THE PROHIBITION OF MOOSHINE:
A CONSUMER PROTECTION ANALYSIS OF RAW MILK IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE
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I. INTRODUCTION

One better be careful sporting a milk mustache while walking across state lines. Among the food fights currently raging in our nation is one heated debate over raw milk, otherwise known as moo-shine, and its prohibition in interstate commerce and some intrastate commerce. Talk of dairy temperance comes at a time when concern over our nation’s food system has increasingly become the focus of individual citizens and policy makers. Whole movements have pushed back on a system ever growing in technology but narrowing in transparency and accountability. Among the trends is consumer demand for raw milk.

Federal regulation banned raw milk in interstate commerce largely for health reasons in the late-80s. Meanwhile, states have been left to decide individually whether those same health concerns warrant an intrastate ban as well. With consumer protection in the form of health safety, any limitation on choice additionally invokes the serious consideration of consumer sovereignty, another form of consumer protection. Consumer sovereignty is “the set of societal arrangements that cause[] the economy to act primarily in response to the aggregate signals of consumer demand, rather than in response to government directives . . . .” It means that “consumers choose what to consume.” The FDA has taken the stance that health safety trumps consumer sovereignty, but a close look at state regulation and a number of other

7 Morell et al., supra note 2.
9 Id. at 345.
considerations shows that choice is unnecessary. The contrast between state and federal regulation reveals that consumer sovereignty may not have been granted appropriate weight at the federal level: around 30 states allow the sale of raw milk in some form. Moreover, the details of state regulation show the best option strikes a balance—optimizing both health safety and consumer sovereignty as consumer protection concerns.

Part II of this Note provides background information regarding the current state of milk regulation and its focus on health safety, the competing consumer protection consideration that is consumer sovereignty, the current state of state regulation, and, lastly, why raw milk is highly sought after and causes such debate. Part III of this Note then uses this information to show that federal regulation of raw milk is necessary because it would better meet the health safety objectives of the original ban: because current state regulation undermines some of those original objectives, and, furthermore, because those objectives were given disproportionate weight in comparison to consumer sovereignty when imposed. It then considers a number of state regulatory schemes insofar as they address these two competing consumer protection concerns.

In sum, this Note argues that consumer sovereignty and health safety are both consumer protection concerns of heightened importance for food; the FDA can and should maximize the goals of both by lifting the ban on the sale of raw milk in interstate commerce and instead imposing consistent regulations that draw from state examples and ultimately better realize the sole objective of the original ban—protecting the health of milk consumers.

II. BACKGROUND

All milk sold in interstate commerce must be pasteurized, which involves heating “every particle of milk” at or above a specified temperature for a set period of time. Section A of this Part addresses milk safety and federal regulation of milk, particularly as compared to other raw food regulation. However, pasteurization is not necessarily required for intrastate sales of milk. As a result, some states have opted to allow the sale of raw milk after considering both health safety and consumer sovereignty—the latter consumer protection concern is addressed in Section B. Section C provides

11 Id. (requiring milk to be heated at or above 145 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 30 minutes, 161 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 15 seconds, 191 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 1 second, 194 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 0.5 second, 201 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 0.1 second, 204 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 0.05 second, or 212 degrees Fahrenheit for at least 0.01 second).
context for the role of consumer sovereignty in food choice. This Part then explains in Section D the various forms of intrastate regulation. Lastly, Section E provides context for this debate—why consumers so adamantly want access to the raw product.

A. Milk Safety and Federal Regulation

Federal regulatory concern over raw milk is predominately health related. Indeed, contamination of milk can occur a number of ways. If a cow is unhealthy, bacteria and disease can survive the digestive tract and end up in its fecal matter. Fecal matter may come into contact with the cow’s mammary glands, udder, or with farm equipment during the milking process. Additionally, both bacteria and disease can be secreted directly into milk when the lactating animal is ill. The surrounding environment also poses a number of contamination risks: sick farm laborers, bacteria kicked up in hay dust, and improper handling or refrigeration. After milk is taken from the cow, it is pooled with other milk for collection and transportation, thereby sharing any potential contamination with a larger quantity of milk. Once contaminated, milk is “an ideal environment for a number of dangerous bacteria and viruses,” including “Anthrax, Campylobacter, E. coli, Listeria, Rabies, Salmonella, Staphylococcus, Tuberculosis, Typhoid fever, and Yersiniosis.” Opponents of raw milk consumption point out that these pathogens can be particularly harmful for children, pregnant women, and the elderly.

Many of these concerns led to federal and state regulation of milk production and marketing in order to protect public health beginning around the

---

14 Id.
17 Id. at 308.
18 Id.
19 Id.
20 See, e.g., S. Lin et al., Identification of Contamination Sources of Bacillus Cereus in Pasteurized Milk, 43 Int’l J. Food Microbiology 159, 168–70 (1998); see also JOANN SILLS GROHMAN, KEEPING A FAMILY COW: A COMPLETE GUIDE TO RAISING COWS AND PRODUCING DAIRY PRODUCTS FOR HOME USE 77–78 (1975).
early twentieth century. As people increasingly moved to cities, “milk from cows in the country was transported farther and stored at higher temperatures than in the past.” “Milk produced closer to cities [often] came from cows kept under crowded and unsanitary conditions.” In 1927, the federal government took the first measures to protect consumers from the dangers associated with milk consumption. It set standards for production and transportation. Shortly thereafter, the Food and Drug Administration adopted the Standard Milk Ordinance, later known as the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (“PMO”). Originally, the ordinance focused on rules for safe production and handling.

The pasteurization of all milk in interstate commerce did not begin to materialize until the FDA passed a rule requiring it in 1973. However, a complaint from a raw milk producer caused this rule to be stayed for six years, allowing the continued sale of “certified” raw milk, or raw milk that must meet certain quality standards. From 1974 to 1982, the FDA collected data and held hearings to assess public health issues. Meanwhile, certified raw milk, produced by the Association of Medical Milk Commissions, Inc.; the Certified Raw Milk Producer’s Association, Inc.; and a few other dairies was subject to regulations to ensure quality and safety. Certifying milk (as compared to pasteurizing) was originally conceived by the Medical Milk Commission to include the following:

[S]etting standards of purity for the milk, conducting periodic inspections of the dairies providing the milk, and providing for periodic examinations of the animals and the employees. . . . The milk produced was to be subjected to periodic chemical analyses, and to bacterial counts made under the direction of

---

25 Id.
27 Id.
28 See Grade “A” Pasteurized Milk Ordinance, supra note 23.
29 Id. at iv.
32 Id. at 1232.
33 Id.
the Commission. The milk was required to be entirely free of pathogenic organisms.  

Despite these efforts to ensure the safety of milk through certification, the FDA’s data, after working closely with the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”) and individual states, revealed that “all forms of raw milk and raw milk products [were] linked to the outbreak of serious disease.”

Importantly, certification would have been a more expensive way to regulate the safety of milk, especially for the larger producers. Regulation in the form of certification would have been “more labor and capital intensive and would have depended on improvements in city sanitation as well as inspections of barns and milking practices.” It also would have been more expensive for the farmers to the extent it would require testing animals and monitoring farm laborers. Though “cooked” milk was considered an inferior product at the time, pasteurization could be incorporated more cheaply and uniformly into the mass production of milk; it was especially worthwhile for dairy farms that were becoming increasingly large-scale productions that utilized technology.

After collecting data from 1974 to 1982, the FDA drafted, but did not adopt, a rule that would have required the pasteurization of all milk in interstate commerce. The agency’s reasoning for not adopting the rule was that there were too few sales of raw milk in interstate commerce to be of significant concern; it questioned whether regulation of raw milk in this way effectively addressed concerns when most sales where intrastate. The FDA’s findings showed that the interstate sales of raw milk were “negligible” and that most raw milk was sold locally and intrastate, in states where it was legal.


35 Pub. Citizen, 653 F. Supp. at 1232. “In particular, as documented by the Center for Disease Control, there has been a number of outbreaks of two serious bacterial diseases, campylobacteriosis and salmonellosis, which on rare occasions result in death. The link between raw milk and Salmonella Dublin Bacterium (‘S. Dublin’) was particularly strong, and the especially virulent S. Dublin often invades sites outside the intestine such as the lung and spinal fluid.” Id. at 1232 n.3.

36 DUPUIS, supra note 23, at 76–77.


38 Id.

39 Id.


41 Adams et al., supra note 16, at 313.

After the FDA opted not to adopt the rule, Public Citizen sued the Department of Health and Human Services. The public watchdog group persuaded the court that “the FDA had unreasonably delayed promulgating the rule, and that [the] justification for this delay ... was insufficient in light of the relative risk of disease,” and therefore the failure was arbitrary and capricious. The court’s primary reasoning in holding that the FDA must promulgate a rule was that “[r]esidents of non-producing states near the producing states do not have access to, and are not represented in, the producing state’s political process.” The court explained that were the out-of-state consumer to become ill from raw milk, there would be no “recourse through the political process.” Thus, on August 10, 1987, the FDA adopted the current rule requiring pasteurization of all milk for interstate commerce: “No person shall cause to be delivered into interstate commerce ... any milk or milk product in final package form for direct human consumption unless the product has been pasteurized ...”

