# HR1 Farmed Animal Impact Analysis Report

Prepared by Steven Rouk, July 2025

## About This Report

H.R. 1, known as the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," is a major reconciliation bill passed by the United States Congress and signed into law in July 2025 that makes sweeping changes to taxes, federal spending programs, and the debt ceiling, representing one of the most significant pieces of legislation affecting government operations and policy priorities. This comprehensive analysis was generated by dividing the full text of H.R. 1 into 46 distinct sections based on titles, subtitles, and content. Each section was individually analyzed using OpenAI's ChatGPT o3 model with detailed prompts specifically designed to identify potential impacts on farmed animals, plant-based foods, alternative proteins, and related policy areas. This report presents the complete findings from all 46 individual section analyses.

**Disclaimer:** This report was created using artificial intelligence and is intended as a brief high-level analysis and proof of concept for AI-facilitated policy analysis. All statements and conclusions should be independently verified before being used for advocacy, policy decisions, or other purposes.

## ANALYSIS SUMMARY

- Total chunks analyzed: 46
- Successful analyses: 46
- Total tokens used: 324,688
- Estimated cost: $0.879

## DETAILED ANALYSIS

### 01. 00 Preamble And Table Of Contents

**SECTION SUMMARY** This portion of H.R. 1 is only the Table of Contents, but it signals which subjects the full text will cover. Several forthcoming sections (especially in Title I—Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry—and Title VI—Environment and Public Works) are likely to influence farmed-animal production, subsidies, research priorities, and environmental oversight.

#### FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** **Provision:** Sec. 10507 "Poultry insurance pilot program" **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium–High **Implications:** A new federally subsidized insurance product would reduce producers' financial risk, encouraging expansion or consolidation of industrial poultry operations. This strengthens the intensive chicken and turkey sectors with-

out adding any welfare safeguards. Advocates may need to oppose or seek welfare-conditional language.

**Provision:** Sec. 10313 "Dairy policy updates" **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Although details are not yet available, "policy updates" in previous farm bills have usually meant higher price supports, margin-protection tweaks, or additional payments—all of which incentivize more milk production and prolong the economic life of low-welfare confinement dairies. Groups should prepare to analyze the statutory language quickly and push for supply-management or welfare criteria.

**Provision:** Secs. 10301-10306; 10309-10310 "Reference prices, ARC/PLC, marketing loans, repayment terms" **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** These commodity support programs mainly cover feed grains (corn, soy) that fuel CAFO growth. Raising reference prices or easing loan terms lowers feed costs and indirectly promotes animal agriculture. Advocates could highlight the externalized costs (greenhouse gases, water pollution, animal suffering) when commenting.

**Provision:** Sec. 10401 "Supplemental agricultural disaster assistance" **Impact:** Negative (for animals) / Neutral (for producers) **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** Unless explicitly tied to stronger preparedness or welfare standards, disaster aid often bails out producers after mass-mortality events (e.g., extreme heat, floods) without preventing recurrence. Advocates can argue for conditioning payments on emergency response plans that minimize animal suffering.

**Provision:** Subtitle F, Sec. 10604 "Research" under "Additional Investments in Rural America" **Impact:** Unclear—potentially Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Historically, USDA research dollars heavily favor animal agriculture. If new funds flow to land-grant universities for productivity, this could increase confinement efficiency. Absent explicit language on alternative proteins or welfare science, expect a pro-livestock tilt. Advocates should lobby for carve-outs for plant-based and cultivated-meat R&D.

**Provision:** Subtitle F, Sec. 10602 "Supplemental agricultural trade promotion program" **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** Trade-promotion dollars typically market U.S. meat and dairy abroad. More export support encourages herd expansion and perpetuates high-volume animal production. Organizations can press for at least parity promotion funds for U.S. plant-based exporters.

**Regulatory & Enforcement** **Provision:** Title VI, multiple sections (e.g., 60009, 60013, 60023) rescinding EPA funds for air-pollution planning, review, and enforcement **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Cutting EPA resources reduces oversight capacity for CAFO air- and water-pollution permits, methane reporting, and community complaints. Weaker environmental enforcement lets producers externalize waste costs, indirectly

harming animals (larger operations) and nearby communities. Advocates should document these harms to build a case for restoring funds or using state-level levers.

**Provision:** Sec. 60026 "Project sponsor opt-in fees for environmental reviews" **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Allowing sponsors to pay for faster federal environmental reviews could streamline approval of new or expanding CAFOs, limiting public scrutiny. Animal-welfare and environmental groups may need to prepare rapid-response comments and litigation strategies.

**Economic & Trade Impacts** **Provision:** Sec. 10606 "Horticulture" (may contain specialty-crop or urban-ag grants) **Impact:** Neutral/Positive Potential **Significance:** Low **Implications:** If funds reach fruit-and-vegetable growers or alternative-protein inputs (e.g., pulses), they could modestly diversify away from feed-grain monocultures. Details will decide value for plant-based supply chains.

**Research & Innovation** **Provision:** Sec. 50404 "Transformational artificial intelligence models" (DOE) **Impact:** Uncertain **Significance:** Low **Implications:** If agriculture is an eligible domain, AI grants could be steered toward cellular-agriculture or welfare-monitoring tools—but livestock productivity models usually get first dibs. Advocates should seek eligibility language for alternative proteins and animal-welfare tech.

**Indirect Effects** **Provision:** Sec. 10101 "Re-evaluation of Thrifty Food Plan" & Sec. 10107 "National education and obesity prevention grant program" **Impact:** Potentially Positive **Significance:** Low **Implications:** SNAP benefit recalculations and nutrition education sometimes elevate healthy, plant-forward eating. Advocates can work with USDA to integrate plant-based dietary guidance, indirectly lowering demand for animal products.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Track and obtain full statutory language for Sec. 10507 (poultry insurance) and Sec. 10313 (dairy updates) as soon as released; prepare amendment language linking any subsidy or insurance to verifiable welfare standards (e.g., space allowances, rapid depopulation limits).
2. Build a coalition with environmental-justice groups to oppose Title VI EPA rescissions, emphasizing CAFO pollution hotspots and community health impacts to broaden support for restoring enforcement funding.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Even at the Table-of-Contents stage, H.R. 1 appears poised to bolster conventional animal agriculture through new risk-management tools, trade promotion, and likely expanded subsidies, while simultaneously weakening environmental oversight. No dedicated support for

plant-based or cultivated alternatives is evident. Animal-advocacy stakeholders should prepare for a largely negative bill and engage early to insert welfare conditions, redirect research dollars, and defend regulatory capacity.

---

### 02. Title I Committee On Agriculture Nutrition And Forestry

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle A of Title I deals exclusively with amendments to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (SNAP). Provisions address how SNAP benefit levels are calculated (Thrifty Food Plan), work-requirement exemptions, cost-sharing between USDA and States, and several technical changes. No text refers directly to farmed animals, animal agriculture, or alternative proteins, but a few items could indirectly shape demand for animal-based versus plant-based foods and influence future nutrition-education funding.

### FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Indirect Effects – Diet Modeling in Federal Nutrition Assistance Provision:** Sec. 10101 freezes the current "Thrifty Food Plan, 2021" market baskets until at least Oct 1 2027 and requires any future re-evaluation to be cost-neutral (no increase in plan cost). **Impact:** Negative (indirect) **Significance:** Medium–Low **Implications:** • Because the 2021 TFP already embeds a mix of meat, dairy, and eggs, locking it in limits USDA's flexibility to adjust toward lower-cost, lower-emission plant-forward patterns that could emerge from new dietary guidance (e.g., 2025 Dietary Guidelines). • Cost-neutrality makes it harder for USDA analysts to substitute higher amounts of fruits, vegetables, or plant-based proteins if those raise the overall basket price. • Advocates lose a near-term policy lever (periodic TFP revisions) for steering tens of billions of SNAP food dollars toward animal-free proteins.

**Indirect Effects – Nutrition Education & Promotion Provision:** Sec. 10107 sunsets funding for the "National Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program" (SNAP-Ed) after FY 2025 (current law extends it indefinitely). **Impact:** Negative (indirect) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** • SNAP-Ed is frequently used by State agencies and NGOs to teach cost-effective, plant-rich eating patterns. A hard sunset threatens long-term program stability and may shrink a key venue for promoting plant-based diets to low-income consumers. • Reduced outreach could slow consumer shifts away from animal products within the nation's largest food-assistance program.

**Indirect Effects – Participation Levels Provisions:** Sec. 10102 (stricter work requirements) and Sec. 10108 (alien eligibility limits) will likely reduce overall SNAP enrollment. **Impact:** Neutral for farmed animals (mixed, indirect) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Fewer beneficiaries marginally

shrink aggregate food purchases, including animal products, but the scale reduction is unlikely to meaningfully influence production practices or demand signals. • Not a priority issue for farm-animal advocates.

