development of land.\textsuperscript{42} States may also reduce assessments on farm land to decrease property taxes.\textsuperscript{43} Tax breaks and purchasing programs, like right-to-farm statutes, attempt to preserve farmland and thus are closely linked to right-to-farm statutes.\textsuperscript{44} Nevertheless, this Note focuses on different applications of right-to-farm statutes.

\section*{B. The Limitations and Controversies of Right-to-Farm Statutes}

Despite right-to-farm statutes’ purpose of protecting traditional economies, cultural values, open spaces, and the environment, many scholars criticize their design and implementation.\textsuperscript{45} Scholars are concerned that right-to-farm laws create loopholes for agribusiness to skirt environmental laws.\textsuperscript{46} For example, scholars worry that right-to-farm laws allow CAFOs, especially hog farms, to avoid the Clean Water Act (CWA) and dump excess phosphorus into local rivers.\textsuperscript{47} In response to claims of CWA violations, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See, e.g., Dowell, supra note 8, at 127–28.
\item See id.
\item Reinert, supra note 6, at 1695.
\item Id.; cf. Sheronick, supra note 3 (describing methods of agricultural preservation).
\item See N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 305 (McKinney 2011); Reinert, supra note 6, at 1695.
\item See N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 300 (noting that the overall purpose of its agricultural preservation statutes applies to both right-to-farm statutes and development rights purchasing programs); see Reinert, supra note 6, at 1695.
\item See Centner, supra note 2, at 92; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1736.
\item See Centner, supra note 2, at 92.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
moved to include these farms as point sources within the statute. In so doing, the EPA subjected CAFOs to stricter limits on effluent discharge. Some believe that despite EPA’s efforts, CWA violations persist because right-to-farm statutes allow, and even promote, CAFOs that cause significant land deterioration and environmental damage. One commentator argues that right-to-farm statutes offer insufficient protection from nuisance suits, particularly for small farms, and therefore should be strengthened. The fear that environmental damage outweighs the societal benefits of right-to-farm statutes remains a powerful criticism.

Beyond their potential environmental costs, right-to-farm statutes may also be ineffective. Starting in the early 1980s, scholars began to investigate the power of right-to-farm laws and whether they would reduce conflicts over land use. By the 1990s some scholars, noting that the development of right-to-farm statutes appeared ineffective and inequitable, questioned why states did not create a comprehensive system. Protecting farmers from nuisance suits might encourage them to act inefficiently, thereby creating problems for the community. Such inefficiencies appear because of right-to-farm statutes’ lack of clarity which, if remedied by more explicit regulations, could promote bargaining between farmers and residents.

---

48 See id. Point sources are defined in the CWA as “any discernible, confined and discrete conveyance . . . from which pollutants are or may be discharged.” 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14) (2006).

49 See 33 U.S.C. § 1342(a) (defining the requirements for regulation of point sources in the CWA); see also Terrence J. Centner, Challenging NPDES Permits Granted Without Public Participation, 38 B.C. ENVTL. AFF. L. REV. 1, 5 (2010) (discussing how the EPA changed the regulations of CAFOs in the CWA as a result of public participation).

50 Centner, supra note 2, at 92; see Hamilton, supra note 7, at 109–10; Knauf, supra note 45, at 8.

51 See Dowell, supra note 8, at 152–53.

52 See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1717–18, 1722.

53 See Duke & Malcom, supra note 45, at 302; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1724.

54 See Mark B. Lapping et al., Right-to-Farm Laws: Do They Resolve Land Use Conflicts? 38 J. SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION, 465, 467 (1983) (indicating that right-to-farm laws are often worded too vaguely, but at least attempt to solve conflicts regarding land uses); Reinert, supra note 6, at 1728.

55 See, e.g., Hamilton, supra note 7, at 118.

56 Reinert, supra note 6, at 1728.

To the extent that right-to-farm statutes are effective, scholars question whom they benefit. The traditional concern is that right-to-farm statutes give too much assistance to large commercial farms without reciprocal benefits to the environment. The agricultural community has shown mixed interest in environmental preservation. If both farmers and their neighbors use their land in socially and economically beneficial ways, one might question why legislatures should favor farmers. In turn, one could propose a Coasean solution—which emphasizes market efficiency in the law—of encouraging farmers and residents to sign contracts where farmers agree to basic environmental protection standards in exchange for more protections from litigation. The value of right-to-farm statutes remains an open question, but state legislatures continue to promote them as a matter of policy.

Additionally, both the Farm Bill and hobby farms influence the development and use of agricultural land. The Farm Bill is a comprehensive set of laws designed to provide food security, promote farming, and develop ethanol production. However, one scholar notes that the Farm Bill has caused massive industrialization of American agriculture. On a smaller scale, hobby farms—farms that are run for their owner’s enjoyment rather than as a source of income—raise some environmental concerns. Specifically, hobby farms sometimes represent a

---

58 See Centner, supra note 2, at 141–42; Hand, supra note 1, at 347; Peter J. Wall, Land Use and Agricultural Exceptionalism, 16 San Joaquin Agric. L. Rev. 219, 236–27 (2006–07); see also R. Lisle Baker, My Tree Versus Your Solar Collector or Your Well Versus My Septic System?—Exploring Responses to Beneficial but Conflicting Neighboring Uses of Land, 37 B.C. Env'l Aff. L. Rev. 1, 8 (2010) (discussing right-to-farm statutes in the context of reciprocal harms).