Presently, public consumption of raw milk is discouraged by both the FDA and the CDC. Statistics from these authorities show that 70% of dairy-related foodborne illnesses are attributable to raw milk as compared to 30% being attributable to pasteurized milk. Far from uncommon, nationwide and considering all foods, there are a number of ways people become ill from food

43 Adams et al., supra note 16, at 313.
45 Id.
46 Id. at 1240–41.
47 Id. Though an out-of-state purchaser may not have recourse in a producing state’s political system, purchasers of raw milk do have recourse through a number of negligence and products liability theories. See Adams et al., supra note 16. There are four theories that a consumer “is likely to use to recover for damages from raw milk: (1) Negligence and negligence per se; (2) Strict products liability for manufacturing, design, and warning defects; (3) Breach of express or implied warranty; and (4) Misrepresentation (fraud).” Id. at 320.
49 See Questions and Answers: Raw Milk, FDA.gov, http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodborneIllnessContaminants/BuyStoreServeSafeFood/ucm122062.htm (last updated Nov. 1, 2011); The Dangers of Raw Milk: Unpasteurized Milk Can Pose a Serious Health Risk, FDA.gov (Aug. 2012), http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/FoodborneIllnessContaminants/UCM239493; Food Safety and Raw Milk, CTR. FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, http://cdc.gov/foodsafety/rawmilk/raw-milk-index.html (last updated May 16, 2014). These websites are designed for a lay audience and do not provide citations to studies that would back up their claims. This lack of citation has given raw milk proponents ammunition to accuse the regulatory agencies of basing their positions on unsubstantiated conventional wisdom about the risks of unpasteurized milk.
50 L.T. Ayres et al., CTR. FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, SURVEILLANCE OF FOODBORNE OUTBREAKS—UNITED STATES, 2006 (June 12, 2009), available at http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5822a1.htm.
consumption: there are around 48 million cases of foodborne illness, affecting roughly one in six consumers annually.\textsuperscript{51} It is estimated that around 128,000 individuals are hospitalized and 3,000 die from foodborne illness.\textsuperscript{52}

Unlike raw milk, the federal government does permit and regulate the sale of raw meat in interstate commerce.\textsuperscript{53} The United States consumption of raw meat includes traditions such as crudos, steak tartare, sushi, sashimi, raw oysters, and other delicacies.\textsuperscript{54} Raw meat is regularly sold in supermarkets. It even is sold at restaurants with the intent that it be consumed raw.\textsuperscript{55} Incidentally, the primary source of disease caused by microbial pathogens, or foodborne illness, is raw meat.\textsuperscript{56} Moreover, any of the pathogens in raw meat are the same as those present in raw milk: Campylobacter, E. coli, Listeria, Rabies, Salmonella, and Staphylococcus.\textsuperscript{57} However, raw meats contain a number of additional health hazards.\textsuperscript{58}

Post-processing regulations to protect consumers from raw meat are frequently limited to disclaimers on packaging and menus.\textsuperscript{59} Rather than require that all meat be cooked before entering interstate commerce—as raw milk is—the process of producing meat is regulated preventatively.\textsuperscript{60}
United States Department of Agriculture, through the Food Safety and Inspection Service regulates most meat with Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (“HACCP”) systems.61

HACCP plans for meat production call for upfront written hazard analysis plans that identify food hazards, evaluate those hazards, set control measures for hazards, review current control measures, and identify critical control points.62 The considered food hazards include: microbiological contamination, parasites, chemical contamination, unlawful pesticides residues, decomposition in food where a food hazard has been associated with decomposition, natural toxins, unapproved use of food or color additives, presence of undeclared ingredients that may be allergens, and physical hazards.63 In addition, preventative considerations include a wide range of processes: “[p]rocessors should evaluate product ingredients, processing procedures, packaging, storage, and intended use; facility and equipment function and design; and plant sanitation, including employee hygiene, to determine the potential effect of each on the safety of the finished food for the intended consumer.”64

HACCP plans aim to prevent contamination of meat and allow it be sold raw.65 Consumer choice is thus preserved as to how and how much that meat will be cooked, if at all. Raw meat is an example of where preventive controls can enforce health safety while preserving consumer sovereignty.66 Notably, the FDA has taken the stance that “[t]here is no absolute right to consume or feed [people] any particular kind of food.”67 As discussed in the next Section, these two aspects of consumer protection are often in contention in the regulation of food.68
B. Consumer Protection and Consumer Sovereignty

Consumer protection laws at the state and federal level formed to make up for the common law’s perceived failings. For example, problems with “intent to deceive” requirements for tort remedies and privity of contract between buyer and seller for contract remedies, coupled with the cost of judicial remedies in general, prompted federal measures to ensure consumer welfare. Modern federal consumer protection law is founded in the following language in the Federal Trade Commissions Act as an effort to prohibit “unfair or deceptive acts or practices . . . in commerce.” This language was intentionally left open-ended in order to allow the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) more latitude to promote consumer welfare. The FTC and the FDA have had a longstanding agreement to coordinate the protection of consumer welfare with respect to food: “[t]he two agencies have a common objective of preventing deception of the public through the misrepresentation of food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics.”

The FDA and FTC each regulate by protecting its agency’s own purposes and interests, which often overlap. The FDA regulates labeling the listed commodities’ packaging to avoid misrepresentations to the public, while the FTC regulates these commodities to avoid misrepresentation through advertisement. Because of the potential overlap in responsibilities, the two agencies “provide for exchange of complete information so that both agencies will be utilized to the maximum effectiveness in the public interest.”

70 Id. at 2226–27.
71 Id. at 2227.
74 Id. at 9850.01.
75 Id.
76 Id. at 9850.03.
77 Id. at 9850.02.
many regulatory measures, however, efforts to protect consumers can reduce consumer sovereignty.78

Consumer sovereignty is “the set of societal arrangements that cause the economy to act primarily in response to the aggregate signals of consumer demand, rather than in response to government directives.”79 It means that “consumers choose what to consume.”80 Rational choice theory justifies consumer sovereignty by reasoning that “individual utility—and social welfare—are maximized when individuals make their own consumption choices.”81 Furthermore, consumer sovereignty is acceptable because the “consumer chooses between courses of action [that] differ only in . . . way[s] that affect him.”82

Specifically for food consumption, consumer sovereignty may be conceptualized as “the right of the individual consumer to get information on food products and to make his or her own choice on the market of food products.”83 Traditionally, governments only take into account the passive consumer when formulating regulations.84 Increasingly, however, consumers are demanding that the goods they purchase, especially food products, be produced according to certain ethical standards—consumers are becoming more active participants in their consumption choices.85 For food, this is largely the result of consumers becoming more concerned about safety for humans, animals, and the environment.86

Each of these concerns—safety for humans, animals, and the environment—surface in the raw milk debate,87 whether in newspapers, advocacy groups, or state legislatures. Proponents of raw milk in these forums consistently advocate for consumer sovereignty, or the individual consumer’s desire to obtain healthier milk, more compassionately produced milk, and milk that is less harmful to the environment.88 Advocacy groups similarly hone in on

78 Wright, supra note 69, at 2223–24.
79 Edwards, supra note 8, at 344–45.
80 Id. at 345.
81 Id. at 345 (citing Joel Waldfogel, Does Consumer Irrationality Trump Consumer Sovereignty?, 87 REV. ECON. & STAT. 691, 691 (2005)).
83 Id. at 204.
84 Id. at 203.
85 Id. at 202.
86 Id. at 203.
87 See infra Part II.E.
the importance of consumer sovereignty, especially in light of what they argue to be questionably portrayed hype regarding the safety risks of raw milk. 89

Lastly, state legislatures have responded to this debate by choosing a different form of regulation than that implemented at the federal level. Rather than ban raw milk altogether, approximately 30 states permit the sale of raw milk and regulate its safety so that consumers have the choice to consume it and consume it knowledgably. 90 In taking a position unlike that imposed at the federal level, frequently, those media, advocacy groups, and state legislatures that permit the sale of raw milk argue that consumer sovereignty should be more heavily weighed when contemplating limitations on food. 91

C. Consumer Sovereignty and Food

Food choice is an intimate decision 92 and is closely tied with a number of fundamental rights and protected interests. 93 As a result, consumer sovereignty in food regulation is particularly important. 94 The choice a person makes as to what substances to allow to enter one’s body and to be a part of one’s culture or religion is an intimate one—food sustains life, affecting both mental and physical health. 95 Food choice is a different decision than, for instance, which lawn mower to purchase. 96 It is connected to autonomy in health, religion, cultural beliefs, and other forms of expression.

91 Anderson, supra note 88.
92 Korthals, supra note 82, at 206 (“Food is not only valued because of its connection with our health, but primarily because of its intimate connection with the quality of life we perceive. Food it is not like the furniture we live with or the gasoline we put in our cars, because it is much nearer to how we see ourselves and how we want to see ourselves.”).
94 See id.; see also Korthals, supra note 82, at 209 (“[C]onsumption of food is intrinsically connected with one’s identity, the places where one lives, the interactions one is involved in, and the collectives one belongs to.”).
95 Rencher, supra note 93, at 419.
96 Id.; Korthals, supra note 82, at 207 (“Democratic societies will not entrust their water, their diets, or their natural resources blindly into the hands of farmers, agribusiness firms, and agricultural scientists. Agricultural producers must participate in the dialogue that leads to social learning and social consensus about risks, and they must be willing to contribute the time and resources needed to understand the positions of their fellow citizens, and to make articulate statements of their own position.”).
Diet decisions can be an individual’s effort to control his or her health. Consumers may choose a variety of diets for general increased nutritional value or in effort to obtain sought-after and hard-to-find nutritional components. Consumers may avoid foods to limit any number of potentially harmful food additives or food qualities. Additionally, allergies are a common consideration for consumers and food choice. The notion that diet is critical to health is a longstanding one.

Moreover, food choice can be an individual’s effort to express religious beliefs. Many religions have doctrine involving what and what not to eat. Some religious beliefs restrict the methods by which food may be processed, while others may prohibit certain food and drink altogether. Some practices condone only a certain demeanor, such as gratitude or restraint, when eating.

Though not necessarily a constitutionally protected interest, food choice can be an individual’s effort to express cultural beliefs. Dining
decisions often have deep roots in heritage. Especially when socially dining, food can symbolize cultural identity as well as social and ethnic boundaries:

“[a]s long as humans have been taking meals together, eating has been as much about culture as it has been about biology.”

Finally, food choice can be an individual’s effort to express personal values and to express in general. Vegetarians may avoid animal flesh for moral, ethical, or environmental reasons. Vegans may avoid animal flesh as well as animal byproducts altogether for the same reasons. Individuals following macrobiotics, a diet as much as a way of life, may make dietary choices based on a unique way of viewing balance and the energy of foods. Each of these choices, when made in the presence of others, may be as important to the individual as an act of eating as it is an act of demonstrating an alternative lifestyle.