**Regulatory & Enforcement / Other Categories** No sections in Subtitle A change USDA, FDA, or EPA authority over animal agriculture, provide subsidies to livestock producers, address alternative-protein research, or alter labeling.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Engage USDA's Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion during any future TFP methodological reviews (before 2027) to document that plant-forward baskets can meet cost-neutrality constraints, positioning legumes, tofu, and other low-cost proteins as direct substitutes for meat.
2. Lobby Agriculture Committee members to extend or expand SNAP-Ed past FY 2025 and explicitly allow grant funds for education on plant-based, climate-friendly eating—framing it as both a public-health and cost-containment tool.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle A contains no direct animal-agriculture provisions, but it modestly narrows future opportunities to shift federal nutrition benefits toward plant-based foods. Locking in the 2021 Thrifty Food Plan and sunsetting SNAP-Ed funding are the key areas where animal-welfare and alternative-protein advocates may wish to focus corrective advocacy.

---

### 03. Title I - Subtitle B Forestry

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle B—Forestry, Sec. 10201 cancels ("rescinds") any unobligated funds that were previously set aside by the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (P.L. 117-169) for four forestry-related programs (sections 23001–23005).

## FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Indirect Environmental Effects (Category 6)** **Provision:** Rescission of unobligated balances for climate-oriented forestry programs (vegetation management, private-land carbon sequestration grants, urban & community forestry, and related technical assistance). **Impact:** Negative (indirect) **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** • Forestry and reforestation programs help sequester carbon and mitigate climate change. Curtailing these funds marginally weakens overall U.S. climate-mitigation capacity. • Because livestock production is a major emitter of greenhouse gases, slower progress in other land-use

sectors could increase pressure to find emissions cuts elsewhere—potentially fueling future scrutiny of animal agriculture. However, this effect is speculative and long-term. • No direct change to farmed-animal welfare standards, subsidies, or regulatory oversight occurs; plant-based or alternative-protein sectors are not addressed.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor follow-up appropriations bills: advocates could urge legislators to preserve or restore climate-smart land-use funding that complements efforts to reduce emissions from animal agriculture.
2. Use the rescission as a talking point: stress that weakening forestry carbon sinks heightens the need to curb emissions from high-impact sectors like industrial animal agriculture and to invest in alternative proteins.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section has no direct effect on farmed animals, animal-welfare regulation, or subsidies for animal agriculture. At most, it slightly undermines broader climate-mitigation efforts, which could indirectly shape future debates over agricultural emissions. Significance for animal advocates is therefore limited and primarily strategic.

---

### 04. Title I - Subtitle C Commodities

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle C—Commodities substantially retunes the farm-safety-net for the 2025-2031 crop years. It raises statutory "reference" and marketing-loan rates for major row crops, expands base-acre allocations, lengthens and sweetens Price Loss Coverage (PLC), Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC), marketing-loan and loan-deficiency programs, increases payment caps, eases adjusted-gross-income (AGI) tests, and enlarges Dairy Margin Coverage (DMC). No language addresses on-farm animal welfare; all material relates to commodity and income supports.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** **Provision:** Raises reference prices for feed grains and oilseeds (corn $4.10, soybeans $10.00, sorghum $4.40, etc.) and lifts the "effective reference price" escalator from 85 % to 88 %. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Higher statutory price floors mean larger PLC outlays when market prices dip. Because 60-70 % of U.S. corn/soy go to animal feed, this lowers effective feed-cost risk for poultry, pork and beef integrators, entrenching intensive confinement systems and making plant-based proteins less price-competitive.

**Provision:** Automatic 0.5 % annual inflation of reference prices after 2031 (capped at 113 %). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:**

Locks-in upward-only adjustments, perpetuating subsidies that cushion feed-crop producers and, by extension, large-scale livestock operations.

**Provision:** Creation of up to 30 million additional "base acres" eligible for PLC/ARC on farms with recent covered-commodity plantings (primarily feed grains/oilseeds). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Expands the acreage that can claim subsidy payments, encouraging continued row-crop monoculture instead of rotation into specialty crops for human consumption or conservation uses.

**Provision:** Extends PLC and ARC through 2031 and guarantees producers the higher of PLC or ARC for 2025. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Guarantees generous income protection for feed-crop growers, indirectly shielding animal-product supply chains from feed-price volatility.

**Provision:** Raises marketing-loan rates (e.g., corn \$2.42 $\rightarrow$ \$3.72 by 2026-31 schedule) and extends loan-deficiency payments through 2031. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Further bolsters price floors for feed commodities, suppressing market signals that might otherwise curb over-production.

**Economic & Trade Impacts** **Provision:** Payment-limit increase from \$125k to \$155k (with CPI escalator) and broadened eligibility for "qualified pass-through entities." **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Allows larger operations—including vertically-integrated animal-feed and livestock enterprises—to capture more subsidy dollars, reinforcing industry consolidation.

**Provision:** AGI cap waiver for entities deriving 75 % of income from farming/ranching; exception applies to most commodity and disaster payments. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** High-net-worth animal-agriculture businesses can circumvent income limits, sustaining public transfers to already well-capitalized factory-farm interests.

**Provision:** Sugar-program loan-rate and tariff-rate-quota tweaks & cotton storage payments. **Impact:** Neutral (for farmed animals) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Little direct connection to animal agriculture.

**Farmed-Animal Sector—Direct** **Provision:** Dairy Margin Coverage changes—production-history reset (using highest of 2021-23), raise Tier I & II cap to 6 million lbs, extend premium discounts, and fund additional dairy data collection. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Provides larger, longer subsidies to dairy producers, lowering economic pressure to reduce herd sizes or exit. Bolsters demand for female dairy cows, prolonging cull-cow and calf-veal pipelines opposed by welfare advocates.

**Regulatory & Enforcement** No new welfare, environmental, or labeling requirements; USDA funding in §10314 is strictly administrative and survey-

oriented. **Impact:** Neutral (lack of progress) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Continues a policy environment where economic incentives favor animal production without adding safeguards for animal well-being or pollution control.

**Research & Innovation** **Provision:** $50 million implementation funds earmarked for program administration, dairy surveys, and a sugar-imports study—no alt-protein R&D. **Impact:** Neutral to Negative **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Opportunity cost—public dollars flow to conventional sectors instead of alternative-protein innovation.

**Indirect Effects** • Cheaper feed and income protection could foster expansion or slowed contraction of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), with attendant environmental and community impacts. • No provisions encourage crop diversification toward legumes or specialty pulses for human plant-protein markets, despite modest chickpea/lentil reference prices.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Lobby House/Senate Agriculture Committees to condition higher reference prices and expanded base acres on parallel investment in plant-based protein R&D and transition assistance for growers shifting from feed to food crops.
2. Publicly highlight how expanded PLC/ARC and DMC outlays constitute hidden subsidies for factory farming; build coalitions with fiscal-conservative and environmental groups to press for payment-cap reinstatement and AGI-cap enforcement.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle C materially strengthens financial supports for feed-crop and dairy production while offering no offsetting benefits for animal welfare or alternative protein development. Net effect is strongly unfavorable for farmed animals and for advocates working to curb industrial animal agriculture.

---

### 05. Title I - Subtitle D Disaster Assistance Programs

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle D—Disaster Assistance Programs expands and sweetens several USDA disaster programs, chiefly by increasing indemnity and other payments for livestock, unborn livestock, aquaculture fish, forage losses, and honeybee losses.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production / Economic Impacts** **Provision:** Livestock Indemnity Payments raised to 100 % of market value for predation losses and 75 % for weather/disease; producers may claim regional price premiums. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Deepens public financial support for animal agriculture, making it cheaper to maintain large herds. Diminishes any financial pressure to reduce stocking density or improve shelter against extreme weather and disease. Makes predator losses fully reimbursable, which can prompt more lethal predator-control measures.

**Provision:** New indemnity for "unborn livestock death losses" up to 85 % of the value of the lowest weight class. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Incentivizes high reproductive throughput and larger breeding herds. Normalises financial valuation of fetuses without attaching any welfare obligations for gestating animals.

**Provision:** Livestock Forage Disaster Program—doubles monthly payment in some situations and lowers drought-trigger threshold (4 consecutive weeks vs. 8). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Further buffers grazing operations from climate-related feed shortages, reducing market signals that could steer land away from cattle production toward crop or conservation uses.

**Farmed Animal Welfare & Protection** **Provision:** Greater disaster payouts for disease and weather losses without new preparedness or welfare conditions. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Removes incentive for producers to invest in better housing, ventilation, heat-stress mitigation, and biosecurity, because losses are now more generously reimbursed.

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production / Economic Impacts** **Provision:** Emergency Assistance for farm-raised fish—new payments (minimum \$600/acre $\times$ 85 % of farm acres) for losses due to piscivorous birds, with eligible costs including "deterrence of birds." **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium–High **Implications:** Subsidises expansion of freshwater aquaculture and encourages lethal or aggressive bird-control practices. No stipulations on humane bird deterrence or aquatic-animal welfare.

**Regulatory & Enforcement** (No new oversight or welfare conditions introduced; programs remain payment instruments only.)

**Research & Innovation** (No plant-based or alternative-protein research funding added; imbalance in federal support widens.)