59 Reinert, supra note 6, at 1715, 1722.

60 See Patricia E. Salkin & Brenda Stadel, Agricultural Land Preservation, in ZONING AND LAND USE CONTROLS § 56.01 (LexisNexis Matthew Bender 2011), available at LexisNexis ZLANDU.

61 See Baker, supra note 58, at 8; Wall, supra note 58, at 236–37.

62 See Lewis, supra note 57, at 1570, 1584; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1734–35.

63 See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1738.


66 See Eubanks, supra note 1, at 251–52.

67 See Krannich, supra note 64, at 83–84; Richardson, supra note 64, at 65–66.
step toward developing farmland for residential purposes. Thus, farmers are pressured to either become larger and more industrialized or sell their land for division.

Much of the ambiguity regarding the effectiveness of right-to-farm statutes results from confusion about whom they are designed to assist. State legislatures often preface their right-to-farm statutes with a vague statement of intent. In these cases, it is unclear whether the legislature was most interested in protecting a rural farming culture, the environment, or the viability of an agricultural economy. Moreover, statutes designed to protect small farms may be more useful to large farms because the scale of nuisances often increases with farm size. Much of the language of right-to-farm statutes, however, is more related to the cultural and environmental benefits associated with small farms than the economic influences of agribusinesses.

II. Statutes, Cases, and History of Agricultural Preservation Laws by State

States employ a variety of tactics to preserve agriculture. New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota use three different techniques to assist farms while also trying to limit the influence of agribusinesses. These methods are only a sample of available strategies. Their statutory language, which ranges from broad statements about the historical impor-

---

68 See Krannich, supra note 64, at 83–84.
69 Reinert, supra note 6, at 1699; see Eubanks, supra note 1, at 251–52; Richardson, supra note 64, at 65–66.
70 Hamilton, supra note 7, at 108 (stating that right-to-farm statutes are too broadly applicable).
71 Reinert, supra note 6, see, e.g., N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 300 (McKinney 2011) (stating that the purpose of New York agricultural preservation is “to conserve, protect and encourage the development and improvement of its agricultural land for production of food and other agricultural products”).
72 Reinert, supra note 6, at 1718–19; see, e.g., N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 300.
73 Hamilton, supra note 7, at 112.
74 See Centner, supra note 2, at 141. Scholars refer to farms of less than 1000 acres, with gross sales of less than $250,000, as small family farms. Chester, supra note 8, at 80; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1698. While the per capita sales of small farms do not match those of large farms and CAFOs, they fit more neatly within traditional conceptions of preservation. Centner, supra note 2, at 141–42; see Salkin, supra note 60, § 56.01.
75 Centner, supra note 2, at 147; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1695.
77 See Centner, supra note 2, at 147 (listing the right-to-farm statutes of all fifty states). Some consider North Carolina to have the model right-to-farm statute. Lapping et al., supra note 54, at 465; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1707.
tance of agriculture, to a ban on corporate farming, to limits on nuisance protections for concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), provides solid grounds for a comparative analysis.78

A. New York: A Standard Right-to-Farm Statute with an Agricultural Advisory Council

New York’s agricultural preservation statute offers a basic set of protections similar to many states.79 The statute begins with a statement of purpose.80 The purpose statement indicates that New York’s lands are in jeopardy, and therefore all efforts should be made to “protect and encourage the development and improvement of its agricultural land for production of food” and “protect agricultural lands as valued natural and ecological resources.”81 Farming land is also valuable as an economic resource, as it accounts for billions of dollars in New York’s economy.82

The statute offers both nuisance and zoning protections to farmers, declaring that “an agricultural practice shall not constitute a private nuisance,”83 and “local governments . . . shall not unreasonably restrict or regulate farm operations.”84 The statute allows for an exception to this protection when the local government can show that the “public health or safety is threatened” by the agricultural practice.85

New York’s nuisance protection for farmers has an interesting twist because the statute requires the State Advisory Council on Agriculture (Council) to determine whether an activity is a “sound agricultural practice” before farmers receive protection.86 The Governor of New York appoints members of local farming communities to the Council, which advises the State Department of Agriculture on all farming and agricultural preservation issues.87 Many states require that farmers follow some

78 See Neb. Const. art. XII, § 8 (1982); Minn. Stat. § 561.19; N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 300.
79 See Centner, supra note 2, at 113.
80 N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 300.
81 Id.
82 Nolon & Solloway, supra note 42, at 592.
83 N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 308.
84 Id. § 305-a.
85 Id.
86 Id. §§ 308, 309; Centner, supra note 2, at 113.
baseline of accepted practices, but New York’s statute attempts to define how such practices will be evaluated.\textsuperscript{88} The Council’s authority, especially when considered in light of the statute’s purpose statement, allows for selective protection of farming practices that are most beneficial to the economy, culture, and environment.\textsuperscript{89} Thus, the Council could favor the practices of small farms instead of agribusiness and CAFOs.\textsuperscript{90}

Case law precedent concerning New York’s right-to-farm statute instructs New York courts to uphold protections for farmers in the absence of compelling evidence to do otherwise.\textsuperscript{91} For example, in \textit{Town of Lysander v. Hafner}, the court evaluated whether a town could pass zoning ordinances that limited a farmer’s ability to construct mobile homes for housing migratory workers.\textsuperscript{92} The court interpreted the meaning of “farm operations” broadly to include residential buildings and held that the town did not present sufficient evidence to show a risk to public safety—the requirement for an exception to New York’s right-to-farm law.\textsuperscript{93}