The struggle to balance the consideration of food choice as an intimate decision and as one with significant health safety implications is reflected in the variety in state regulation of raw milk. Some states so heavily weigh health safety that it warrants the prohibition of raw milk sales, while others weigh both competing concerns, or weigh them differently, such that consumer sovereignty warrants permitting raw milk sales.

D. Intrastate Regulation of Raw Milk

States vary widely on raw milk regulation. Some ban the sale of raw milk altogether, while others take a range of stances. Recently, the trend has
been towards more access to raw milk, although states may impose a number of restrictions, including production quotas, seller limitations, or labeling requirements. These approaches can be broken down into four categories: “(1) [a]ctual or de facto prohibition on sale, (2) [a]nimal-share or leasing, (3) [l]imited public sale and/or labeling requirements, and (4) [p]et food exception.” Because these approaches are used in Part III.B to suggest potential federal regulation of raw milk sales, this Section explains briefly what each approach entails.

1. Prohibition on Sale

The most recent survey by the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA) in 2011 showed that 30 states allowed the sale of raw milk, with five states increasing regulation in the three years since the 2008 survey. Around 20 states prohibited the sale of raw milk to consumers. States that prohibit its sale do so mainly reasoning that raw milk poses a substantial health risk. For example, Delaware recently considered legalizing on-farm sales of raw milk, and the primary reason voiced for maintaining raw milk’s illegal status was the public health risk. Many states de jure prohibit raw milk sales through laws that require pasteurization. Some de facto prohibit raw milk sales by imposing regulatory standards that are too costly for producers.

---

118 Pete Kennedy, State Raw Milk Bills, FARM-TO-CONSUMER LEGAL DEF. FUND (Mar. 11, 2013), http://www.farmtoconsumer.org/news_wp/?p=5754 (“So far, bills have been introduced in 15 states with all but one either expanding or legalizing raw milk sales.”).

119 Adams et al., supra note 16, at 315.


121 Id. The sale of raw milk is prohibited in the following states: Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Id. at 2.


123 Delaware Considers Allowing Farms to Sell Raw Milk, FOOD SAFETY NEWS (June 20, 2013), http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2013/06/delaware-considers-allowing-farms-to-sell-raw-milk/#.VDdVY_IdWAV.

124 State-by-State, supra note 90.

2. Animal-Shares, Herd-Shares, and Farm-Shares

In states where the sale of raw milk is prohibited, some consumers have opted to lease all or a portion of a dairy animal or herd from a farmer in order to obtain raw milk. Sometimes lessees pay a service fee to the producer for milking the animal. Similarly, some raw milk consumers purchase a portion of a dairy animal or herd—known as an animal-share or herd-share. Owners are allowed to keep milk produced by the animal or herd and sometimes pay an additional service fee. In both scenarios raw milk is exchanged for money. However, the buyer and seller try to bypass prohibitive state raw milk laws by limiting the actual money transaction to one involving only the animal or the producer’s service and not the raw milk itself. As a result, a few states have acted to prevent these arrangements. They have done so by clarifying in regulations that share arrangements are a purchase of raw milk.

Where animal-shares have been banned, producers can set up the more difficult farm-share. In a farm-share, the consumer may obtain raw milk as part of the farm’s profits. The consumers typically hold non-voting shares of a farm corporation. One benefit of this arrangement is that the farmer is provided more protection because the consumer has a property interest in the farm itself. The shareholder thus shares in the success or failures of the farm. No state has yet to ban the consumption of raw milk via farm-shares.

---

129 Learn More - Cow and Goat-shares, supra note 126.
132 Share Agreements, supra note 128.
133 Id.
134 Id. One issue some advocates have with current raw milk regulation is that, even as it stands, it currently transgresses private property rights and private right to contract. See Morell et al., supra note 2.
In states where raw milk is illegal, these various share agreements can leave raw milk virtually unregulated: Id. Some farmers have successfully used share arrangements to provide consumers with raw milk. Id. On one farm, $50 purchases a portion of a jointly owned cow and provides shareholders with about one gallon of milk per week. Id. The milk is distributed to shareholders at locations in nearby large cities, and no money exchanges hands when the raw milk does. Id.

3. Limited Public Sale and Labeling Requirements

Although many states permit the sale of raw milk, most limit the sale in some way. Id. Raw milk sales might be allowed on farm, in farmer’s markets, at road-side stands, in retail stores, or some limited combination of these options. Id. Sales might be limited to a certain quantity of milk or to milk derived from a certain number of animals. Id. They may also be limited to milk derived only from a certain type of animal, or may require bottle labeling, warning signs at the point of sale, or limited advertising. Id.

In states that permit the sale of raw milk, the first realm permitted is usually on-farm sales. Id. Several states limit the sale of raw milk strictly to on-farm sales and vary whether licensing is required for the sale. Id. On-farm sales require that consumers drive to the farm “each and every time the consumer wishes to purchase milk.” Id. Efforts to bypass strict adherence to the on-farm purchase requirements by purchasing online or by group purchasing and later distribution have resulted in state action. Id.

137 Id.
138 Id.
139 Id.
140 State-by-State, supra note 90.
141 Id.
142 Id.
143 Id.
144 Id.
145 Id.
Off-farm sales at either farmer’s markets or retail stores are permitted in around 13 states.\footnote{State-by-State, supra note 90 (Arizona, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, and Washington).} Some require that the producer own and operate the store or stand or at least require that the producer have a majority ownership in the store.\footnote{Id.} At least one state limits retail sales to milk derived from certain animals.\footnote{Id. (Oregon).} Three states permit farmer’s market sales in addition to on-farm sales, but exclude retail sales.\footnote{Id. (New Hampshire, Missouri, and South Dakota).}

The dairy operation itself might be limited to a certain number of lactating animals.\footnote{Id.} It may be required to obtain licensing, permitting, or registration.\footnote{Id. It may be required to obtain licensing, permitting, or registration.} Several states exclude cow’s milk from permitted raw milk sales.\footnote{Id.} At least two states limit sales for human consumption by doctor’s prescription only.\footnote{Id.} Raw milk regulation, as it stands, is highly inconsistent.

Even more inconsistent are raw milk labeling requirements. Labels provide consumers with health or producer contact information.\footnote{WASH. REV. CODE § 15.36.231 (2014); WASH. ADMIN. CODE § 16-101-800 (2014).} Some states require that the product be clearly labeled as ungraded,\footnote{See KAN. STAT. ANN. § 65-771(w) (2014).} not pasteurized,\footnote{ME. REV. STAT. tit. 7, § 2902-B (2014).} or raw.\footnote{S.D. CODIFIED LAWS § 39-6-3 (2014).} The substantive labeling language takes various forms. One example is: “Raw (unpasteurized) milk and raw milk dairy products may contain disease-causing micro-organisms. Persons at highest risk of disease from these organisms include newborns and infants; the elderly; pregnant women; those taking corticosteroids, antibiotics or antacids; and those having chronic illnesses or other conditions that weaken their immunity.”\footnote{CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 17, § 11380(a) (2014).} Another example of raw milk product labeling is: “Raw milk is not pasteurized. Pasteurization destroys organisms that may be harmful to human health.”\footnote{330 MASS. CODE REGS. 27.08(F)(1) (2014).}

Warning signs at the point of sale may require the dissemination of similar information.\footnote{Id.; WASH. ADMIN. CODE § 246-215-03610 (2014).} A producer might also be required to reveal...
Advertising might also be limited in a number of ways. Some states ban advertising raw milk altogether. Others limit advertising on farm or at the point of sale. Some states limit advertising to only incidental sales, which are usually defined as some relatively small number of gallons of milk or purchasers. Other states do not place restrictions on raw milk advertising, or may merely limit specific language such as the term “fresh.”

4. Raw Milk as Pet Food

Almost all states permit the sale of raw milk as pet food. However, some have created regulations to discourage human consumption of raw milk intended to be pet food, including a regulation requiring that producers add dye to the raw milk. For example, Alaska requires that raw milk be labeled “FOR ANIMAL FOOD NOT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.” It also requires

163 COLO. CODE REGS. § 25-5.5-117(d) (2014).
166 State-by-State, supra note 90.
168 Id.; State-by-State, supra note 90.
171 Adams et al., supra note 16, at 319; State-by-State, supra note 90 (Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Virginia, and West Virginia).
173 ALASKA ADMIN. CODE tit.18, § 32.060 (2014).
dying raw milk with finely powdered charcoal or with a food dye that is blue, green, or red. 174

Importantly, enough “winking and nodding” can bring virtually unregulated raw milk permitted for animal consumption—but destined for human consumption—to be sold on-farm, at farmer’s markets, and even in retail stores. 175 For example, state regulations that only allow pet food sales of raw milk often only require that the product be labeled as “pet food” when sold; there are no laws against human consumption. 176 Attempts to exploit the pet food exception have, in fact, been made even in interstate commerce. 177

E. Why Raw Milk Consumers Want the Product

Raw milk consumers want the choice to consume the product because of its health benefits and taste benefits—even above those available via small-scale, sustainable, organic dairy farms that pasteurize—and also because of concerns with mainstream pasteurized milk. Rather than use technology to make up for unsafe processing, or potentially unsafe processing, and harm the nutrient value of milk, proponents argue that certified raw milk provides a superior alternative. 178 They argue that certification, as a preventative measure, maximizes safety and health benefits by avoiding pasteurization and focusing on the integrity of the raw product. 179