**Indirect Effects** **Provision:** Lower "normal mortality" benchmark for honeybee losses (15 %). **Impact:** Neutral to Negative **Significance:** Low **Implications:** More claims may be paid to commercial beekeepers, but no accompanying measures to curb pesticide use or improve pollinator habitat.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Urge lawmakers to condition any disaster payments on meeting basic animal-welfare and climate-resilience standards (e.g., heat abatement, predator-friendly practices, humane aquaculture).
2. Lobby for parity: comparable disaster or transition assistance for plant-based producers and alternative-protein R&D to offset the expanded livestock subsidies.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This subtitle substantially increases taxpayer support for livestock and aquaculture operations without attaching welfare or environmental guardrails. It strengthens the economic position of animal agriculture and may indirectly worsen farm-animal welfare and wildlife conflicts, while offering no comparable benefits to plant-based or alternative-protein sectors.

---

### 06. Title I - Subtitle E Crop Insurance

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle E—Crop Insurance expands and sweetens federal crop-insurance subsidies, raises administrative reimbursements, and creates a new poultry-specific pilot program that insures contract growers against higher utility costs caused by extreme weather.

---

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**1. FARMED ANIMAL WELFARE & PROTECTION** **Provision:** SEC. 10507 – Poultry Insurance Pilot Program offering index-based insurance to contract broiler and layer growers for weather-driven spikes in utility costs (gas, electricity, water, etc.). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** • Lowers production risk and operating costs for intensive poultry operations, encouraging continued or expanded use of high-density confinement systems. • No welfare conditions are attached; growers could receive subsidies even if birds are kept in sub-standard environments. • "Stakeholder engagement" language gives advocates an opening to demand that eligibility be conditioned on meeting higher welfare standards (e.g., stocking-density limits, ventilation/temperature thresholds).

**2. AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS & FOOD PRODUCTION** **Provision:** SEC. 10501 – Beginning Farmer & Rancher Benefit: doubles the qualifying period (5→10 yrs) and adds up to +5 percentage-point premium subsidies. **Impact:** Negative (for animals) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Makes it cheaper for new feed-crop producers and livestock ranchers to insure revenue,

indirectly propping up animal-ag supply chains by lowering feed and input costs. Advocates could push for plant-focused eligibility carve-outs.

**Provision:** SEC. 10502 & 10504 – Higher coverage levels (up to 95 %) and larger premium subsidies (many tiers +3–15 points). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Further socializes production risk for commodity and feed crops that support CAFOs, helping keep animal-derived products artificially cheap relative to plant-based foods.

**Provision:** SEC. 10503 – Extra A&O reimbursements, inflation escalator, and 6 % bonus for high-loss states. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** Reinforces the financial attractiveness of crop insurance to private insurers, keeping the overall subsidy pipeline robust for animal feed crops.

**Provision:** SEC. 10503(11) – Minimum 17 % reimbursement for "specialty crops" (fruit, vegetables, nuts). **Impact:** Positive **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Marginally improves risk management for crops consumed directly by humans, slightly narrowing the subsidy gap between feed and food crops. Opportunity for plant-based groups to highlight this as a model for further support.

**3. ECONOMIC & TRADE IMPACTS** **Provision:** Cumulative subsidy increases across §§ 10501-10504. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** By lowering financial risk for both feed-crop farmers and poultry integrators, the subtitle strengthens the competitive position of animal products vs. plant-based alternatives. Plant-based companies may face a relatively more skewed market.

**4. REGULATORY & ENFORCEMENT** **Provision:** §§ 10505 & 10506 – Extra funds for program compliance ($6 M-$10 M/yr). **Impact:** Neutral (potentially slight positive) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** More oversight could curb fraud or misuse but does not target animal-welfare violations; advocates could lobby USDA/RMA to include welfare-related compliance metrics in future rule-making.

**5. RESEARCH & INNOVATION** No research funding or innovation programs are included in this subtitle.

**6. INDIRECT EFFECTS** • By cushioning extreme-weather costs for poultry, the bill may reduce producer motivation to transition to more climate-resilient, less animal-intensive systems. • Expanded subsidies for feed crops may perpetuate environmental harms (manure runoff, GHGs) associated with large-scale livestock production, indirectly affecting public health and ecosystems.

---

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Engage immediately in USDA's stakeholder process for the Poultry Insurance Pilot Program and press for welfare-conditional eligibility (e.g., compliance with the Better Chicken Commitment, ventilation standards, emergency preparedness plans).
2. Publicly highlight how expanded crop-insurance subsidies advantage feed crops and CAFOs, and lobby for parallel or superior support for specialty crops, pulse crops, and alternative-protein inputs in upcoming farm-bill negotiations.

---

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle E substantially increases risk-management subsidies for commodity crop and poultry producers, thereby reinforcing the economic foundations of intensive animal agriculture. Except for a modest boost to specialty-crop insurance, the section offers little that benefits plant-based food systems or farmed-animal welfare and may make advocacy for systemic change more challenging.

---

### 07. Title I - Subtitle F Additional Investments In Rural America

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle F allocates and rescinds billions of dollars across conservation, trade, research, energy, horticulture, and miscellaneous rural-development programs for FY 2025-2031. Most resources flow through USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). While the subtitle does not set any new farm-animal welfare standards, it substantially increases funding that supports industrial livestock production and disease management, while offering modest gains for plant-centric research and specialty-crop programs.

## FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** Provision: Conservation program funding increases for EQIP, CSP, ACEP, and RCPP (Sec. 10601 (a) & (b)) Impact: Negative (likely) Significance: Medium Implications: Roughly $6–7 billion/yr of conservation dollars can be—and historically are—used to underwrite CAFO manure-handling systems, waste lagoons, and confined-housing "improvements." Without statutory language limiting livestock cost-share, these appropriations continue to subsidize intensive animal agriculture, lowering production costs and reinforcing existing confinement models.

Provision: Rescission of Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) climate-smart conservation funds (Sec. 10601 (g)) Impact: Negative Significance: Medium–High Implications: Removes unspent IRA dollars that were earmarked for greenhouse-gas-mitigating practices and subject to additional climate accountability. Loss

of these guardrails may redirect future conservation dollars toward conventional livestock infrastructure instead of climate-beneficial or pasture-based practices.

Provision: Supplemental Agricultural Trade Promotion Program—$285 million/yr (Sec. 10602) Impact: Negative Significance: Medium Implications: Funds generic export promotion for "agricultural commodities," historically dominated by meat, dairy, and feed grains. Expanding overseas demand entrenches U.S. factory-farm capacity and complicates efforts to down-size domestic animal production.

Provision: Biofuels Program extension to 2031 (Sec. 10605) Impact: Slightly Negative Significance: Low Implications: Advanced biofuels include biodiesel derived from animal fats. Continued subsidies can raise demand for slaughter by-products, marginally bolstering meat processing margins.

Provision: Sheep Production & Marketing Grant Program (+$3 M, Sec. 10607 (b)); Wool Trust & Research Funds extensions (Sec. 10607 (c)-(e)) Impact: Negative Significance: Low Implications: Direct financial support to the sheep & wool sectors prolongs the viability of small ruminant industries that have minimal federal scrutiny of shearing or transport welfare practices.

**Farmed Animal Welfare & Protection** Provision: Animal Disease Prevention & Management Program—$233 M/yr (2026-2030) then $75 M/yr (Sec. 10607 (a)) Impact: Negative (for farmed-animal welfare) Significance: High Implications: Funds surveillance, vaccine banks, and indemnities for diseases such as highly pathogenic avian influenza and African swine fever. Historically, rapid depopulation and mass on-farm culling receive support without parallel welfare safeguards. Animal advocates may face larger, better-funded response systems that default to ventilation shutdown and other inhumane depopulation methods.

**Regulatory & Enforcement** Provision: None conferring new welfare enforcement powers; expanded disease-control funding (above) increases USDA's role in livestock health, not welfare. Impact: Neutral (no new welfare rules) Significance: Medium (by omission) Implications: Opportunities to tie funding to minimum welfare or depopulation-method standards were missed.

**Research & Innovation** Provision: Urban/Indoor/Emerging Ag Initiative – permanent funding (Sec. 10604 (a)) Impact: Positive Significance: Medium Implications: Can support controlled-environment crop production that competes with animal-based foods. Advocacy groups could steer grant calls toward plant-based protein inputs.

Provision: Foundation for Food & Agriculture Research – +$37 M (Sec. 10604 (b)) Impact: Potentially Positive Significance: Medium Implications: FFAR has previously funded cultivated-meat and plant-protein research. Advocates

have a window to influence FFAR's match-funding priorities toward alternative proteins.

Provision: Specialty Crop Research Initiative rise to $175 M in FY 2026 (Sec. 10604 (e)); Specialty Crop Block Grants increase (Sec. 10606 (b)); Organic data and certification extensions (Sec. 10606 (c),(e)) Impact: Positive Significance: Low–Medium Implications: More public dollars flow to fruit, vegetable, and organic supply chains—foods that can displace animal products. Creates collaborative research, extension, and market-development opportunities for plant-based sectors.