Additionally, case law precedent reinforces the Council’s determinations concerning agricultural practices.\textsuperscript{94} For example, a court upheld the Council’s determination that storage of pig manure in a large concrete container is a sound agricultural practice.\textsuperscript{95} The court also decided that the Council has the authority to determine practices for pesticide use.\textsuperscript{96} Although these rulings reinforce the authority of the Council to protect farmers, they do not embody the environmental protections envisioned in the purpose statement of New York’s agricultural preservation statutes.\textsuperscript{97} New York’s laws thus offer an interesting point of comparison because of their effectiveness in preserving agriculture and promoting family farms.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{88} N.Y. AGRIC. & MKTS. LAW § 308; see Dowell, \textit{supra} note 8, at 133–35.
\textsuperscript{89} See N.Y. AGRIC. & MKTS. LAW § 308; Dowell, \textit{supra} note 8, at 134–35.
\textsuperscript{90} See N.Y. AGRIC. & MKTS. LAW § 308; Dowell, \textit{supra} note 8, at 135.
\textsuperscript{92} 759 N.E.2d at 359.
\textsuperscript{93} Id.
\textsuperscript{94} Pure Air & Water, 669 N.Y.S.2d at 250–51.
\textsuperscript{95} Lacona, 858 N.Y.S.2d at 835–36.
\textsuperscript{96} Id. at 835.
\textsuperscript{97} See N.Y. AGRIC. & MKTS. LAW §§ 300, 305-a, 308, 309 (McKinney 2011); Lysander, 759 N.E.2d at 358–59; Lacona, 858 N.Y.S.2d at 835–36; Pure Air & Water, 668 N.Y.S.2d at 250–51.
\textsuperscript{98} See N.Y. AGRIC. & MKTS. LAW § 300.
B. Nebraska: Nuisance Protection and a Constitutional Ban on Corporate Farming

Nebraska’s laws combined a standard nuisance protection clause and a constitutional amendment that restricted the ability of out-of-state corporations to operate farms in the state. The Nebraska legislature, in passing the Constitutional amendment, addressed concerns about the influences of agribusinesses and provided additional protection to family farms because only they offered sufficient cultural and environmental benefits. The combination of nuisance protection and limitations on corporate farming between 1982 and 2006 distinguish Nebraska’s agricultural preservation laws from those of many other states.

1. The Structure and Limitations of Nebraska’s Right-to-Farm Statute

Nebraska’s right-to-farm statute provides a basic set of nuisance protections for both animal and crop farms. The statute provides that “[a] farm . . . shall not be found to be a public or private nuisance,” as long as the farming activity is a preexisting use. Another section of the statute defines “farm” as “any tract of land over ten acres in area used for or devoted to the commercial production of farm products.” The statute thus excludes very small farms from the nuisance shield. The legislature makes no further distinction between types of farms in the basic right-to-farm statute. The statute’s “coming to the nuisance” defense, however, requires the farming practices to predate the plaintiff’s enjoyment of the land.

---

100 See Anthony B. Schutz, Corporate-Farming Measures in a Post-Jones World, 14 Drake J. Agric. L. 97, 120–21 (2009); Chester, supra note 8, at 82.
101 See Neb. Const. art. XII, § 8; Neb. Rev. Stat. § 2-4403; Jones, 470 F.3d at 1271; Schutz, supra note 100, at 106. Twelve other states have some form of corporate farming restriction. Schutz, supra note 100, at 106.
102 Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 2-4402 to -4403; see Reinert, supra note 6, at 1707 (describing the North Carolina right-to-farm law as a model statute, and detailing its nuisance protections).
104 Id. § 2-4402. The statute also offers similar protections to “public grain warehouse[s].” See id. § 2-4403.
105 Id. § 2-4402.
106 Id. § 2-4403.
107 Id.
the use of zoning to protect farms, but that scheme is not part of the right-to-farm statute.\textsuperscript{108}

The Nebraska Supreme Court interprets the right-to-farm statute narrowly, thereby offering farmers protection only when their operations fit within the text of the statute.\textsuperscript{109} Most recently, the court held that the statute does not apply retroactively.\textsuperscript{110} In earlier cases, the court was not sympathetic to CAFOs for hogs, finding that construction of hog confinement areas did not protect the farmers because they changed their use of their land and thus could not avail themselves of the “coming to the nuisance” defense.\textsuperscript{111} These cases show that the court did not strike down nuisance protections for CAFOs because the farms should not have been protected within the plain meaning of the statute.\textsuperscript{112}

2. A Constitutional Amendment Banning Corporate Farming

An amendment to Nebraska’s Constitution changed the background of agricultural preservation by prohibiting out-of-state corporate farming.\textsuperscript{113} While in effect, article twelve, section eight provided that “[n]o corporation or syndicate shall acquire . . . any title to real estate used for farming or ranching in this state, or engage in farming or ranching.”\textsuperscript{114} Additionally, the amendment did not apply to “family farm[s]” where the “majority of the voting stock is held by members of a family . . . at least one of whom is a person residing on or actively engaged in the day to day labor and management of the farm.”\textsuperscript{115} In this way, the people of Nebraska tried to affirmatively ban agribusinesses to preserve their culture and heritage.\textsuperscript{116}

In \textit{Jones v. Gale}, the Eighth Circuit held article twelve, section eight of the Nebraska Constitution invalid because it violated the dormant

\textsuperscript{108} \textit{See}, \textit{e.g.}, \textit{id.} § 23-114.03 (allowing counties to set restrictions on the use of agricultural lands); \textit{id.} § 81-2,147.12 (preempting local laws relating to the sale of seeds).