174 Id. (“(A) finely powdered charcoal; (B) FD & C Blue No. 1, FD, & C Blue No. 2, Ultramarine Blue; or (C) FD & C Green No. 3, FD & C Red. No. 3, or FD & C Red No. 40.”).
176 Flynn, supra note 175.
179 Id. There are numerous aspects of the food system where food advocates voice concern over the inadequacy of reactive as opposed to preventative measures because reactive measures may lower the nutritional quality of food. See, e.g., Regulatory Comments and Petitions, Re: Irradiation of Meat and Meat Products, CTR. FOR SCI. IN THE PUB. INTEREST (Feb. 24, 1999), available at http://www.cspinet.org/foodsafety/irradiation_usda.html; Christine M. Williams, Nutritional Quality of Food: Shades of Grey or Shades of Green?, 61 PROCEEDINGS OF THE NUTRITION SOC’Y, 19–24 (2002).
Furthermore, raw milk is often obtained from sustainable and organic small-scale family farms.\footnote{Byrne, supra note 37, at 109; see, e.g., Sources of Real Milk and Real Milk Products in Oregon REAL MILK (Jan. 1, 2000), http://www.realmilk.com/real-milk-finder/oregon/#or [hereinafter Sources of Real Milk]; Learn More-Cow and Goat-shares, supra note 126.} It is often a different kind of transaction than one made in a large, impersonal grocery store.\footnote{Janice Blair, Economic Impact on Wisconsin from the Sales of Raw Milk, FARM-TO-CONSUMER LEGAL DEF. FUND, http://www.farmtoconsumer.org/news/Economic%20Impact%20on%20WI%20summary%20for%20Hearing.pdf (last visited Oct. 9, 2014).} Rather, the closeness of the transaction between farmer and customer can create heightened accountability on the part of the farmer and connectedness to one’s food on the part of the consumer.\footnote{Morell et al., supra note 2 (arguing that pasteurization kills essential enzymes and in turn leads to higher rates of anemia, less bone strength, hair loss, and behavioral issues in rats; also arguing that there is a fivefold protective system in raw milk: (1) reduces pathogens in milk, (2) stimulated the immune system, (3) build healthy gut wall, (4) prevents absorption and toxins in the gut, (5) ensures assimilation of all nutrients). But see Food Safety and Raw Milk, CDC, http://www.cdc.gov/foodsafety/rawmilk/raw-milk-index.html (last visited Oct. 9, 2014); Dan Flynn, Study: Raw and Pasteurized Milk Differ in Taste, Smell and Safety, FOOD SAFETY NEWS (Oct. 10, 2013), http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2013/10/milk-smell-and-taste-may-differ-but-benefits-are-the-same/#.UmrKmCR6aAc (arguing that the only difference between raw and pasteurized milk are its “organoleptic” qualities, i.e. taste, smell, feel, and appearance).}

1. Health Benefits

Proponents of raw milk argue that vitamins, minerals, immunoglobulins, proteins, and digestive enzymes are all of greater quantity or quality when milk is not subject to pasteurization.\footnote{See, e.g., Frank E. Runge & Rober Heger, Use of Microcalorimetry in Monitoring Stability Studies, 48 J. AGRIC. FOOD CHEM. 47 (2000); Terry Gompert & Martin Kleinschmit, Raw Milk Use and Safety Fact Sheet, THE NEW FARM (May 15, 2007), available at www.newfarm.org/features/2007/0607/rawmilk/bowman.shtml.} For instance, the application of heat may degrade the vitamin A, D, B12, and B6 present in milk.\footnote{See Runge & Heger, supra note 184; Gompert & Kleinschmit, supra note 184; The Case for Raw Milk, supra note 178.} Heat also may undermine the quality of proteins and enzymes or destroy immunoglobulins.\footnote{Gompert & Kleinschmit, supra note 184.} Enzymes present in raw milk may help with digestion and may prevent the presence of unwanted bacteria.\footnote{Id.; The Health Benefits of Raw Milk, RAW-MILK-FACTS.COM, http://www.raw-milk-facts.com/raw_milk_health_benefits.html (last visited Oct. 9, 2014).} Though raw milk contains all of the essential amino acids to ease protein absorption, 20% of the proteins in milk are derived from whey and are heat sensitive.\footnote{Id.} Immunoglobulins, also known as antibodies, provide resistance to viruses and
disease, but their numbers may be significantly decreased in the process of pasteurization.\textsuperscript{188}

In nutrition, balance can be as important as substance.\textsuperscript{189} In the case of raw milk, it may have an ideal balance of minerals to promote absorption.\textsuperscript{190} For example, calcium requires phosphorus and magnesium in order for the body to utilize the mineral.\textsuperscript{191} Raw milk may contain this balance when unpasteurized,\textsuperscript{192} and exposure to heat may alter it.\textsuperscript{193} In fact, pasteurized milk may actually cause the depletion of calcium in the body’s attempt to process it, due in part to this mineral imbalance.\textsuperscript{194}

The resulting health benefits of raw milk may include “protecting against infection, diarrhea, rickets, [and] tooth decay.”\textsuperscript{195} Raw milk may also lead to “better growth, denser bones, greater integrity of internal organs, less anemia, fewer signs of anxiety and stress, and fewer signs of nutrient deficiency.”\textsuperscript{196} Raw milk may positively affect asthma and allergies.\textsuperscript{197} One study revealed that around 82\% of individuals that could not consume pasteurized milk due to lactose intolerance could consume raw milk without digestive problems.\textsuperscript{198} Advocates further argue that compromising the nutrients in raw milk through pasteurization cannot be countered with additives such that the same beneficial composition results.\textsuperscript{199}

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{188} The Health Benefits of Raw Milk, supra note 187.
\textsuperscript{190} The Case for Raw Milk, supra note 178; see also Morell et al., supra note 2.
\textsuperscript{191} The Case for Raw Milk, supra note 178.
\textsuperscript{192} Id.
\textsuperscript{193} Martha M. Kramer, Esther Latzke & Mary Margaret Shaw, A Comparison of Raw, Pasteurized, Evaporated, and Dried Milks as Sources of Calcium and Phosphorous for the Human Subject, 79 J. BIOL. CHEM. 283 (1928), available at http://www.jbc.org/content/79/1/283.full.pdf.
\textsuperscript{196} Fresh, Unprocessed (Raw) Whole Milk, supra note 195.
\textsuperscript{197} George Loss et al., The Protective Effect of Farm Milk Consumption on Childhood Asthma and Atopy: The GABRIELA Study, 128 J. ALLERGY & CLINICAL IMMUNOLOGY 766 (2011).
\textsuperscript{198} Morell et al., supra note 2.
\textsuperscript{199} Fresh, Unprocessed (Raw) Whole Milk, supra note 195.
\end{footnote}
2. Taste Benefits

Raw milk proponents also assert that unpasteurized milk has enhanced organoleptic qualities. These qualities include better taste, feel, smell, and appearance. Supporters of raw milk claim it tastes sweeter. This may be due to the lack of pasteurization itself or due to increased freshness because it spends less time being processed than if it were pasteurized. In addition to taste, raw milk enthusiasts claim the feel and consistency of the milk is more appealing without pasteurization.

3. Concerns with “Mainstream” Pasteurized Milk

Consumers wanting to purchase raw milk are often dissatisfied with the reactive measure that is pasteurization. Instead, they think regulation should be a more proactive measure by certifying healthy milk from quality animals and farms. The choice to consume raw milk has as much to do with avoiding the negative qualities of mainstream milk as it does with obtaining raw milk’s positive qualities. While the latter objective may be more apparent, the decision to consume raw milk is just as much about the former. Raw milk proponents voice concerns over the substance of pasteurized milk as well as the processes involved in obtaining most pasteurized milk.

The majority of milk consumed in the United States comes from large commercial dairies and is pasteurized and homogenized. Even so, pasteurized milk has proven perfectly capable of causing foodborne illness:

[P]asteurized milk sickens an average of over 600 people per year. There are many documented outbreaks that have been traced back to pasteurized milk: 1983, when 49 people became ill and 14 died from listeria from milk that was contaminated

200 Flynn, supra note 183.
201 Id.
204 Id.
205 Id.; Byrne, supra note 37, at 110.
207 Id. (at least to a plausible extent).
208 Id.; see also Morell et al., supra note 2.
209 Gompert & Kleinschmit, supra note 184, at 2.
210 Byrne, supra note 37, at 109.
before pasteurization; 1985, when 16,000 people became ill with salmonella from pasteurized milk traced to a single dairy; 1994, when 224,000 Americans became ill from salmonella traced to Schwan’s ice cream; 2006, when 1300 prisoners in California became ill with campylobacter from pasteurized milk; and 2007, when three people were killed by listeria from contaminated pasteurized milk. 211

Instances such as these are often pointed to as having been deceptively omitted from statistical computations when opponents compare the relative safety of raw milk and pasteurized milk; comparatively, from 2002 to 2011, between 25 and 175 cases of foodborne illness were caused by raw milk. 212 Proponents of raw milk typically admit that raw milk is relatively less safe as compared to pasteurized milk, but instead they argue that it is not as exceptionally unsafe as it is portrayed to be by government officials and opposing industry. 213 For example, in 2008 there were 23,152 reported cases of foodborne illness and half of a percent (0.5%), or 132 in number, of those reported cases are attributable to raw milk, whereas one third of the reported cases are attributable to beef, chicken, and fish. 214 The term “fearmongering” has been used by at least one raw milk advocate to describe the arguably misleading hype over raw milk risks. 215 As a distinction, advocates typically are not pushing for all milk to be unpasteurized, but only that raw milk be an option for those who seek to consume it; even advocates concede that raw milk produced and distributed at the level of pasteurized milk may not be appropriate for the very reasons that pasteurization was initially implemented. 216

Furthermore, among the reasons that raw milk consumers want access to the product is that whether due to the sheer volume of production or sway of industry, pasteurized milk is permitted to contain a number of contaminants. 217 For instance, mainstream dairy cows may be given hormone treatments to

211 GUMPERT, supra note 100, at 115–16, 119.
212 Morell et al., supra note 2.
213 Id.
214 Id.
215 Id. (explaining for example, that there are no reported deaths from raw milk since the 1980s, yet since 1999 there have been 32 deaths from cantaloupe, 5 from spinach, 14 from lunch meat, 9 from peanut butter, 30 per year from eggs, and 15 per year from oyster, which, notably, are often a raw animal product).
216 Id. Consider, however, that HACCP plans for raw meat are implemented at as grand a scale as may be required for all milk to be preventatively regulated so that it could be consumed raw, potentially.
increase milk production.\textsuperscript{218} This increase can be in excess of ten times the amount a cow would naturally produce.\textsuperscript{219} Due to the potentially harmful effect these hormones may have on human health after they leach into the milk, administering them was banned in the European Union and Canada.\textsuperscript{220}