**Economic & Trade Impacts** Provision: Conservation, trade, animal-disease, wool, and sheep subsidies (various sections) collectively sustain cost competitiveness of U.S. animal agriculture. Impact: Negative Significance: High Implications: These programs reinforce status-quo economics that disadvantage plant-based alternatives, making transition campaigns harder.

**Indirect Effects** Provision: Feral Swine Eradication & Control Pilot (+$105 M, Sec. 10601 (f)) Impact: Neutral to Negative (wild animal welfare, limited farmed-animal angle) Significance: Low Implications: Lethal control methods raise humane concerns but are peripheral to farmed animals.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Push USDA to issue administrative guidance that caps or conditions EQIP/CSP livestock cost-share on higher welfare and environmental performance; lobby for carve-outs prioritizing plant-based agronomy practices.
2. Engage FFAR, Urban/Indoor Ag Initiative, and Specialty Crop Research panels early to secure calls focused on plant-based protein, cultivated meat, and animal-free fiber alternatives, ensuring new research money shifts dietary patterns away from animal products.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle F largely channels new and reprogrammed dollars toward programs that stabilize or expand industrial animal agriculture, while offering only incremental opportunities for plant-based and specialty-crop sectors. The absence of any welfare-conditioned funding means advocates must rely on agency rule-making or future amendments to mitigate the negative effects and leverage the modest research dollars that could accelerate animal-free food systems.

---

### 08. Title II Committee On Armed Services

**SECTION SUMMARY** Title II of H.R. 1 is a large, defense-focused spending title. It appropriates hundreds of billions of dollars for military housing,

shipbuilding, munitions, missile defense, low-cost weapons, cybersecurity, nuclear forces, Indo-Pacific readiness, border support, and other Department of Defense (DoD) programs through FY 2029.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED The provisions exclusively address military construction, weapons systems, personnel benefits, and related defense activities. They do not contain:

• Animal welfare language, standards, or enforcement mechanisms • Agricultural subsidies, research, or procurement directives for animal- or plant-based foods • Environmental or trade rules affecting livestock operations • Research funding for alternative proteins or other food-system innovation

Accordingly, none of the six analysis categories (Farmed Animal Welfare, Agricultural Systems & Food Production, Economic & Trade Impacts, Regulatory & Enforcement, Research & Innovation, Indirect Effects) are triggered by this section.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action is required from farmed-animal or plant-based food advocates regarding Title II.
2. Continue monitoring later sections or amendments for any food-system or agriculture-related riders that could be appended to defense funding.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Title II is defense-centric and has no discernible impact—positive or negative—on farmed animals, animal agriculture, or plant-based food systems.

---

### 09. Title III Committee On Banking Housing And Urban A

**SECTION SUMMARY** Title III covers financial-sector provisions: it caps CFPB funding, rescinds a green-retrofit housing program, eliminates the SEC Reserve Fund, and appropriates $1 billion for general use under the Defense Production Act (DPA).

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Indirect Environmental Impact** **Provision:** Sec. 30002 – Rescission of funds for the Green and Resilient Retrofit Program for Multifamily Housing **Impact:** Negative (indirect) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** The canceled retrofit grants would have promoted energy efficiency and lower greenhouse-gas emissions in housing. While not agriculture-specific, reduced climate-mitigation spending can marginally slow decarbonization efforts, indirectly easing pressure

on high-emitting sectors such as industrial animal agriculture. Advocates may note the lost opportunity to frame climate solutions that include shifting away from livestock emissions.

**Potential Industrial-Agriculture Subsidy Pathway** **Provision:** Sec. 30004 – $1 billion FY 2025 appropriation to carry out the Defense Production Act **Impact:** Uncertain / Potentially Negative **Significance:** Low–Medium (depends on implementation) **Implications:** DPA funds are discretionary and historically have been used for COVID-era meat-packing capacity, PPE, and, more recently, clean-energy inputs. If USDA or another agency requests DPA authority to "strengthen the food supply chain," some of this money could subsidize meat- or dairy-processing facilities, underpinning large-scale animal agriculture. Conversely, the executive branch could choose to direct the funds to plant-based or other resilient food technologies. Because the bill places no guardrails, animal advocates may wish to monitor DPA allocations and push for alternative-protein or non-livestock uses.

**Financial Regulation Items** **Provisions:** Sec. 30001 (CFPB cap) and Sec. 30003 (SEC Reserve Fund elimination) **Impact:** Neutral for farmed animals **Significance:** Low **Implications:** These changes affect consumer-finance enforcement budgets and SEC operations, with no foreseeable linkage to animal agriculture or alternative proteins.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Track DPA spending announcements and submit comments or coalition letters urging that any food-system allocations support plant-based and cultivated-protein infrastructure rather than industrial meat or dairy processing.
2. Use the loss of green-retrofit funds to highlight broader climate-finance rollbacks and reinforce the narrative that systemic emissions reductions—including those from animal agriculture—require sustained federal investment.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This title is largely financial and contains no direct animal-welfare provisions. Potential impacts arise only through indirect climate effects and the open-ended DPA appropriation, which could subsidize or, with advocacy, exclude factory-farming infrastructure. Vigilant monitoring rather than immediate mobilization is advised.

---

### 10. Title IV Committee On Commerce Science And Transp

**SECTION SUMMARY** Title IV of H.R. 1 is a large transportation-and-technology spending title that: • injects $24.6 B into Coast Guard assets; •

extends FCC auction authority and requires new spectrum auctions; • adds $12.2 B for FAA air-traffic-control facilities and equipment; • appropriates $10 B for NASA Moon-to-Mars work; • zeros-out Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) civil-penalty rates; and • rescinds several pools of climate-, technology-, and alternative-fuel-related funds.

No text in this title modifies farm-animal welfare law, slaughter standards, or agricultural subsidies. All potential effects are indirect.

## FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**INDIRECT EFFECTS – Climate, Transportation, Trade Provision:** Section 40006 eliminates CAFE civil penalties by changing the per-0.1 mpg penalty from $5 and $10 to $0.00. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Removing penalties weakens fuel-economy enforcement, likely increasing transportation-sector greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions. Higher national GHGs intensify climate change, which in turn exacerbates heat stress, disease pressure, feed-crop failures, and extreme-weather disruptions in animal-agriculture regions. Animal advocates who argue for reduced animal-product consumption on climate grounds will find it marginally harder to achieve emissions targets when non-agricultural sectors back-slide.

**Provision:** Section 40010 rescinds unobligated funds for "Alternative Fuel and Low-Emission Aviation Technology" originally appropriated by the Inflation Reduction Act. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low-to-Medium **Implications:** Many alternative-aviation-fuel R&D efforts focus on plant-based or waste-based feedstocks. Pulling these funds slows commercialization, slightly reducing future demand for large monoculture oil-seed and feed-crop systems that compete with food plants. However, the bigger impact is delaying aviation decarbonization, again widening the economy-wide emissions gap animal advocates cite in climate campaigns.

**Provision:** Section 40008 rescinds NOAA climate-resilience funds previously available under Public Law 117-169. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Less NOAA climate data and modeling may impair the ability of advocates and researchers to quantify livestock-sector climate impacts or to promote climate-resilient, animal-free food systems.

**Provision:** Section 40001 provides $24.6 B for Coast Guard "interdiction" assets, including cutters, aircraft, and autonomous maritime systems. **Impact:** Slightly Positive **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Enhanced maritime-domain awareness can improve detection of illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing and live-animal smuggling. If the Coast Guard prioritizes those missions, aquatic-animal exploitation and disease-transfer risks could decline. Animal-welfare groups might engage the agency to ensure new assets target IUU seafood and wildlife trade.

**AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS & FOOD PRODUCTION** **Provision:** None directly concerning agricultural subsidies, plant-based foods, or factory-farm regulation. **Impact:** — **Significance:** — **Implications:** No immediate change.

**RESEARCH & INNOVATION** **Provision:** Rescission of Alternative-Fuel Aviation R&D (Section 40010). **Impact:** Negative (see above) **Significance:** Low-to-Medium **Implications:** Removes a possible spill-over funding source for lipid-based or other plant-derived biofuels that could also be inputs for novel food systems.

**REGULATORY & ENFORCEMENT** **Provision:** CAFE penalty repeal (Section 40006). **Impact:** Negative (see climate discussion) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Weakens a long-standing environmental enforcement tool.

**ECONOMIC & TRADE IMPACTS** **Provision:** Coast Guard asset expansion (Section 40001). **Impact:** Neutral-to-Positive (minor) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Could slightly alter costs or risks of live-animal maritime shipping if inspections increase, but specifics will depend on future Coast Guard enforcement priorities.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Climate framing: Highlight how repealing CAFE penalties (Section 40006) and canceling alternative-fuel funds (Section 40010) undermine U.S. climate goals, reinforcing the need to curb animal-agriculture emissions rather than rely on transportation-sector cuts that are now weakened.
2. Agency engagement: Urge the Coast Guard to dedicate a portion of its new interdiction capacity to IUU fishing, live-animal transport, and wildlife-contraband enforcement, and request public reporting on seizures to build transparency.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Title IV contains no direct farm-animal-welfare provisions. Its primary relevance is indirect: (1) it weakens fuel-economy enforcement and cancels low-emission-aviation funds, both of which modestly worsen the climate landscape in which animal-agriculture impacts are judged, and (2) it expands Coast Guard resources that, if steered toward wildlife-trade enforcement, could slightly benefit aquatic animals.