\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Soukop}, 653 N.W.2d at 658 (holding that the 1998 addition of grain operators in the definition of farm did not extend retroactive protections for grain operators).

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{See} \textit{Flansburgh}, 370 N.W.2d at 129, 131; \textit{Cline}, 361 N.W.2d at 569, 572.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{See} \textit{Neb. Rev. Stat.} § 2-4403; \textit{Flansburgh}, 370 N.W.2d at 129, 131; \textit{Cline}, 361 N.W.2d at 569, 572.

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Neb. Const.} art. XII, § 8 (1982); \textit{see} \textit{Chester}, \textit{supra} note 8, at 82, 84; \textit{Schutz, supra} note 100, at 106–07.

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Neb. Const.} art. XII, § 8 (1982).

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{See id.}; \textit{Schutz, supra} note 100, at 101–02.
commerce clause. The dormant commerce clause provides that, because Congress has the affirmative power to regulate commerce, states may not act to limit interstate commerce. The court specifically attacked the exception that allowed corporate farming for family farms that were managed by Nebraska residents. The statute violated the dormant commerce clause because it discriminated against out-of-state businesses. Because only part of the statute violated the dormant commerce clause, it may still be permissible for a state to ban corporate farming all together. Nevertheless, Nebraska case law required the Eighth Circuit to hold the entire statute unconstitutional instead of simply severing the offending provision.

When one considers the amendment along with the right-to-farm statute, Nebraska had a developed a distinct strategy for agricultural preservation.

C. Minnesota: Limits on Nuisance Protection for CAFOs and a Ban on Corporate Farming

The Minnesota agricultural preservation statutes both provide small farms with nuisance protection and ban corporate farming. The state’s right-to-farm statute operates like those of New York and Nebraska. The statute provides that a farm “is not and shall not become a private or public nuisance after two years from its established date of operation.” It also contains a few standard limitations—the farm must be in an “agriculturally zoned area,” the farmer must follow “generally accepted agricultural practices,” and the farmer cannot operate equipment negligently. The statute defines farm as “a facility and its appurtenances for the production of crops, livestock, poultry, dairy products or poultry products, but not a facility primarily engaged

117 470 F.3d 1261, 1271 (8th Cir. 2006).
118 See id. at 1267.
119 Id. at 1264, 1267.
120 Id. at 1269.
121 Id. at 1271.
122 Id.
124 Minn. Stat. §§ 500.24, 561.19 (2010); see Schutz, supra note 100, at 132–33; Chester, supra note 8, at 81–82.
126 Minn. Stat. § 561.19.
127 Id.
in processing agricultural products.” Interestingly, the statute does not apply to farms that can hold more than 1000 hogs or 2500 cattle. Although Minnesota’s right-to-farm statute provides standard protections for farmers, the legislature must have been concerned about large CAFOs abusing environmental protection laws.

Minnesota has another statute that bans certain types of corporate farming. In the statute’s purpose statement, “the family farm” is described as “the most socially desirable mode of agricultural production” and essential to “the stability and well-being of rural society in Minnesota and the nuclear family.” The statute goes on to list certain exceptions to the ban, mostly related to family corporations. The exceptions have some of the residency requirements seen in the Nebraska constitution but are more complex. Consequently, the reasoning in Jones v. Gale probably does not undermine Minnesota’s ban on corporate farming.

Similar to Nebraska, the Minnesota courts interpret these statutes according to their plain meaning. Farmers may be liable for nuisances, even when using generally accepted agricultural equipment. Plaintiffs must show that the farmer used that equipment negligently. For example, a dairy farm that used a clay manure storage area could commit a nuisance from the odor of that manure if the farmers did not properly construct the storage basin.

128 Id. The statute uses “agricultural operation” instead of farm. Id.
129 Id.
130 See id.
131 Id. § 500.24.
133 Id.
135 See Minn. Stat. § 500.24; Jones, 470 F.3d at 1271; see also infra notes 159–232 and accompanying text (analyzing the statues in context).
III. **Empirical Data on Demographic Changes in Farming by State, Farm Size, and Gross Sales**

A. **An Overview of Methods and Considerations**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture keeps detailed records of changes in farming output and demographics, measured every five years. The Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau have collected data on agricultural demographics since 1840. For the purposes of this Note, data from 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2007 will be analyzed. Demographic changes are important because they may signify the increase of agribusinesses at the expense of more traditional agriculture. The current literature, published before some of the more recent agricultural censuses, offers only a brief analysis of demographic changes and does not attempt to link those changes with specific statutes.

Although New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota have different agricultural protection statutes, they all exhibit similar trends—large and small sized farms are increasing in number while medium size farms are decreasing in number. The following section highlights the data indicating these demographic shifts.