Increased production from hormone treatments in turn often necessitates antibiotic treatment to avoid mastitis and infection.\textsuperscript{221} In order to keep up with such volume of milk production, cows are mechanically milked.\textsuperscript{222} During this extended process, teats can obtain lesions just from the sheer amount of mechanized milking.\textsuperscript{223} The lesions cause severe pain for the animal.\textsuperscript{224} Only a limited amount of pus and related contaminants is allowed in mainstream milk, but nevertheless is permitted.\textsuperscript{225} Some have shown concern that increased use of hormones has led to an increased presence of pus.\textsuperscript{226}

Another process concern is that cows must be inseminated and produce calves regularly in order to remain milk-producing animals.\textsuperscript{227} Dairy cows may suffer greatly from this process; they are highly social creatures that live in herds and would naturally remain with their young for years.\textsuperscript{228} In mainstream dairy production, calves are often removed from their mothers within minutes of birth.\textsuperscript{229} Additionally, traditional dairy cows may be kept in confinement for long periods of time,\textsuperscript{230} and may have their tails docked without anesthesia.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{218} Id.; \textit{JEFFREY MOUSSAIEFF MASSON, THE FACE ON YOUR PLATE: THE TRUTH ABOUT FOOD} (2010). John Webster, Emeritus professor of animal husbandry at Bristol University’s Clinical Veterinary Science Department, who is widely considered the world’s leading authority on dairy cows, acknowledges that the removal of her calf is the single worst incident in the life of a dairy cow.” \textit{Cows for Dairy}, WOODSTOCK FARM ANIMAL SANCTUARY, http://www.woodstocksanctuary.org/learn-3/factory-farmed-animals/cows-for-dairy/ (last visited Oct. 9, 2014).
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Consumers may have difficulty finding information regarding the quality of treatment present at a mainstream dairy. One alternative that provides some guarantees for consumers is buying organic. Organic dairy cows must be provided access to pasture even while lactating. They may not receive certain medical treatment while lactating and must be fed organic feed. Though buying organic may solve some of raw milk advocates’ input and processing concerns, organic milk is subject to the same federal and state pasteurization laws. It also has grown in scale to a point where many animal welfare concerns for organically produced milk are nearer to concerns for mainstream milk. Meanwhile, raw milk is often obtained from sustainable and organic small-scale family farms. Consumers want to be able to make the type of purchase that raw milk typically involves.

For a number of reasons, raw milk advocates want the opportunity to consume the product. They point to health benefits, taste benefits, and concerns over mainstream milk that include controversial inputs and animal welfare issues. Meanwhile, states permit or deny access to raw milk through various degrees of regulation—the level of regulation depends largely on how the state has weighed the balance between health safety and consumer sovereignty. The role of consumer sovereignty in consumer protection and its specific role with raw milk is exceptionally important because food choice is an intimate one connected to fundamental rights. Yet, the history of raw milk regulation and the circumstances under which pasteurization rules were promulgated reveal that discussions during this process wholly omitted consumer sovereignty.


_234_ 7 C.F.R. § 205.239(a)(1) (2014) (“Year-round access for all animals to the outdoors, shade, shelter, exercise areas, fresh air, clean water for drinking, and direct sunlight, suitable to the species, its stage of life, the climate, and the environment”); 7 C.F.R. § 205.239(b)(2) (2014). (“The producer of an organic livestock operation may provide temporary confinement or shelter for an animal because of: . . . [t]he animal’s stage of life: Except, that lactation is not a stage of life that would exempt ruminants from any of the mandates set forth in this regulation”).


_238_ Byrne, *supra* note 37, at 109; see also *Learn More-Cow and Goat-shares, supra* note 126; *Sources of Real Milk, supra* note 180.
III. REGULATING RAW MILK

Consumer sovereignty and health safety are both consumer protection concerns of heightened importance for food; the FDA can and should maximize the goals of both by lifting the ban on the sale of raw milk in interstate commerce and instead imposing consistent regulations that draw from state examples and ultimately better realize the sole objective of the original ban—protecting the health of milk consumers. This Part first argues that federal regulation of raw milk is necessary, discussed in Section A, because it would better meet the health safety objective of the original ban, it could counter the shortcomings of widely varying states regulation, and it would allow proper weight to be placed on consumer sovereignty. The focus of this Part then shifts in Section B to analyzing the costs and benefits associated with various state approaches in light of the competing consumer protection interests central to this Note. Lastly, a summary of the state regulatory methods that would best strike a balance between health safety and consumer sovereignty will be offered at the end of Part II.B.

A. Federal Regulation of Raw Milk Is Necessary

Federal regulation of raw milk is necessary because it would better meet the objectives of the original ban—protecting the health of milk consumers—and it could do so without sacrificing consumer sovereignty. Possibly the most important benefit of federal regulation would be consistent regulation. It could ensure that all raw milk was, in fact, actually regulated, as some state regulation fails to do. Consistently regulated raw milk could optimally limit sales to promote safe and informed consumption.

1. Federal Regulation Could Better Meet the Objectives of the Original Ban

One of the primary arguments made by the FDA, in the cases that forced the agency to prohibit raw milk in interstate commerce, was that a ban in interstate commerce would be only marginally effective.\(^{239}\) The FDA’s findings showed that most of the product is sold at the local or state level, so a ban on interstate sales would have a limited effect on the safety and health concerns associated with raw milk.\(^{240}\) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, however, was unconvinced for two reasons: the FDA did not provide a source for its determination that most sales were intrastate,\(^{241}\) and even if that were the case, the risks of raw milk were so high that it was still

\(^{240}\) Id.
\(^{241}\) Id.
arbitrary and capricious for the agency to not ban raw milk in interstate commerce. 242 Meanwhile, the states were left to set their own standards for intrastate sales of raw milk—approximately 30 permit it to some extent. 243

The arbitrary and capricious standard is a high one. 244 Naturally it begs the question: how could the court have found it so decisively clear—as would be required by the arbitrary and capricious standard—that the sale of raw milk posed such a risk to the public that it must be banned interstate when over half of the nation’s states have found otherwise for intrastate sales?

One potential answer is that raw milk’s safety concerns increase as time increases between production and consumption—pathogens can multiply over time. 245 In other words, the farther the raw milk must travel, the longer the time between production and consumption. Limiting sales to intrastate imposes at least a limited geographical scope within which the product may travel. 246 Additionally, sales within a limited geographic region keep producers and consumers in closer proximity, which can have the effect of increasing accountability. 247 When producers and consumers interact directly (as many state regulations require for the sale of raw milk) producers are more connected to the individuals consuming their products and so presumably feel a greater duty to make quality and safe products. 248 Consumers, in turn, have the ability to ask questions of the producers regarding a number of potential concerns. 249 Proximity also reinforces consumer protection insofar as reputation is more

---

242 Id.; State-by-State, supra note 90.

243 Id.

244 Rulemaking is unlawful if it is “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law,” according to the Administrative Procedures Act, § 706(2)(A). “This review is focused and restricted, and it does not permit the court to substitute its judgment for that of the agency.” Pub. Citizen, 653 F. Supp. at 1238–39 (citing Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402, 414–15 (1971)).


246 Though this probably is not all that true considering that people can travel to get the milk however far they want and the FDA will not take action against that; and even if the agency tried to take action, it would be questionable whether it could infringe on the freedom to travel in this way. Farm-to-Consumer Legal Def. Fund v. Sebelius, 734 F.Supp. 2d 668 (N.D. Iowa 2010).


249 Id.; Gompert & Kleinschmit, supra note 184, at 7.
important and drives producers to value quality and safety. When a producer distributes products primarily at the local level, he or she has a limited market and a market that is likely more close-knit in terms of sharing product information, good or bad.

However, the in-state distinction ultimately proves arbitrary. The benefits from intrastate sales can only manifest for truly local sales where states impose regulations such as those that require consumers to purchase directly from producers, whether on farm or at a farmer’s market. A producer that may be just minutes from the state border of a state that does not permit the sale of raw milk would be unable to make the short trip to a nearby farmer’s market in a non-permitting state to sell his product; meanwhile, that same producer may be permitted within his own state to travel several hundred miles to sell his product or even to place his product in the hands of a retailer.

Current regulation would permit raw milk to travel the full length of California, well over 700 miles long, for retail sales, but not travel just over the border to a nearby farmer’s market in Nevada for a direct farmer-to-consumer sale. The former sale lacks the same accountability that the latter sale preserves. Thus, interstate sales of raw milk—when limited by regulation to a limited radius of sale instead of state boundaries—would likely better achieve the goal that raw milk sales be near-at-hand between farmer and consumer.

2. State Regulation Has Its Shortcomings

Where states ban the sale of raw milk, consumers have found creative ways of bypassing state laws to obtain the product. This often results in the consumption of a product that is wholly unregulated for human consumption. There are two primary methods producers and consumers use to transfer raw milk without performing the literal sale of raw milk for human consumption:

250 Id.
251 Id.; see also Suzanne B. Bopp, Declaring Sovereignty (Over Food), DROVERS CATTLE NETWORK (Aug. 16, 2013), http://www.cattlenetwork.com/drovers/columns/consumer-trends/Declaring-Sovereignty-over-food-21992791.htm (“Proponents of food sovereignty say that when operating at this level — local and personal — if a producer sells bad food, people will quickly know it and know where it came from, making it a sort of self-governing system.”).
252 State-by-State, supra note 90.
254 State-by-State, supra note 90.
255 Christie, supra note 247, at 7.
256 Underground Raw Milk, supra note 175.
257 Id.
(1) creating animal-shares, herd-shares, or farm-shares, and (2) selling the product as pet food.