---

### 11. Title V Committee On Energy And Natural Resource

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle A of Title V directs the Department of the Interior to dramatically expand on- and offshore oil and gas leasing, loosens or repeals several Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) constraints, raises acreage-offering minimums, and repeals the federal royalty on extracted methane. The section is entirely focused on fossil-fuel development; no agricultural programs or animal-specific language is included.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** Indirect Effects – Environmental / Climate Provision: Mandatory quarterly onshore lease sales, 30 Gulf of Mexico offshore sales, six Cook Inlet sales, four Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR / "Coastal Plain") sales, five National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A) sales, and repeal of IRA royalty increases. Impact: Negative Significance: Medium Implications: Greater fossil-fuel extraction will increase greenhouse-gas emissions, slow the national decarbonisation trajectory, and intensify climate-related stresses (heat waves, droughts, extreme weather) on farmed animals and feed crops. Elevated climate pressure can exacerbate heat stress in poultry and pigs, worsen water scarcity for cattle, and drive up feed prices—outcomes detrimental to animal welfare and potentially increasing industry costs that advocates sometimes leverage to advance plant-based alternatives.

Indirect Effects – Methane Policy Signalling Provision: SEC. 50103 repeals the IRA's royalty on extracted methane from oil & gas operations. Impact: Negative Significance: Low Implications: Although livestock methane is not directly affected, removing a high-profile federal methane disincentive weakens political momentum for parallel fees or regulations on enteric or manure-derived methane. Advocates may face a steeper climb when pressing for livestock-sector methane measures.

Regulatory & Enforcement Precedent Provision: Requirements for "immediate" leasing and faster National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) timelines (SEC. 50101(b)(2)) set expectations that resource-extraction permits be expedited. Impact: Negative Significance: Low Implications: While the language is confined to oil and gas, future efforts to accelerate permitting could spill over to concentrated animal-feeding operations (CAFOs), limiting advocates' ability to use NEPA litigation to slow or stop new factory-farm construction.

Competing Land-Use Pressures Provision: Redefinition of "eligible lands" under the Mineral Leasing Act and mandatory offering of large acreages (SEC. 50101(c)(1)-(2)). Impact: Neutral (mixed) Significance: Low Implications: In the western states, many of the same BLM lands host federal grazing allotments for beef cattle and sheep. Expanded drilling can (a) disturb rangeland ecosystems—potentially reducing forage quality and increasing predator conflicts that harm livestock welfare—or (b) displace some grazing, modestly lowering cattle numbers on public lands. The net effect is uncertain and likely minor

relative to national production.

NO other provisions in this subtitle directly affect farmed-animal welfare standards, subsidies, trade in animal products, alternative-protein research, or food labeling.

### ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Strengthen climate-focused alliances: Partner with climate-policy groups to oppose or amend fossil-fuel-expansion measures and reaffirm the need for comprehensive methane reduction—including from livestock—despite the repeal of the oil-and-gas methane royalty.
2. Prepare for permitting-reform spillover: Track future "fast-track" permitting bills and comment periods to ensure that any similar provisions applied to CAFOs preserve robust NEPA and public-input safeguards.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section has no direct bearing on farmed-animal welfare regulation or plant-based food support. Its relevance is indirect—accelerating fossil-fuel development, dampening momentum for methane pricing, and setting permitting precedents that could later influence factory-farm oversight. Animal-advocacy organizations mainly need to monitor the broader climate-policy context and potential cross-application of expedited permitting rules.

---

### 12. Title V - Subtitle B Mining

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle B—Mining (Secs. 50201–50204) expedites new federal coal leasing, lowers royalty rates through 2034, opens at least 4 million additional federal acres for coal extraction, and fast-tracks authorization to mine federal coal adjacent to existing private or state mines.

### FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Indirect Environmental Effects → Farmed Animal Welfare & Protection** Provision: All four sections expand and accelerate coal mining on federal land, cut royalty rates from 12.5 % to "not more than 7 %," and authorize rapid approvals. Impact: Negative Significance: Medium Implications: • Greater coal extraction and combustion increase greenhouse-gas emissions, particulate matter, and mercury, exacerbating climate change and air/water pollution that already stress farmed animals (heat stress in poultry, dairy-cow productivity declines, disease pressure in confined operations). • Coal-related water contamination (acid mine drainage, heavy metals) threatens downstream croplands that supply feed grains and water sources used by animal agriculture, potentially increasing disease risks and veterinary drug use. • Climate-driven

weather volatility raises feed-crop price volatility, heightening economic pressure that can translate into intensified confinement and cost-cutting on welfare.

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** Provision: Royalty reduction to 7 % effectively subsidizes coal-fired energy, lowering electricity costs for energy-intensive confined-animal feeding operations (CAFOs) and large meat-processing plants. Impact: Negative (competitive disadvantage for low-energy, plant-based or cellular protein facilities that rely on renewables) Significance: Low–Medium Implications: • Cheap fossil-fuel energy reinforces cost advantages of legacy animal-protein supply chains, slowing market shifts toward plant-based and cultivated alternatives. • Additional federal revenues foregone through royalty reductions decrease funds that could otherwise support agricultural diversification or alternative-protein R&D in forthcoming Farm Bills.

**Economic & Trade Impacts** Provision: Opening 4 million acres and accelerating leases is likely to expand U.S. thermal-coal exports. Impact: Negative (indirect) Significance: Low Implications: • Strengthened coal trade can undermine U.S. credibility in negotiating climate-aligned trade rules that could favor lower-carbon food (e.g., plant-based) in global markets. • Persistently low domestic coal prices may delay grid decarbonization, prolonging indirect subsidies to energy-intensive meat and dairy processing.

**Regulatory & Enforcement** Provision: Statutory deadlines (90 days) limit the Department of the Interior's ability to impose additional environmental safeguards; NEPA review is technically preserved but practically constrained. Impact: Negative Significance: Low Implications: • Weak environmental oversight increases risk of habitat destruction and watershed degradation that affect both wildlife and nearby grazing or cropland used for animal feed. • Sets precedent for future "fast-track" provisions that could also be applied to large-scale livestock permitting.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Coalition-Building: Join climate, public-health, and environmental-justice organizations to oppose royalty reductions and acreage expansions; emphasize downstream impacts on rural farming communities, livestock heat stress, and feed-crop security.
2. Messaging Strategy: Frame coal subsidies as indirect livestock-welfare threats and economic barriers to a just transition toward lower-emission, plant-based food systems; highlight opportunity cost of foregone federal revenue that could fund alternative-protein research or farm-transition programs.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** While Subtitle B contains no direct animal-agriculture provisions, it materially strengthens coal mining, worsening climate

and pollution pressures that already harm farmed animals and slow the shift to more humane, plant-based food systems. Animal advocates have a credible stake in opposing these coal-expansion measures and in pushing Congress to re-allocate energy subsidies toward sustainable, animal-free food production.

---

### 13. Title V - Subtitle C Lands

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle C—Lands focuses on (1) sharply increasing timber harvests and long-term logging contracts on National Forest System and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands; (2) establishing new acreage-rent and capacity-fee formulas for wind and solar projects on Federal lands, including a discount when the land is concurrently used for other purposes (e.g., livestock grazing); (3) sharing a portion of renewable-energy revenues with States and counties; (4) rescinding several Inflation Reduction Act conservation/climate appropriations for the National Park Service and BLM; and (5) appropriating funds for America's 250th-anniversary celebrations.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** Agricultural Systems & Food Production Provision: "Multiple-use reduction factor" (Sec. 50302(c)(3)) enables a 10 % discount on wind-energy capacity fees if 25 % of the right-of-way is simultaneously used for another activity, such as livestock grazing. Impact: Negative (encourages continued or expanded grazing on public lands). Significance: Medium Implications: Makes it financially attractive for renewable-energy developers and ranchers to co-locate turbines with cattle/sheep operations, thereby reinforcing public-land grazing and the associated animal-welfare and environmental harms. Advocates may want to oppose or narrow this provision or push for wildlife-friendly, grazing-free siting guidelines.

Agricultural Systems & Food Production / Economic & Trade Provision: Acreage-rent formula ties the "Per-Acre Rate" to USDA pastureland cash-rent data (Sec. 50302(a)(4), (b)). Impact: Mixed (slightly positive for renewables, but locks Federal pricing to low pasture values). Significance: Low Implications: Because pasture rents are usually much lower than cropland rents, solar/wind developers get inexpensive Federal land access, which may accelerate clean-energy deployment (good for climate mitigation). On the other hand, benchmarking to pastureland could entrench the economic value of grazing lands and maintain pressure to keep them in animal agriculture.