New York and Minnesota experienced the most similar changes in demographics. Nebraska’s numbers are somewhat deceptive, however, because the average farm is much larger in Nebraska than New York and Minnesota. In 2007, the average size of a farm was 953 acres.

---

141 Id.
143 Chester, supra note 8, at 80; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1698.
144 See generally Reinert, supra note 6 (analyzing the effects of right-to-farm statutes on family farms without a detailed analysis of demographic shifts).
147 2007 Census, supra note 140, at 348–50.
in Nebraska, 197 acres in New York, and 332 acres in Minnesota. At the same time, Nebraska had 36,352 farms, compared to 36,352 in New York and 80,992 farms in Minnesota. The states all experienced similar trends in demographic shifts in size despite different statutory approaches to agricultural preservation.

B. Demographic Changes in Number of Farms

New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota experienced similar shifts in the number of small, medium, and large farms between 1987 and 2007. The number of small farms increased in New York and Minnesota by 28.6% and 39.8% respectively; the number of small farms in Nebraska decreased by 1.7%. The number of medium-sized farms decreased in all three states, by 25.8% in New York, by 26.7% in Minnesota, and by 36.2% in Nebraska. The number of large farms increased in all three states—by 35.8% in New York, by 45.2% in Minnesota, and by 6.9% in Nebraska.

The demographic shifts in gross sales in New York, Nebraska, and Minnesota mirror the shifts in average farm size. The number of farms with low gross sales increased in New York by 14.5% and in Minnesota by 54.9%. Conversely, the number of farms with low gross sales in Nebraska decreased by 2.1%. Farms with moderate gross sales

---

148 Id.
149 Id.


IV. The Demographic Trends Indicate That the Statutes Are Ineffective and Could Be Improved by More Tailored Action


The lack of a correlation between divergent statutory language and statistical results suggests that these agricultural preservation statutes are not effective.\footnote{See Centner, supra note 2, at 90. See generally Eubanks, supra note 1.} Macroeconomic factors, such as the Farm Bill, probably have a greater effect on the success of agricultural preservation.\footnote{See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1738 (suggesting how right-to-farm statutes could be amended to preserve the environment).}

Nevertheless, right-to-farm statutes can still play a role in environmental preservation.\footnote{See Centner, supra note 2, at 143; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1736.}

States can solve many of the problems associated with right-to-farm statutes by permitting state agricultural boards to consider not only sound practices but also the type of farm.\footnote{See Centner, supra note 2, at 143; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1736.}

A. Demographic Data Indicates That Right-to-Farm Statutes are Ineffective

The demographic trends discussed in Part III suggest that the differences in statutory language have little influence on farming growth. Notably, small and large farms have increased in all three states, while
the number of medium-sized farms has decreased. The cause of these trends and the overall effectiveness of the statutes, however, cannot be determined from the Department of Agriculture’s data alone.

The data offers no baseline for comparison because all states have right-to-farm statutes and all states differ in the structure of their agricultural economy. Surprisingly, the data does not coincide with the expectation that divergent strategies for farm preservation would produce different results. Nebraska and Minnesota have made strong attempts to limit corporate farming but have only experienced comparable increases in the number of farms with high gross sales to New York. To the extent that the data differs from state to state, Nebraska’s data is the most distinctive. Yet Nebraska and Minnesota have the most similar statutes, suggesting that New York should have more distinctive results.

Nebraska’s deviation can partially be explained by the structure of its right-to-farm statute. Nebraska refused to extend nuisance protections to farms with less than ten acres. Accordingly, the most dramatic drop in the number of small farms occurred in farms with less than ten acres. The absence of this protection and the corresponding drop in the number of small farms indicates the importance of nuisance shields in maintaining farms. Thus, although analysis of the demographic trends as a whole downplays the significance of right-to-farm statutes, their presence is somewhat important. Other data does not show what occurs with the complete removal of nuisance protections. Neither Minnesota’s removal of nuisance protection for CA-

---


166 See Centner, supra note 2, at 90 (suggesting economic factors influence farming population shifts).

167 See id. at 87, 88.


170 See supra notes 75–139 and accompanying text.

171 NEB. REV. STAT. § 2-4403 (2010).


FOs nor Nebraska and Minnesota’s general limitations on corporate farming correspond with shifts in farm’s land area or gross sales. The other small differences in Nebraska’s data trends are best explained by the differences in average farm size between Nebraska and the other two states.

While previous scholarship has focused on the distinction between small and large farms, the data indicates that distinguishing among three size groups reveals meaningfully different trends. Scholars traditionally separate farms into two categories—farms with less than both 1000 acres and $250,000 in gross sales, and larger farms. It makes sense, however, to break farms into three categories—farms that do not produce enough revenue to support their owners (hobby farms), family farms, and agribusinesses. For the purpose of this Note, hobby farms are those with less than both $10,000 in gross sales and 100 acres.

The drastic increases in the number of large farms and hobby farms, and corresponding decreases in medium-sized farms, indicate that economic pressures overwhelm the statutes’ strategies. Though right-to-farm statutes may be important for the protection of farms generally, attempts to limit corporate farming appear to be ineffective. Despite having an outright ban on corporate farming, Nebraska and

---


176 See supra notes 140–150 and accompanying text.

177 See, e.g., Centner, supra note 2, at 141–42; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1698.

178 See Chester, supra note 8, at 80; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1698. These numbers are not adjusted for inflation. But see Eubanks, supra note 1, at 229 (analyzing the national decrease in numbers of small, medium, and large farms). Gross sales provide a better indication of the economic structure of a farm, but because of inflation, land acreage offers a more consistent variable for comparison across time. See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1698.