Some states have reacted by banning animal-shares, but none have gone so far as to ban farm-shares. In either case, the state likely has no regulations for the sale of raw milk for human consumption. The transaction is governed solely by the consumer and producer. Regulating the sale of raw milk, instead of completely banning it, would permit the government to better protect the consumer by setting at least minimum standards for all raw milk sales.

Another method consumers use to obtain raw milk is by purchasing raw milk that is sold only for pet consumption. Some states have imposed regulations that require raw milk for pet consumption to be dyed in order to deter human consumption. Many states, however, have not passed such regulations. Either way, consumers can—and do—obtain and ingest raw milk that is not regulated for human consumption at the federal or state level via the pet food exception. For a product that has such potential for harm—so much so that failure to regulate it was deemed arbitrary and capricious—it seems counterintuitive to essentially choose no regulation (resulting from prohibition) over express regulation.

Where the safety of raw milk is of such concern, express regulation appears significantly preferable to regulatory prohibition with “under the table” transactions that provide little consumer protection. Share arrangements could still be legal, though they would probably be less utilized, to not interfere with property rights. However, raw milk for human consumption could be regulated no matter how the transfer manifested to ultimately allow a safer, federally regulated means to the same end. That federal regulation could, in turn, no longer rely on arbitrary state boundaries to limit the radius of sale, but instead could set one based more on useful geographical limits.
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259 \textit{Id.}
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262 \textit{Id.}
263 See Flynn, \textit{supra} note 175; \textit{Underground Raw Milk, supra} note 175.
264 \textit{State-by-State, supra} note 90 (Indiana, Kentucky, Virginia, Alabama).
265 See, e.g., Fulton, \textit{supra} note 175; Flynn, \textit{supra} note 175; \textit{Underground Raw Milk, supra} note 175.
3. Heightened Consumer Protection Concerns Require Federal Regulation of Raw Milk

Raw milk warrants higher consumer protection insofar as it concerns both health safety and consumer sovereignty. In *Public Citizen v. Heckler*, the court focused solely on the health concerns surrounding unpasteurized milk, and in fact, pasteurization can reduce common dangerous bacteria and viruses found in milk. Milk, in comparison to many other foods, is unique in that it is an ideal environment for bacteria and viruses to proliferate. To make matters worse, milk is pooled for processing, making it easy for contaminants to spread. Between the nature of the contaminants, the ideal environment provided by milk, and the pooling process, health safety is of particularly heightened concern for milk. Thus, the court rightly ordered the FDA to regulate milk.

In promulgating its rule, however, the court and the FDA failed to also place proper emphasis on the heightened concern for consumer sovereignty when regulations affect consumer food choice. Had each done so, as around 30 states have done, the regulatory scheme for milk would likely look much different and, arguably, should look much different: (1) food choice is an intimate decision and (2) it is often closely tied with a number of interests where autonomy, which is similar to consumer sovereignty, is highly protected.

Food consumption is an intimate decision. For example, there is a big difference between a consumer’s choice between lawnmowers and a consumer’s choice among foods. Consumer protection that leaves choice in whether to allow a substance to enter one’s body—and become part of it—is quite different than that regarding many other consumer choices. First, imagine the level of disappointment one might feel upon discovering that his or her favorite model of lawn equipment has been removed from the market. Now consider this in comparison to how a person might be affected if a staple in her

---
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diet, one that is deeply rooted in her longstanding culture, or religion even, were removed from the market for health safety reasons. Second, imagine the level of violation one feels upon discovery that the lawnmower she purchased is defective for some mechanical reason. In comparison, imagine the level of violation one feels upon discovering that a food item in his or her refrigerator, a food item recently enjoyed and ingested, is contaminated. The latter events in both comparisons are invasive and penetrating. Thus, when formulating regulations that limit or eliminate access to food, it is essential that consumer sovereignty be properly weighed as a consumer protection concern in conjunction with health safety.276

Furthermore, that food choice is intimate is evidenced by how particularly important it is to the public.277 Diet and food choice have become a “hot topic.” Innumerable books, documentaries, articles, blogs, and so on provide endless information on dietary choices: vegan, paleo, vegetarian, macrobiotics, raw, etc. People care about what enters their bodies, often investing much time and energy into making such a personal decision.280

One particular personal diet choice is the raw foods diet.281 It advocates consuming uncooked and unprocessed foods from all the major food groups.282 The raw diet can include both raw meats and raw dairy.283 However, despite the at least equally great risk of raw meat consumption, as compared to raw dairy, raw meat is readily sold in interstate and intrastate commerce.284 Access to raw meat is available and sold on-farm, at farmer’s markets, at roadside stands, at retail stores, and even at restaurants with the intent that it be consumed raw.285 Interestingly, many of the harmful pathogens in raw milk are the same as those
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285 FIDDES, supra note 54, at 87.
in raw meat. However, rather than require that all meat be cooked (like pasteurization for milk) before entering the stream of commerce, meat is preventively regulated for health safety, which allows individuals access to the raw product. Meat regulations aim to inform consumers of the risks of consuming it raw, but consumers are allowed to do so at their own risk. Notably, meat is no less amenable to being precooked before being sold; in fact, many pre-cooked meat products are available to consumers. One might ask: who would buy a pre-cooked steak? Consumers thought cooked milk, (i.e., pasteurized milk), tasted funny when it was first introduced, but they apparently have gotten used to it. More importantly, meat is sold with the intent that it be consumed raw in delicacies such as sushi, sashimi, or steak tartare. Raw milk consumers are simply seeking the same type of access to a comparable product that is arguably less harmful, particularly when sold on a small scale.

Secondly, food consumption is so closely tied with a number of protected interests that it warrants heightened consideration of consumer sovereignty when formulating regulations. Food can be involved in an individual’s culture, religion, health, and self-expression. Importantly, many of these realms have been legally determined to require heightened scrutiny when depriving the individual of his or her autonomy. Food has a longstanding history with religion, from animal sacrifice to modern kosher standards. Food and health are so closely tied that one ancient Chinese proverb states, “He that takes medicine but neglects diet, wastes the skill of the physician.” Hippocrates, after whom Western medicine’s Hippocratic Oath is

286 Food Safety for Moms-to-Be: Medical Professionals - Foodborne Pathogens, supra note 57; see also supra Part II.A.
287 9 C.F.R. § 417.2 (2014); 21 C.F.R. § 120.7(c) (2014) (requiring HACCP plans).
289 See Morell et al., supra note 2 (questioner Ron Schmid, author of The Untold Story of Milk, asked: “What is freedom if not the right to choose the food you eat?”); RAW MILK FREEDOM RIDERS, supra note 1. As an aside, a recent movement, “Food Sovereignty,” has been used to refer to the desire for food consumer sovereignty. See Anderson, supra note 88. This movement: (1) advocates food for people and that it is not just another commodity, (2) values food providers, (3) advocates localized food systems, (4) prefers control at the local level, (5) improves knowledge and skills in these local systems and producers, and (6) works with nature rather than against it. Id.
290 See supra Part II.C.
291 See supra Part II.C.
293 Shatenstein & Ghadirian, supra note 103, at 225.
294 PURTELL, supra note 101, at 93.
named, is quoted as saying, “Let food be thy medicine.” Food and personal expression take many forms. For example, veganism can represent one’s belief in animal rights or welfare, protection of the environment, and the promotion of a system with greater accountability and quality of life for workers.

Thus, consumer sovereignty should not only be considered with food regulation, but it should be given significant weight; food consumption is an intimate decision and one rooted in autonomy as it relates to several protected interests. The fact that consumer sovereignty was wholly unconsidered in the reasoning for banning raw milk in interstate commerce is both alarming and inconsistent when compared with comparable food products such as raw meat. Federal regulation of raw milk would look much different, potentially like some state approaches, if both health safety and consumer sovereignty were properly weighed.

B. The Consumer Protection Value of State Approaches

States take a number of different approaches in regulating raw milk. Although some ban the sale of raw milk altogether, most permit the sale of raw milk to some extent. The most restrictive states that permit the sale of raw milk allow only cow-share, herd-share, or farm-share agreements. States may additionally allow on-farm sales or sales at farmer’s markets directly by producers. At the least restrictive end of the regulatory schemes, are states that permit retail sales. Typically, state regulations require some sort of certification or permitting as well as labeling on products and possibly point-of-sale warning signs. The variety in state regulation is evidence that there are, in fact, competing consumer protection interests to consider in formulating raw milk regulation, more than was considered in Public Citizen v. Heckler. A consumer protection analysis of these state approaches sheds light on how federal regulations can better strike a balance between health safety and consumer sovereignty.

295 Edelson, supra note 101.
297 State-by-State, supra note 90.
298 Id.
299 Id.; see also Plummer, supra note 122.
300 State-by-State, supra note 90.
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302 See, e.g., N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 1, § 2.3(b)(1)(iv) (2014) (A person can sell raw milk if “at the point of sale a sign is conspicuously posted, easily capable of being read, from such point, stating: ‘NOTICE: Raw milk sold here. Raw milk does not provide the protection of pasteurization.’”).
1. Location of Sale

Limiting the location of sale for raw milk is one way to protect consumers—both in terms of health safety and consumer sovereignty. Sixteen states, 13 of which have special restrictions, limit the sale of milk strictly to on-farm sales.\textsuperscript{303} Additionally, 16 states, 6 of which have special restrictions, allow some form of retail sales separate from on-farm sales.\textsuperscript{304} Only 18 states prohibit the sale of raw milk altogether.\textsuperscript{305}

\textit{i. On-Farm}

The closer consumers are to producers, the greater the achievable accountability between the two,\textsuperscript{306} which promotes both consumer protection objectives. When sales are made on-farm, the producer has greater incentive to produce safe, quality products for a number of reasons.\textsuperscript{307} In close proximity, it is easy for word to spread about the quality—or lack thereof—in a seller’s products.\textsuperscript{308} Reputation is essential to maintain business in a surrounding community.\textsuperscript{309} Furthermore, when producers interact with their consumers directly—whether it is a mother and child, a family, or a next door neighbor—they are much more likely to ensure a quality product for more than simply quality’s sake, but for the sake of the individual consuming it.\textsuperscript{310} This can easily result in a heightened sense of duty, and as a result, diligence.\textsuperscript{311} In this way, on-farm sales enhance health safety.\textsuperscript{312}

\textsuperscript{303} State-by-State, supra note 90 (Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin).