Indirect Effects—Climate & Land Use Provision: Mandatory annual increases in timber sales (Sec. 50301(a)(2) & (b)(2))—minimum +250 million board-feet/year for the Forest Service and +20 million board-feet/year for BLM from FY 2026-2034. Impact: Negative (potentially higher deforestation and carbon emissions). Significance: Low–Medium (depends on implementation scale vs. existing harvest). Implications: Accelerated logging may reduce carbon sequestration, exacerbating climate change that disproportionately harms animals

through extreme heat, feed-crop volatility, and disease risk. Animal advocates working on climate-related arguments should note this contradiction.

Indirect Effects—Public-Land Conservation Funding Provision: Rescission of Inflation Reduction Act NPS & BLM funds (Sec. 50304). Impact: Negative (removes funding that could have bolstered habitat restoration and climate resilience beneficial to all animals). Significance: Low Implications: Although farmed animals are not the direct beneficiaries, diminished ecological-integrity projects on public lands can weaken overall environmental progress that underpins plant-based and animal-welfare narratives.

Economic & Trade Provision: Revenue-sharing with States/counties from wind/solar projects (Sec. 50303). Impact: Neutral for farmed animals. Significance: Low Implications: Could increase local political support for public-land renewables, indirectly aiding climate goals. No direct effect on animal agriculture.

Regulatory & Enforcement Provision: Long-term ( 20-year) timber contracts with revenue deposited in the Treasury (Sec. 50301(a)(3), (b)(3)). Impact: Neutral for farmed animals. Significance: Low Implications: Locks in extractive use of public lands for decades, potentially complicating future transitions away from animal-ag-related grazing that often co-occurs with logging roads.

### ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Submit comments and lobby against the "multiple-use reduction factor" or demand explicit exclusion of livestock grazing from qualifying secondary uses, to prevent entrenchment of grazing on public lands hosting renewable-energy projects.
2. Build coalitions with climate and forest-conservation groups to oppose the mandatory timber-sale increases and to advocate for re-investment of rescinded IRA funds into climate-smart agriculture programs or alternative protein research.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle C contains no direct animal-welfare provisions, subsidies, or regulations affecting farmed animals, but it does create modest, mostly negative indirect effects: it encourages continued livestock grazing alongside wind development, accelerates logging that can worsen climate impacts, and rescinds conservation funds. Animal advocates should prioritize challenging the grazing-friendly "multiple-use" incentive and monitoring how expanded timber harvests may interact with existing grazing leases on public lands.

---

### 14. Title V - Subtitle D Energy

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle D—Energy authorizes new spending for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR), repeals or rescinds several Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) clean-energy programs, expands DOE loan-guarantee authority to fossil-energy and critical-mineral projects ("Energy Dominance Financing"), and funds an artificial-intelligence initiative at DOE.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Indirect Effects – Climate & Environmental Externalities Provision:** $218 M for SPR maintenance and $171 M for new crude-oil purchases (Sec. 50401). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low-Medium **Implications:** Cheaper, more secure petroleum supplies can slow the shift away from fossil fuels. Intensive animal agriculture is energy-intensive (feed, transport, on-farm fuel). Lower fuel prices reduce producers' operating costs and lessen pressure to adopt more climate-friendly, plant-based systems. Advocates may face a headwind when linking animal agriculture to decarbonization efforts.

**Regulatory & Enforcement / Environmental Policy Provision:** Repeal and rescission of multiple IRA sections (Sec. 50402) that funded decarbonization, industrial emissions reduction, and energy-efficiency programs. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Many rescinded sections (e.g., 50141, 50144, 50145, 50151-53, 50161) supported clean-energy demonstrations, low-carbon manufacturing, and energy-efficiency financing. Their removal weakens federal tools that could have curbed agriculture-related GHGs (methane, nitrous oxide) or funded cleaner processing plants. Animal advocates lose a potential policy lever for tying farm-animal reforms to federal climate investments.

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production (Energy Inputs) Provision:** "Energy Dominance Financing" – modifies EPAct 2005 §1706 to prioritize projects that "increase capacity or output," deletes climate-avoidance language, and appropriates $1 B for fossil-energy and critical-mineral infrastructure (Sec. 50403). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Redirects DOE loan guarantees toward fossil-fuel extraction, refining, and related infrastructure, lowering capital costs for energy-intensive industries, including large-scale meat and dairy processors. Undermines momentum for renewable-energy or energy-efficiency upgrades that could reduce factory-farm pollution. Creates a financing gap for plant-based supply-chain projects that might have qualified under IRA language.

**Research & Innovation Provision:** $150 M to DOE for AI-driven "transformational models" using National Laboratory data (Sec. 50404). **Impact:** Neutral (potentially Positive if leveraged) **Significance:** Low **Implications:**

While aimed at micro-electronics and new energy technologies, the AI infrastructure (American Science Cloud) could conceivably be used for alternative-protein R&D (e.g., optimizing fermentation or cultivated-meat processes). No dedicated funding or mandate exists, so benefits will depend on whether advocates and companies proactively engage DOE to include food-system applications.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Climate Framing: Highlight the climate-animal agriculture nexus when opposing increased fossil-fuel subsidies and the rescission of IRA clean-energy funds; emphasize that factory-farm methane reductions are jeopardized.
2. Funding Access: Engage DOE's new AI and loan-guarantee programs to advocate that alternative-protein manufacturing, low-carbon plant-based food processing, and manure-methane mitigation qualify for support, partially offsetting the loss of IRA programs.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle D contains no direct farmed-animal welfare provisions, but it indirectly affects the sector by steering federal resources toward fossil-energy infrastructure and away from decarbonization programs that could have constrained factory-farm emissions or supported plant-based innovation. Animal advocates should view the section as a setback for climate-aligned food-system reform while remaining alert to niche opportunities in DOE's AI initiative.

---

### 15. Title V - Subtitle E Water

**SECTION SUMMARY** Appropriates $1 billion (FY 2025–2034) for the Bureau of Reclamation to enlarge or rehabilitate existing water-conveyance canals, pipelines, and reservoirs in the western United States. Funds are fully federal (no cost-share) and contracts created under this subtitle are not considered "new" or "amended" under key Reclamation laws.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** **Provision:** $1 billion in federal outlays to expand the capacity and reliability of Bureau of Reclamation water-delivery and storage infrastructure. **Impact:** Negative (for farmed animals) **Significance:** Medium–High **Implications:** • Greater water availability will disproportionately benefit large-scale irrigated agriculture in the West—including alfalfa, corn, and other feed crops for dairy and beef cattle, as well as concentrated dairy and cattle feedlots that receive subsidized irrigation water. • By reducing water scarcity pressure, the measure may prolong or expand intensive animal agriculture in arid regions rather than encouraging shifts to less water-intensive plant-based systems. • The "no cost-share" clause removes the

usual beneficiary-pays requirement, effectively subsidizing water for agribusiness users. • Because the contracts are not treated as "new" under the Reclamation Reform Act, acreage-limitation and pricing reforms that animal-welfare or environmental advocates might push for cannot be triggered.

**Indirect Effects** **Provision:** Exemption from reimbursement, matching, or cost-sharing requirements. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** • Eliminates a financial lever advocates could use to require environmental safeguards, wildlife protections, or conditional water pricing that discourages water-intensive animal operations. • May divert federal dollars away from climate-adaptive, plant-based agricultural practices or wildlife-friendly habitat restoration that could indirectly aid farmed animals by reducing feed-crop expansion.

**Research & Innovation** **Provision:** Focus exclusively on conventional water-infrastructure expansion; no funds for demand-side innovation or water-efficient plant-based agriculture. **Impact:** Neutral–Negative **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** • Opportunity cost: federal funds are not directed toward research on water-saving alternative proteins or drought-resistant plant-based cropping systems that could displace feed crops for livestock.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Engage during implementation: Urge the Bureau of Reclamation to incorporate environmental review conditions that limit deliveries to water-intensive CAFOs and prioritize wildlife-friendly or plant-based agricultural users.
2. Promote parity: Lobby for complementary legislation that ties federal water infrastructure spending to strict animal-welfare, climate, and water-efficiency benchmarks, or imposes tiered water pricing that discourages feed-crop irrigation and large dairies/feedlots.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** While not addressing animal welfare directly, this subtitle channels large, fully subsidized water resources to western agriculture, likely reinforcing the economic viability and potential expansion of water-intensive animal agriculture. Animal advocates should view the provision as a missed opportunity to shift toward water-efficient, plant-based food systems and seek ways to attach environmental and animal-welfare conditions to federal water investments.

---

### 16. Title VI Committee On Environment And Public Work

**SECTION SUMMARY** Title VI eliminates or reduces previously approved federal funds for a wide array of climate-, air-pollution-, and environmental-

justice-related programs and imposes a new, fee-based fast-track option for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews.

## FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**REGULATORY & ENFORCEMENT** **Provision:** Sec. 60004, 60009 – Rescission of funding "to address air pollution" and for "Enforcement Technology and Public Information." **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Cuts to EPA monitoring and enforcement capacity can reduce oversight of air emissions from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) and slaughter/processing plants. Less monitoring and public data make it harder for advocates to document harms or press for stronger Clean Air Act enforcement against animal-ag facilities.