179 See Eubanks, supra note 1, at 229. Hobby farms lack a clear definition. See, e.g., Krannich, supra note 64, at 83 (stating that three to five acre farms are hobby farms); Richardson, supra note 64, at 65–66 (indicating that hobby farms are about ten acres in size).

180 When originally analyzing the data, I expected only to find a distinction between small and large farms. I made these categories only after viewing the data and recognizing the difference between smaller family farms, which I describe as hobby farms, and larger family farms.

181 See Centner, supra note 2, at 90.

Minnesota experienced drastic increases in the number of farms with more than $250,000 in gross sales (217% and 266%, respectively). Conversely, all three states saw a decrease in the number of moderate income farms. The decreases by gross sales ranged from 30% to 48%. When grouped by size, the decreases ranged from 25% to 38%.

Demographic shifts away from medium-sized farms threaten many of the cultural and economic benefits that agricultural preservation statutes seek to protect. Both New York and Minnesota explicitly justify their agricultural preservation statutes on the importance of protecting cultural values, traditional economies, and the environment. Additionally, scholars attribute environmental benefits to medium-sized farms. Thus, it appears that agribusinesses and hobby farms unjustly benefit from right-to-farm statutes.

B. A Potential Solution: Granting Agricultural Advisory Councils Discretion to Favor Both Environmentally Sound Practices and Medium-Sized Farms

The disconnect between the purpose underlying right-to-farm statutes and changing demographics suggests the need to revise the laws. Proposed solutions are difficult to verify because the variation between states’ statutes and economies makes clear comparison almost impossible. Additionally, macroeconomic issues appear to drive the shifts in farming demographics. Agricultural preservation statutes can only

188 See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737.
190 See, e.g., Krannich, supra note 64, at 83–84; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737.
191 See, e.g., Krannich, supra note 64, at 83–84; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737.
192 See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1736.
193 See Centner, supra note 2, at 90, 147 (commenting on the influence of macroeconomic factors).
194 See id. at 90; Eubanks, supra note 1, at 217.
insulate certain populations from those pressures.\textsuperscript{195} Potential solutions, such as creating more distinctions within the statutes, encouraging contractual agreements, and strengthening right-to-farm statutes offer some promise.\textsuperscript{196} Legislatures should proceed carefully in implementing any changes to right-to-farm statutes to minimize economic disruption.\textsuperscript{197} Using state agricultural boards to decide which farms and practices are most deserving of protection will promote locally appropriate changes consistent with the purpose statements of agricultural preservation statutes.\textsuperscript{198}

First, universally strengthening right-to-farm statutes will not reverse the demographic trends because of the economic pressures driving agricultural industrialization.\textsuperscript{199} Some commentators champion the enhancement of right-to-farm statutes as a solution to the decreasing number of farms.\textsuperscript{200} The more extreme version of this argument contends that population migration and lack of cultural understanding are the primary threats to the American family farm.\textsuperscript{201} The more moderate approach articulates that agricultural interests need more protection because states have not integrated current right-to-farm statutes with broader economic policies.\textsuperscript{202} The moderate argument correctly characterizes many of the problems facing American agriculture as both economic and cultural.\textsuperscript{203} Economic changes, more than cultural intolerance, drive agricultural demographics.\textsuperscript{204}

Other proposed changes to agricultural preservation, such as modifying the structure of farm subsidies or encouraging contract formation, provide a background when considering the alteration of right-to-farm statutes.\textsuperscript{205} First, the Farm Bill gives rise to many of the economic influences that alter the effectiveness of right-to-farm statutes.\textsuperscript{206} Sec-

\textsuperscript{195} See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1738.
\textsuperscript{196} Lewis, supra note 57, at 1594–95; Reinert, supra note 6, at 1738; see Dowell, supra note 8, at 152–53.
\textsuperscript{197} See Centner, supra note 2, at 145.
\textsuperscript{198} See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737.
\textsuperscript{199} See Dowell, supra note 8, at 152–53 (suggesting that states should strengthen right-to-farm statues); Eubanks, supra note 1, at 217 (describing the industrialization of farming); Hamilton, supra note 7, at 118.
\textsuperscript{200} See Dowell, supra note 8, at 128, 152–53.
\textsuperscript{201} See id. at 128.
\textsuperscript{202} See Hamilton, supra note 7, at 118.
\textsuperscript{203} See Dowell, supra note 8, at 149 (indicating that lack of understanding and education are the primary culprits of agricultural destruction); Hamilton, supra note 7, at 118.
\textsuperscript{204} See Centner, supra note 2, at 90.
\textsuperscript{205} See Eubanks, supra note 1, at 309–10; Lewis, supra note 57, at 1594–95.
\textsuperscript{206} See Eubanks, supra note 1, at 309–10.
ond, fixing inconsistencies within right-to-farm statutes would permit farmers and residents to bargain more efficiently.\textsuperscript{207} Nevertheless, legislatures should change how right-to-farm statutes function by altering the rights they give to farmers and residents.\textsuperscript{208}