\textsuperscript{304} Id. (Arizona, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington).

\textsuperscript{305} Id. (Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming).

\textsuperscript{306} Local Food Systems, U.S. Dep’t of Agric.,  http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/122868/err97_1_.pdf (last visited Oct. 9, 2014); Christie, supra note 247, at 7, 11; Grubinger, supra note 247.

\textsuperscript{307} Local Food Systems, supra note 306.

\textsuperscript{308} Id.

\textsuperscript{309} Id.

\textsuperscript{310} Id.

\textsuperscript{311} Id.

From the consumer’s perspective, direct transactions with producers also increase consumer sovereignty by providing the consumer with more ready access to information about a product. In the case of raw milk, consumers often have a number of concerns about the substance of the product itself as well as the production processes. Consumers can be concerned about the type of feed or medications given to animals because these inputs can easily find their way into, or affect the quality of, milk. Another serious substance concern might involve what kind of preventative measures are in place or what testing is done on the milk or animals to ensure its safety.

As far as the processes are of concern, consumers may want to know how the animals are treated in order to obtain compassionately produced dairy. Treatment questions may include whether and how much animals are let out to pasture or what is done with the regularly produced offspring that a lactating animal must produce in order to continue lactating. Other processing questions might involve how the milk is obtained from the animals, how often it is obtained, where it is processed, how much it is processed, or how it is pooled or bottled.

When sales occur on-farm, producers and consumers of raw milk are in the best position to exchange information with transparency. The “direct farmer-to-consumer relationship . . . ensure[s] that raw dairy is available only to those who intentionally seek it out and that consumers know the source.” As a state regulatory approach, on-farm sales—through transparency—significantly enhance health safety and consumer sovereignty. Transparency and free exchange of information can occur beyond the farm, however, especially when the direct farmer-to-consumer relationship is maintained.

---
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314 See HSUS Report, supra note 221.
315 Id.
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319 Id. (whether the animals are milked by hand or by machine and if by machine, what kind of machine).
320 Id. One issue some consumers have with some mainstream milk producers is that lactating animals, for instance cows, are sometimes forced to produce up to three times the amount of milk they naturally would produce in a day. Id. This can result in serious discomfort to the animals. It also can lead to mastitis, which causes pus to flow along with the milk. Id.
321 Id.
322 Local Food Systems, supra note 306.
ii. Sales by Producer at Farmer’s Markets and Local Stands

Many of the benefits of on-farm sales are present in sales at farmer’s markets and local stands where the producer is involved in the sale.\textsuperscript{324} The opportunity to ask questions and for face-to-face accountability is still present.\textsuperscript{325} The primary difference between these and on-farm sales is that the consumer does not have the same ready access to inspect the animals, machinery, and process—though if sales were limited to a certain proximity to the farm, that distinction could be minimized.\textsuperscript{326}

There are a number of additional benefits in allowing sales by producers at farmer’s markets and local stands.\textsuperscript{327} Producers may have safer transport conditions, i.e., refrigerated trucks, to bring the milk from the farm to a location nearer to consumer’s homes.\textsuperscript{328} Easier access via farmer’s markets and stands can better suit the needs of elderly, disabled, and low income consumers who may have difficulty going or are unable to go to the actual farm.\textsuperscript{329} Fewer individuals on-farm lessens the exposure farm workers and farm animals have to pathogens brought in by the public.\textsuperscript{330}

Farmer’s market or stand sales enhance health safety and consumer sovereignty through transparency in much the same way that on-farm sales do because the farmer-to-consumer relationship is still present and, in addition, they provide raw milk access to more consumers. These sales further enhance health safety by providing better quality transportation of the product and limiting pathogen exposure.

iii. Retail Sales

Although retail sales can exhibit many of the accountability mechanisms at work in on-farm sales and sales at farmer’s markets and local stands,\textsuperscript{331} each mechanism’s effectiveness is markedly lessened.\textsuperscript{332} Instead of the actual producer handing over a product, the producer’s information may be

\textsuperscript{324} Local Food Systems, supra note 306.
\textsuperscript{325} Id.
\textsuperscript{326} Id.
\textsuperscript{327} Real Milk Movement, supra note 323.
\textsuperscript{328} Id.
\textsuperscript{329} Id.
\textsuperscript{330} Id. This is not necessarily a consumer protection issue, but for farms located farther away, bringing milk to farmer’s markets may reduce overall travel involved in the transaction, consequently improving air quality, congestion, and public safety; additionally, local communities and farmer benefit from the additional opportunity for income.
\textsuperscript{331} Local Food Systems, supra note 306.
\textsuperscript{332} Id.
located on the product.\textsuperscript{333} An effort to contact the producer may or may not result in quality information or any information at all;\textsuperscript{334} whether or not a tour of facilities is available is similarly uncertain. Rather than an individual representing the integrity of a product, a brand name on the face of the product takes that individual’s place.\textsuperscript{335}

The nature of a retail sale transaction involving raw milk does not enhance health safety the same way the previously discussed transactions do.\textsuperscript{336} While retail sales achieve the greatest access to raw milk and most enhance consumer sovereignty, they may actually do so at the expense of health safety.\textsuperscript{337} Retail sales involve more handling and storage and therefore more opportunity for milk to be compromised.\textsuperscript{338} Time may be a critical part of promoting health safety for raw milk considering the limitations that some states regulations impose on the time lapse between the production and sale of raw milk.\textsuperscript{339} More importantly, retail sales may attract less knowledgeable or accidental consumers, consumers other than those “who intentionally seek it out and . . . consumers [who] know the source.”\textsuperscript{340} For a product like raw milk—one that involves such serious health safety concerns—it may be advisable for federal regulations to not permit retail sales in interstate commerce.

\textit{iv. Animal-Shares, Herd-Shares, and Farm-Shares}

Presently, animal-shares, herd-shares, and farm-shares are a way to bypass bans on raw milk and often result in the consumption of wholly unregulated milk.\textsuperscript{341} Lifting the federal ban on raw milk might diminish the use

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{334} It is an interesting exercise, and an important one, to pick up an item at the grocery store and make an attempt to find out the answers to questions you have about the product. It may be surprising how difficult it is to determine something as simple as the country of origin for the produce department’s butternut squash. What is more difficult is obtaining answers about pesticide or herbicide usage, farmer worker treatment, etc. See, e.g., Jim Slama, \textit{Whole Foods’ New Produce Ratings: Transparency Bears Fruit}, CIVIL EATS (Oct. 29, 2013), http://civileats.com/2013/10/29/whole-foods-new-produce-ratings-transparency-bears-fruit (last visited Sept. 3, 2014).

\textsuperscript{335} See supra Part II.B.

\textsuperscript{336} See \textit{Our Mission}, supra note 312.

\textsuperscript{337} Nelson, supra note 202.

\textsuperscript{338} \textit{Id}.

\textsuperscript{339} See, e.g., 7 PA. CODE § 59a.411(a)(3)(i) (2014) (limiting the sale of raw milk to 17 days from production).

\textsuperscript{340} \textit{Real Milk Movement}, supra note 323.

\textsuperscript{341} See supra Part II.D.2.
\end{footnotesize}
of these arrangements because the original need would cease. Were they to continue, however, share arrangements may actually be a raw milk transaction that enhances both health safety and consumer sovereignty, so long as the arrangement is classified as a milk sale and brings the milk under regulation. In fact, some states have done this.

In share arrangements, consumers have a property interest in an animal, herd, or entire farm. Because of their investment, these consumers would likely have even better access to quality information about the product and conditions of production than consumers in other direct farmer-to-consumer sales. Share arrangements could be federally regulated such that the transfer of milk in this way is considered a sale so that a transaction that otherwise enhances health safety and consumer sovereignty—as much or more than other farmer-to-consumer transactions—is allowed and the milk is regulated.

v. Proximity to Farm

Limiting raw milk sales to within a certain radius of sale from the point of production serves a number of protective functions for the consumer in terms of both health safety and consumer sovereignty. With regard to health safety, less transportation increases the likelihood of freshness, which may be especially important for raw milk. As mentioned earlier, some state regulations require that milk be sold within a limited time from production. Moreover, a limited radius of sale can define the community served and enhance the role that reputation plays in ensuring health safety. It does guarantee consumers are within a limited distance from the production site so that consumers have more access to inspect. A smaller radius of sale, in general, reinforces the accountability in direct farmer-to-consumer sales.

Importantly, a limited radius of sale does not render the same arbitrary differences that occur when sales are limited by state boundaries. Some states are potentially smaller than the optimal radius of sale for enhancing health safety and consumer sovereignty, while other states may be much larger.
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348 See, e.g., 7 PA. CODE § 59a.411(a)(3)(i) (2014) (limiting the sale of raw milk to 17 days from production); 330 Mass Code Regs. 27.08 (D) (2014) (limiting the sale to within 5 days).
349 See Local Food Systems, supra note 306.
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Moving away from these arbitrary boundaries is essential to adequately address consumer sovereignty in raw milk regulation. Raw milk consumers want access to the product and the current patchwork of state regulations does not consistently provide that access. That is not to say that federal regulations that limit the radius of sale to optimally promote health safety and consumer sovereignty would ultimately provide access to raw milk for everyone in the nation, but at least the access would be determined by balancing consumer protection considerations and not arbitrary state boundaries.