**Provision:** Sec. 60010 – Rescission of funding for greenhouse-gas corporate reporting. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** A stalled or scaled-back corporate GHG reporting program will likely delay or weaken disclosure of Scope 3 emissions, including livestock-related methane and nitrous oxide. This diminishes pressure on large meat and dairy corporations to reduce animal numbers or transition to alternative proteins.

**Provision:** Sec. 60026 – "Project Sponsor Opt-In Fees for Environmental Reviews" (accelerated NEPA timelines of 180 days for EAs and one year for EISs when a sponsor pays a 125 % fee). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** CAFOs, slaughterhouses, rendering plants, and related infrastructure that require federal permits could pay to fast-track reviews, limiting the time available for public comment and detailed impact assessment (water pollution, odor, wildlife, cumulative climate impacts). This makes it harder for communities and animal-welfare groups to challenge environmentally harmful animal-ag projects.

**INDIRECT EFFECTS / ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE** **Provision:** Sec. 60016 – Rescission of Environmental and Climate Justice Block Grants. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Communities disproportionately burdened by CAFO pollution (often low-income and BIPOC) lose a potential funding stream for monitoring, mitigation, and legal challenges. Advocates will have fewer federal resources to confront factory-farm siting and expansion.

**Provision:** Sec. 60001, 60003, 60006, 60012, 60013 – Broad rescissions of funding for clean heavy-duty vehicles, diesel-emission reductions, low-emission electricity, methane programs, and state GHG-reduction planning. **Impact:** Negative (indirect) **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** While aimed mainly at energy and transportation, the overall retreat from GHG-mitigation funding reduces federal momentum to cut methane and nitrous-oxide emissions. This may delay future inclusion of livestock emissions in climate-policy frameworks, indirectly extending the lifespan of intensive animal agriculture.

**AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS & FOOD PRODUCTION** **Provision:** Sec. 60007 – Rescission of funding tied to Clean Air Act § 211(o) (Renewable Fuel Standard). **Impact:** Neutral (animal-welfare specific) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Could slightly temper corn-ethanol demand, marginally affecting feed prices, but the animal-welfare relevance is minimal and uncertain.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Prepare to intervene at the state and local levels, where environmental reviews for new CAFOs or slaughter facilities may now proceed on a shortened federal timeline. Develop template comments and litigation strategies that can be executed quickly ( 180 days).
2. Seek alternative funding (philanthropic, state EJ programs) for community air- and water-quality monitoring around CAFOs to compensate for the loss of federal enforcement-support dollars.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section contains no direct farm-animal-welfare provisions, but it weakens environmental oversight mechanisms that advocates rely upon to limit CAFO expansion and to hold animal-ag corporations accountable for pollution and greenhouse-gas emissions. The accelerated NEPA process (Sec. 60026) poses the most immediate, high-significance threat to animal-welfare and environmental-justice campaigns.

---

### 17. Title VII - Subtitle A Tax - Chapter 1 Providing Permanent Tax Relief For Middl

**SECTION SUMMARY** Chapter 1 of H.R. 1 is almost entirely a package of individual- and small-business tax changes (rate extensions, standard-deduction increases, child-credit adjustments, estate-tax relief, SALT cap changes, etc.). Most provisions are broadly applicable and do not mention agriculture or food production. Only a handful of items touch on farm businesses indirectly by altering the tax treatment of pass-through income, cooperatives, estates, and property taxes.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Economic & Trade Impacts** **Provision:** Sec. 70105 – Extension and enhancement of the §199A Qualified Business Income (QBI) deduction (higher phase-in thresholds; new $400 minimum deduction for "active" business income). **Impact:** Negative (for farmed animals) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** • All sole proprietorships, partnerships, and S-corps—including animal-feeding operations—receive a larger or more certain deduction, lowering their effective tax rate. • Makes it marginally cheaper to start or expand an animal-ag business relative to a C-corp or wage income. • Plant-based start-ups organized

as pass-throughs also benefit, but animal agriculture currently dominates the pass-through farm sector, so the net effect likely favors conventional livestock operations. Advocates may wish to highlight this hidden subsidy and press for welfare or sustainability conditions on future tax benefits.

**Economic & Trade / Regulatory & Enforcement Provision:** Sec. 70111(b) – New itemized-deduction limitation ("haircut") will NOT be applied when computing the §199A deduction for (i) all pass-throughs and (ii) patrons of "specified agricultural and horticultural cooperatives." **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** • Protects the full §199A benefit for cooperative members (e.g., dairy, egg, and hog co-ops), slightly increasing after-tax income for intensive livestock producers. • Signal that agriculture retains privileged status inside the tax code; advocates could use this as an example of uneven treatment when lobbying for parity for alternative proteins.

**Economic & Trade Impacts Provision:** Sec. 70106 – Estate and gift-tax exemption raised to $15 million (indexed) after 2025. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** • Large animal-ag operations (especially concentrated animal-feeding operations, CAFOs) are often family-held. A higher exemption eases succession, reduces pressure to subdivide or sell assets, and may entrench existing high-intensity livestock systems. • Plant-based or crop farms benefit too, but concentrated animal operations are disproportionately capital-intensive, so the relative gain favors them. Advocates may need to rely more on environmental or zoning avenues, as tax-based turnover pressure will diminish.

**Economic & Trade Impacts Provision:** Sec. 70120 – SALT cap temporarily lifted to $40 k (until 2030). **Impact:** Negative (but marginal) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Large landowners—including industrial livestock facilities paying high property taxes—can deduct more, slightly lowering costs. • Effect size is small for typical farms; attention likely better spent elsewhere.

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production Provision:** No direct references to animal-ag subsidies, environmental standards, or plant-based R&D. **Impact:** Neutral **Significance:** High (because absence of positive provisions means status quo remains) **Implications:** • Missed opportunity: bill does not channel any of the permanent revenue loss toward alternative-protein research, transition assistance, or higher welfare standards. • Advocates can frame this as another instance where fiscal policy reinforces industrial animal agriculture by omission.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Use the expanded §199A and estate-tax provisions as concrete examples of "silent subsidies" when campaigning for parity or for attaching animal-welfare/environmental conditions to future tax benefits.

2. Prepare briefing materials for Congressional allies noting that none of the permanent tax cuts support plant-based innovation or farm-animal-welfare improvements, recommending targeted amendments in future tax or farm bills (e.g., a refundable R&D credit for alternative proteins).

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section does not change animal-welfare regulations, but several tax adjustments (larger §199A deduction, estate-tax relief, SALT cap increase) modestly strengthen the financial position of conventional animal agriculture while offering no parallel boost to plant-based or welfare-oriented production. The effects are indirect but real; animal advocates should view Chapter 1 as another policy layer that entrenches the economic advantages of intensive livestock systems.

---

### 18. Title VII - Subtitle A Tax - Chapter 2 Delivering On Presidential Priorities To

**SECTION SUMMARY** This chapter of HR 1 creates several temporary federal tax deductions and savings incentives: (1) a personal income-tax deduction for up to $25,000 in reported cash tips (Sec. 70201); (2) a personal deduction for up to $12,500 in qualified overtime pay (Sec. 70202); (3) a temporary above-the-line deduction for interest paid on personal car loans (Sec. 70203); and (4) the establishment of "Trump Accounts" and an associated contribution pilot program for children's savings (Sec. 70204). All measures are framed as middle-class tax relief and run, in most cases, through 2028.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

A close review of the text shows no provisions that: • Regulate farmed-animal treatment, housing, transport, slaughter, drugs, or inspection • Alter subsidies, insurance, or tax credits for animal agriculture or alternative proteins • Change USDA, FDA, EPA, or trade authorities relevant to farmed-animal industries • Affect research funding, labeling, or procurement for animal-based or plant-based foods

Any indirect labor-market or disposable-income effects are too attenuated and speculative to warrant inclusion under the Analysis Framework.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate engagement required; allocate limited advocacy resources to other parts of the bill (e.g., agriculture, energy, or trade titles) that present clearer implications for farmed animals.
2. Continue bill tracking: if later amendments add agricultural tax provisions (e.g., accelerated depreciation for livestock facilities or credits for

alternative proteins) they will likely appear in this same tax subtitle and should be reviewed promptly.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This portion of HR 1 deals solely with personal tax relief and youth savings and is effectively neutral for farmed-animal welfare and plant-based food advocacy.

---

### 19. Title VII - Subtitle A Tax - Chapter 3 Establishing Certainty And Competitivene

**SECTION SUMMARY** Chapter 3, Subchapter A of HR 1 creates a suite of permanent business-tax changes: 100 % bonus depreciation for most tangible property (Sec. 70301), immediate expensing of domestic R&D (Sec. 70302), higher Section 179 expensing caps (Sec. 70306), a new 100 % "special depreciation allowance" for newly built U.S. production facilities (Sec. 70307), and several narrower provisions (e.g., expanded deductions for meals on fishing vessels, increased advanced-manufacturing credit). None of the text refers to animals directly, but several provisions materially alter the financial calculus for building or expanding animal-based production and processing, while others can be leveraged by plant-based or cultivated-protein companies.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** **Provision:** Sec. 70301 – Permanent 100 % "bonus depreciation" (full expensing) for most business property, including barns, confinement sheds, slaughter-line equipment, feed mills, and refrigerated transport. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Large animal-ag firms and vertically-integrated integrators can expense the entire cost of new or replacement facilities in the year placed in service, lowering after-tax cost of expanding CAFOs, hatcheries, or slaughter plants. Could accelerate capacity growth and extend asset life cycles that lock-in intensive production methods. Advocates may face faster build-out of high-density animal housing.