Legislatures could start by enacting statutes that allow courts to differentiate between different types of plaintiffs and defendants.\textsuperscript{209} Offering nuisance protections only to smaller farms and allowing claims only from local residents would further the goals of agricultural preservation.\textsuperscript{210} The idea that residents should have some right to sue, especially if a farmer drastically changes the type of farming practiced, comports with notions of fairness.\textsuperscript{211} Further, distinguishing plaintiffs and defendants could account for local economic or environmental factors because they can incorporate the nuances of local farming economies.\textsuperscript{212}

Allowing courts to differentiate based on plaintiffs and defendants does not fully address the declining number of medium-sized farms.\textsuperscript{213} The argument advocates distinguishing between businesses and family farms because businesses can view nuisance as an expense rather than a threat to their livelihood.\textsuperscript{214} While the argument’s reasoning may be accurate, it does not properly account for the growing number of small farms.\textsuperscript{215} The legislatures and courts should therefore attempt to favor medium-sized farms.\textsuperscript{216} They should establish laws that account for local culture, climate, and individual circumstances.\textsuperscript{217} However, courts may lack the specialized expertise to determine the subjective cultural and environmental benefits to a given farm or farming practice.\textsuperscript{218}

State agricultural boards, such as New York’s Agricultural Advisory Council (Council), are the proper authorities to decide what types of farming to encourage.\textsuperscript{219} Statutes that define strict acreage and gross income requirements for nuisance protection might not be able to ac-
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\item See id. at 1736–38.
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\item Reinert, \textit{supra} note 6, at 1722.
\item See id. at 1736–37. Farms with 50 to 499 acres of land have been decreasing most dramatically. See id. at 1698.
\item Id. at 1722, 1733.
\item See id.; \textit{supra} notes 140–150 and accompanying text.
\item See Reinert, \textit{supra} note 6, at 1736.
\item See id.
\item See id. at 1737.
\item See N.Y. AGRIC. & MKTS. LAW § 309 (McKinney 2011).
\end{enumerate}
\end{notes}
count for differences in climate and economic structure. The New York State legislature has already charged the Council with determining “sound agricultural practices.” The Council should have the expertise to determine not only what practices are generally sound but also which most benefit the local economy and environment. Through the delegation of authority and discretion to their agricultural boards, states may gradually modify the application of their agricultural preservation laws.

The proposal of greater reliance on agricultural boards shifts the responsibility from courts to these boards. Greater reliance on agricultural boards does not necessarily give farmers more certainty as to how they should act. The real advantage of shifting more discretion to agricultural boards would not be the certainty offered to any individual claimant. Rather, the advantage would be that the boards could substantively change which types of farms to protect to increase fairness and environmental preservation.

Furthermore, although modifying statutes risks disrupting existing economies and does not undermine the economic forces driving farming demographic shifts, gradual change can improve the efficacy of right-to-farm statutes’ preservation of the environment. Different strategies aimed at directing the benefits of right-to-farm statutes have not been effective, and one should question why modifying statutes to promote medium-sized farms would be any different. The two dangers contradict each other—one cannot fail by causing insufficient economic change and simultaneously cause too much economic change. Nevertheless, both dangers are real, and legislatures should proceed with caution. By granting specialized agricultural boards primary oversight of developing local programs, states should be able to work gradually but effectively. Moreover, states may draw on the
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wisdom of their counties’ experiences with local agricultural preservation ordinances.\footnote{See id. at 1738.}

Through gradual exploration, states may improve the allocation of farming resources to preserve their cultural heritage and natural environment.\footnote{Id. at 1735–38; see also Centner; supra note 2, at 110 (suggesting that regulatory solutions can prevent litigation).} Rigid limitations and bans on corporate farming have failed to realize the goals of cultural and environmental preservation.\footnote{See supra notes 165–191 and accompanying text.} States will need to alter the language in their right-to-farm statutes to create agricultural advisory boards when appropriate and empower those boards to consider the totality of a farm’s circumstances.\footnote{See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1736. See generally N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 308, 309 (McKinney 2011) (implementing a basic framework to evaluate “[s]ound agricultural practices”).} Hopefully, these changes will allow states to prioritize the most deserving farms without causing economic hardship.\footnote{See id. at 1737.}

CONCLUSION

Changing agricultural demographics will continue despite the best efforts of right-to-farm statutes, but legislatures can improve right-to-farm statutes by allowing agricultural councils to favor medium-sized farms.\footnote{See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737.} The economic efficiencies of mass production will continue to cause large farms to increase in number.\footnote{See Centner, supra note 2, at 90.} Nevertheless, legislative attempts to design statutes that protect medium-sized farms can be more effective.\footnote{See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1735–38.} An increasing number of large farms offer economic benefits and a reliable food supply.\footnote{See Centner, supra note 2, at 90–91.} Legislatures should therefore not attempt to ban corporate farming, but rather should provide nuisance protections to medium-sized farms.\footnote{See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737. See generally N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 308, 309 (McKinney 2011).} Agricultural preservation boards are currently empowered to make decisions only on agricultural practices.\footnote{See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737. See generally N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 308, 309 (creating and empowering an agricultural advisory council).} Legislatures should expand the powers of their agricultural preservation boards to consider the local circumstances and the needs
of the individual farmer. In this way, the economic, agricultural, and social role of small farms will be protected for generations to come—thus fulfilling the motivations of agricultural preservation statutes.