2. Labeling

Product labeling and point of sale warning signs can be critical methods of getting important information to consumers for both health safety and consumer sovereignty purposes. Labels on raw milk promote health safety by including production dates to indicate freshness; stating clearly that it is raw to avoid unintentional consumption; and warning of risks in general and for specific populations. Labels on raw milk promote consumer sovereignty to the extent they provide information to consumers that allows them to make knowledgeable choices.

i. Warning Label on Product

When a product is labeled on its packaging, consumers have easy access to information that can help them assess health risks and make informed choices. Warning labels for raw milk can disclose the risks specifically associated with drinking it. They can forwardly disclose that raw milk is not pasteurized and explain the benefits of pasteurization. An example of this in raw milk labeling is Massachusetts’s labeling requirement: “Raw milk is not pasteurized. Pasteurization destroys organisms that may be harmful to human health.” Other state labeling requirements are more specific about risks to the

353 See supra Part II.D.3.
354 See supra Part II.D.3.
356 CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 17, § 11380 (a) (2014); 330 MASS. CODE REGS. 27.00(F)(1) (2014).
357 330 MASS. CODE REGS. 27.08(F)(1) (2014).
358 Id. The words “not pasteurized” must be not less than “twice the height of any other lettering” or not less than an eighth of an inch in height, whichever is greater. Id.
individual as well as the heightened risk raw milk may pose to the young, elderly, or those with compromised immune systems.\textsuperscript{359} These raw milk labels resemble quite closely the warnings that are required for raw meat, another raw animal product that is currently allowed in interstate commerce.\textsuperscript{360}

As a result of labeling, consumers who still choose raw milk may be more likely to ensure the quality of the product through the various accountability methods discussed in this Note, such as speaking with the producer or inspecting.\textsuperscript{361} They may also be more likely to use care in keeping the raw milk refrigerated and in ensuring that the raw milk is consumed within a safe time frame.\textsuperscript{362} In formulating federal regulation for raw milk, the labeling requirement should be specifically tailored to maximize its potential to promote health safety and consumer sovereignty; this can be done by drawing from the most thorough state examples.\textsuperscript{363}

\textbf{ii. Warning Signs at the Point of Sale}

Informed consumption of raw milk so enhances both health safety and consumer sovereignty that consumer protection for this product may also warrant warning signs at the point of sale.\textsuperscript{364} Warning signs at the point of sale for raw milk may resemble the raw meat warnings in restaurant menus.\textsuperscript{365} They often call attention to a difference, a particular risk, and then advise the consumer to proceed cautiously.\textsuperscript{366} Warning signs provide another layer of labeling so that unsuspecting consumers do not inadvertently purchase raw milk, thinking it is pasteurized milk.\textsuperscript{367} These signs serve a purpose themselves and reinforce product labeling: if a consumer were to purchase raw milk

\textsuperscript{359} \textit{CAL. CODE REGS.} tit. 17, § 11380 (a) (2014); \textit{330 MASS. CODE REGS.} 27.00(F)(1) (2014).

\textsuperscript{360} 9 C.F.R. § 317.2 (2014); \textit{FEDERAL FOOD LABELING REQUIREMENTS}, \textit{supra} note 59, at 51–52. One focus of labeling is on the safe handling of raw meat; the same sort of on-product labeling for raw milk might similarly prove beneficial.

\textsuperscript{361} \textit{See} Engs, \textit{supra} note 355.

\textsuperscript{362} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{363} \textit{Information Guide,} \textit{supra} note 355.

\textsuperscript{364} \textit{See, e.g., Questions About Consumer Advisories for Food Establishments Serving Raw or Undercooked Foods, ALLEGHENY CNTY. HEALTH DEP’T, http://www.achd.net/food/rawfood.html} (last visited Sept. 3, 2014) [hereinafter \textit{Consumer Advisories}] (“A consumer advisory is a publicly available written statement that informs consumers that a ready-to-eat food of animal origin is raw, undercooked, or not otherwise processed to eliminate disease causing organisms, and the food therefore poses a risk. A consumer advisory consists of two distinct parts: disclosure and reminder. A consumer advisory goes on the menu or on whatever consumers read to make their food selections.”).

\textsuperscript{365} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{366} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{367} \textit{Id.; see also} \textit{330 MASS. CODE REGS.} 27.08(F)(2) (2014); \textit{WASH. ADMIN. CODE} § 246-215-03615(s) (2014).
accidentally, they may be less likely to notice on-product labeling and special handling requirements.

Multiple layers of warning information can help to ensure that raw milk consumers mean to consume the product, that they do so with access to risk information, and that they potentially do so with more care. Federal regulation of raw milk that includes warning signs would enhance consumer sovereignty and health safety through knowledge, just as these same labeling methods do for raw meat and other risk-posing consumer products.369

3. Advertising

Limits on advertising may enhance both health safety and consumer sovereignty by limiting consumers of raw milk to those who desire and actively seek the product.370 Consumers have no less choice to obtain the product, just less access to information as to how to obtain the product and, therefore, consumer sovereignty may be marginally affected.

Meanwhile, health safety has the potential to be greatly improved by limits on advertising. For the most part, raw milk consumers are not accidental consumers.371 They seek raw milk often because of some knowledge or research that drives them to want it.372 Information in the general marketplace may be imperfect, but this can be countered with product labeling and warning signs.373 The key point is that seekers are more likely looking for the benefit—and risk—information.374 Knowledgeable consumers are more likely to inquire, inspect, and be cautious.375 Thus, balancing both consumer protection interests favors limits on advertising in federal regulation.376

368 See Consumer, supra note 364.
369 See id.
370 See supra Part II.D.3.
372 See Real Milk Movement, supra note 323.
373 See supra Part II.D.3.
374 See Real Milk Movement, supra note 323; see also PERCEPTIONS, supra note 371.
375 See Real Milk Movement, supra note 323.
376 This Note only argues that raw milk should be regulated and in a manner that best utilizes state examples that optimize consumer protection concerns; it does not necessarily argue the specific degree to which or manner in which raw milk should be regulated. The constitutionality of limits on advertising for raw milk is beyond the scope of this Note.
4. Certification Requirements

The amount of pre-screening of raw milk per state ranges from no certification requirements\(^{377}\) to very detailed initial certification and continued monitoring.\(^ {378}\) Ensuring quality and safety of raw milk on the front-end, much like the regulations for raw meat, is critical to health safety. In fact, certification, more than any other form of regulation, has the potential to enhance health safety.\(^ {379}\)

Though exactly what certification should involve is beyond the scope of this Note, some examples of how state approaches to certification enhance health safety are as follows. Certification can set high quality standards for the end product: at least one state requires that raw milk meet the same standards as Grade A pasteurized milk.\(^ {380}\) Licensing\(^ {381}\) or permitting\(^ {382}\) can provide a log of producers to track consumption and outbreaks. Uniform bottling standards promote sanitary conditions.\(^ {383}\) Post-bottling cooling requirements aim to minimize the spread of pathogens.\(^ {384}\) Monitoring the health of animals periodically may be a critical part of ensuring the safety and quality of unpasteurized milk.\(^ {385}\) This can be reinforced through periodic testing of the milk itself to monitor issues such as bacteria count, somatic cell count, and sediment.\(^ {386}\) Standards regarding environmental conditions may lessen contamination.\(^ {387}\) In order to set and monitor the effectiveness of all of these possibilities, a commission specific to raw milk might be established.\(^ {388}\)

Ultimately, raw milk regulation would probably look a lot more like raw meat regulation, and focus on certification, if it considered both health safety and consumer sovereignty. It would focus on contamination prevention at every

\(^{377}\) NEB. REV. STAT. § 2-3969 (2014). However, this usually applies to incidental sales. See, e.g., 410 ILL. COMP. STAT. 635/8 (2014).


\(^{379}\) See supra Part II.E.3.

\(^{380}\) ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. § 3-606(b) (2014).

\(^{381}\) ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. § 3-607 (2014); KAN. STAT. ANN. § 65-778(a) (2014).

\(^{382}\) CAL. FOOD & AGRIC. CODE § 33226 (2014); CONN. AGENCIES REGS. § 22-172(b) (2014); MO. CODE REGS. ANN. tit. 2, § CSR 80-3.030 (2014).


\(^{385}\) CAL. FOOD & AGRIC. CODE § 35891(a) (2014) (once every two months).

\(^{386}\) CONN. AGENCIES REGS. § 22-133-129 (2014).

\(^{387}\) MISS. CODE ANN. § 75-31-65(3)(d) (2014).

\(^{388}\) NEV. REV. STAT. § 584.207 (2014).
stage of the process so that the end product was something that consumers could safely choose.

In sum, applying this analysis to form a proposed federal regulatory checklist, milk sales could be safely and responsibly regulated by utilizing the following state approaches: limit sales to those involving a direct farmer-to-consumer transaction; restrict the radius of sale; require product labeling to fully disclose the lack of pasteurization and potential hazards and then reinforce product labeling with point-of-sale warning signs; limit advertising; and, most importantly, establish a standardized certification process for the production of certified raw milk.

IV. CONCLUSION

Consumer sovereignty and health safety are both consumer protection concerns of heightened importance for food; the FDA can and should maximize the goals of both by lifting the ban on the sale of raw milk in interstate commerce and instead imposing consistent regulations that draw from state examples and ultimately better realize the sole objective of the original ban—protecting the health of milk consumers.

Raw milk advocates seek the product due to health benefits, taste benefits, and concerns over mainstream milk, including controversial inputs and animal welfare issues. In recognition of this position and of the importance of consumer sovereignty, many states allow access to raw milk in varying degrees. Yet, the history of federal raw milk regulation reveals that discussion wholly omitted consumer sovereignty. This tradeoff is both improper and unnecessary. Consistent federal regulation would eliminate the need for raw milk advocates to go “underground” and consume raw milk that is under-regulated or entirely unregulated. Actual regulation, in lieu of a ban, would render the treatment of raw milk no longer inapposite to other food regulation—in particular, meat regulation.

Though it was determined that the failure to ban raw milk in interstate commerce was arbitrary and capricious, given the FDA’s stance that most sales were intrastate and that most states now allow intrastate sales in some form, it seems very difficult to argue that raw milk is so apparently harmful that it must be banned. Indeed, it appears the only thing arbitrary and capricious about the banning of raw milk in interstate commerce is the ban itself.
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