\[244\] See Reinert, supra note 6, at 1737. See generally N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 308, 309.
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### Table 1a: New York Farms by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 9 Acres</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 Acres</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>5,201</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>8,359</td>
<td>8,799</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69 Acres</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 99 Acres</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 139 Acres</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>4,109</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 to 179 Acres</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 219 Acres</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>-23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 to 259 Acres</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>-31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 to 499 Acres</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>-43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 Acres</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>-35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999 Acres</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 4,999 Acres</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>129.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5,000 Acres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>620.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 99 Acres</td>
<td>14,488</td>
<td>12,221</td>
<td>12,913</td>
<td>17,855</td>
<td>18,627</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 999 Acres</td>
<td>22,490</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>17,988</td>
<td>18,391</td>
<td>16,686</td>
<td>-25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000 Acres</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1b: New York Farms by Economic Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1,000</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>8,884</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $2,500</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>4,802</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $4,999</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>4,809</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>-58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>5,053</td>
<td>4,442</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>-41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>191.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>448.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 to $9,999</td>
<td>17,121</td>
<td>14,249</td>
<td>14,615</td>
<td>20,711</td>
<td>19,606</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>18,877</td>
<td>15,783</td>
<td>14,719</td>
<td>13,791</td>
<td>13,118</td>
<td>-30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $250,000</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>107.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2a: Nebraska Farms by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 9 Acres</td>
<td>5,090</td>
<td>3,698</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>-55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 Acres</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69 Acres</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 99 Acres</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 139 Acres</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 to 179 Acres</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>3,911</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>-28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 219 Acres</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>-24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 to 259 Acres</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>-41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 to 499 Acres</td>
<td>12,627</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>8,932</td>
<td>7,921</td>
<td>6,755</td>
<td>-46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 Acres</td>
<td>12,153</td>
<td>10,966</td>
<td>10,338</td>
<td>9,049</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>-36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999 Acres</td>
<td>6,494</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 4,999 Acres</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5,000 Acres</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 99 Acres</td>
<td>13,362</td>
<td>11,584</td>
<td>11,055</td>
<td>11,535</td>
<td>13,132</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 999 Acres</td>
<td>36,663</td>
<td>30,793</td>
<td>29,019</td>
<td>26,324</td>
<td>23,378</td>
<td>-36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000 Acres</td>
<td>10,477</td>
<td>10,546</td>
<td>11,380</td>
<td>11,496</td>
<td>11,202</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2b: Nebraska Farms by Economic Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1,000</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>3,559</td>
<td>3,964</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $2,500</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $4,999</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>-36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>10,923</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>6,733</td>
<td>6,489</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>-55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>8,362</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>6,187</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>-60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>11,305</td>
<td>9,274</td>
<td>8,005</td>
<td>6,601</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>-53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>10,188</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>10,852</td>
<td>9,177</td>
<td>7,979</td>
<td>-21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>132.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>353.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>430.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 to $9,999</td>
<td>13,614</td>
<td>10,651</td>
<td>11,549</td>
<td>13,520</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>43,097</td>
<td>36,931</td>
<td>32,552</td>
<td>28,454</td>
<td>22,374</td>
<td>-48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $250,000</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>5,341</td>
<td>5,717</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>216.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3a: Minnesota Farms by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 9 Acres</td>
<td>4,613</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 Acres</td>
<td>9,481</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>16,546</td>
<td>16,927</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69 Acres</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 99 Acres</td>
<td>6,534</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>6,983</td>
<td>7,577</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 139 Acres</td>
<td>6,272</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>5,999</td>
<td>6,556</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 to 179 Acres</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>6,992</td>
<td>6,884</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>-25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 219 Acres</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>-28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 to 259 Acres</td>
<td>5,862</td>
<td>4,956</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>-35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 to 499 Acres</td>
<td>19,289</td>
<td>16,621</td>
<td>14,611</td>
<td>13,030</td>
<td>12,220</td>
<td>-36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 Acres</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>10,497</td>
<td>9,781</td>
<td>8,986</td>
<td>8,323</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999 Acres</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 4,999 Acres</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>189.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5,000 Acres</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>406.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 99 Acres</td>
<td>23,436</td>
<td>20,540</td>
<td>22,214</td>
<td>31,209</td>
<td>32,761</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 999 Acres</td>
<td>57,382</td>
<td>49,763</td>
<td>45,661</td>
<td>43,241</td>
<td>42,043</td>
<td>-26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3b: Minnesota Farms by Economic Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1,000</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>5,054</td>
<td>9,829</td>
<td>13,181</td>
<td>11,410</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $2,500</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>9,662</td>
<td>9,775</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $4,999</td>
<td>6,509</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>6,959</td>
<td>8,434</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>7,028</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>7,696</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>13,588</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>9,207</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>8,261</td>
<td>-39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>12,983</td>
<td>10,168</td>
<td>8,033</td>
<td>7,390</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>-52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>15,385</td>
<td>12,482</td>
<td>9,402</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>-56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>12,830</td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>12,839</td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>9,537</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>6,412</td>
<td>136.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>524.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>1,087.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 to $9,999</td>
<td>20,411</td>
<td>17,104</td>
<td>21,904</td>
<td>31,804</td>
<td>31,626</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>50,249</td>
<td>40,865</td>
<td>32,821</td>
<td>31,935</td>
<td>28,752</td>
<td>-42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $250,000</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>9,084</td>
<td>13,104</td>
<td>266.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>