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** **Provision:** Sec. 70306 – Section 179 caps raised to $2.5 m (immediate) and phase-out threshold to $4 m for small/medium businesses. Livestock producers routinely use §179 to write off tractors, mixers, manure-handling systems, small poultry barns, etc. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Makes rapid capital recovery easier for mid-size growers under contract with integrators, potentially entrenching existing intensive systems. Could slow transitions away from livestock if the economics of incremental upgrades remain attractive.

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production / Regulatory & Enforcement Provision:** Sec. 70307 – 100 % first-year deduction for "Qualified Production Property" (new U.S. non-residential real property used in "manufacturing, production, or refining of tangible personal property") constructed 2025-2029 and placed in service by 2031. Explicitly includes agricultural production and excludes only products "prepared in the same building as the retail establishment." **Impact:** Negative (for animals) / Mixed (for alt-protein manufacturing) **Significance:** High **Implications:** Slaughterhouses, rendering facilities, milk-drying plants, feed processing mills, and large hatcheries qualify. Immediate write-off plus recapture rules favor long-term animal-protein production. However, plant-based, fermentation, or cultivated-meat factories also qualify, creating an opening for humane protein investment if advocates can steer capital.

**Research & Innovation Provision:** Sec. 70302 – Full and immediate deduction for domestic R&D; restores deductibility retroactively for many firms. **Impact:** Positive (for animal-free proteins) / Neutral-to-Negative (overall) **Significance:** Medium-High **Implications:** Alt-protein, precision-fermentation, cell-cultivated meat, animal-free dairy R&D—often carried out in U.S. labs—can now be fully expensed, improving cash flow for startups. Yet large meat, dairy, and feed conglomerates receive the same benefit for genetics and productivity R&D that can intensify animal use. Targeted advocacy could channel public and private R&D toward non-animal solutions.

**Economic & Trade Impacts Provision:** Sec. 70305 – Allows 100 % deductibility of business meals on commercial fishing vessels and in northern fish-processing plants, removing the usual 50 % limitation. **Impact:** Negative (for aquatic animals) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** A narrow tax perk that marginally lowers costs for wild-capture fishing and remote fish processing—industries with serious welfare and environmental concerns. Signal that Congress is willing to grant sector-specific tax favors; advocates may want to spotlight inequities.

**Research & Innovation / Agricultural Systems Provision:** Sec. 70308 – Increases the advanced-manufacturing investment credit from 25 % to 35 %. **Impact:** Positive (potentially) **Significance:** Low-Medium **Implications:** If alt-protein equipment (bioreactors, extrusion lines) qualifies, companies can claim a larger credit when placing property in service after 2025, improving project finance. Little direct benefit to conventional livestock operations (they rarely meet "advanced manufacturing" definitions), so this may provide a modest competitive nudge toward innovative plant-based or cultivated production.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Engage Treasury & IRS rulemaking: Push for guidance that clarifies plant-based and cultivated-meat facilities/equipment qualify for Sec. 70307's

special depreciation and Sec. 70308's manufacturing credit; simultaneously urge exclusion or tighter animal-welfare/environmental criteria for CAFO and slaughter infrastructure.
2. Public messaging & investor outreach: Highlight how Secs. 70301 & 70306 subsidize factory-farm expansion; use data to frame these as hidden "industrial-animal-ag giveaways" and build support for parallel or countervailing measures (e.g., cage-free conversion grants, emissions fees).
3. Leverage R&D expensing (Sec. 70302) for alternative proteins by connecting startups with accountants and investors now modeling improved cash flows; advocate for state-level matching credits that expressly prioritize animal-free research.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** While ostensibly "broad-based business tax reform," the provisions analyzed tilt capital-investment economics in favor of large, capital-intensive animal-protein facilities by delivering faster tax write-offs and higher deductions. Alternative-protein enterprises can also benefit—especially from the enhanced R&D rules and advanced-manufacturing credit—but only if they are ready to capitalize on the incentives. Farm-animal advocates should view this section as a potentially significant, though indirect, accelerator of factory-farm build-outs and should act to steer investment and public perception accordingly.

---

### 20. Title VII - Subtitle A Tax - Chapter 4 Investing In American Families Communiti

**SECTION SUMMARY** Chapter 4 of H.R. 1 is a large tax package that (1) expands family-oriented credits, (2) creates and extends a variety of education, housing, community-development, and small-business tax incentives, and (3) modifies charitable-giving rules. Several provisions touch agriculture, rural lending, fisheries, and nonprofit fundraising—areas that can materially influence farmed-animal industries and the advocacy sector.

---

### FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS & FOOD PRODUCTION** **Provision:** Sec. 70435 – 25 % income-tax exclusion for interest earned on "qualified real-estate loans" secured by rural or agricultural property or aquaculture facilities. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** Lowers after-tax lending costs for farmland purchases, CAFO expansions, and aquaculture build-outs. Cheaper credit can accelerate consolidation and growth of intensive animal agriculture and fish-farming. Advocates may see more new or expanded facilities and should prepare for increased siting and permitting battles.

**Provision:** Sec. 70437 – Four-year installment plan for federal tax on capital gains from selling farmland to a "qualified farmer"; land must stay in agricultural use for 10 years. **Impact:** Moderately Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Makes it easier for retiring owners to sell to continuing producers, reinforcing long-term agricultural use (including livestock). Could slow transition of land toward non-agricultural or re-wilding uses. Plant-based growers receive the same benefit, but the default likely favors current animal-ag incumbents unless advocates actively facilitate plant-centric purchasers.

**ECONOMIC & TRADE IMPACTS** **Provision:** Sec. 70421 – Expansion and sweeteners for Opportunity Zones; creation of "Qualified Rural Opportunity Funds" (QROFs) that receive larger basis step-ups and looser improvement tests in rural areas. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** New federal and private capital may flow to rural processing plants, feed mills, and CAFO infrastructure because these projects meet OZ/QROF rules and generate predictable returns. Advocates should track local OZ designations and push states to steer funds toward animal-free or higher-welfare enterprises.

**RESEARCH & INNOVATION (INDIRECT)** No direct R&D allocations for alternative proteins are included, while multiple finance incentives (Opportunity Zones, rural loan interest break) can be used by animal-protein companies. **Impact:** Negative (opportunity cost) **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** Competitive landscape tilts further toward conventional animal agriculture unless advocates secure parallel incentives for plant-based and cultivated-meat facilities.

**INDIRECT EFFECTS – NONPROFIT FUNDING** **Provision:** • Sec. 70425 – 0.5 % "floor" before individuals can deduct charitable gifts. • Sec. 70426 – 1 % floor before corporations can deduct charitable gifts. • Sec. 70424 – Restores/expands above-the-line deduction for non-itemizers to $1,000 ($2,000 married). **Impact:** Mixed (Net Slightly Negative) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** Small- and mid-size donors who itemize (or corporate givers) must now clear higher thresholds, likely reducing larger-ticket gifts to animal-protection charities. The new $1,000 non-itemizer deduction could offset some loss among modest donors. Organizations should revise fundraising messaging and monitor giving patterns.

**INDIRECT EFFECTS – WILD-CAPTURE & MARINE ANIMALS** (Outside farmed scope but relevant to broader animal welfare) • Sec. 70428 treats large-scale Bering Sea fisheries activities as mission-related for certain 501(c)(3) community-development entities → could increase fishing pressure. • Sec. 70429 raises the deductible limit for Native Alaskan subsistence whaling expenses five-fold. Impact: Negative for wild animals; Significance: Low–Medium.

---

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Engage Rural Finance Channels • Meet with Farm Credit institutions and rural banks to promote use of the Sec. 70435 interest exclusion for plant-based, regenerative, or higher-welfare operations instead of CAFOs. • Urge regulators and lenders to attach strong environmental-and-welfare criteria to loans benefitting from the new tax break.
2. Monitor Opportunity Zone Activity • Track state OZ/QROF designations and comment early on projects (slaughterhouses, feed facilities, etc.). • Partner with local economic-development boards to propose alt-protein manufacturing or greenhouse projects that still qualify, redirecting funds away from intensive animal agriculture.
3. Adjust Fundraising Strategy • Inform donors about the new $1,000 above-the-line deduction and how to optimize giving despite the 0.5 %/1 % floors. • Diversify revenue streams, anticipate potential short-term dip in major-gift pledges, and campaign for legislative fixes that exempt public-interest charities from the new floors.

---

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** While most language in Chapter 4 is family-, education-, or small-business-oriented, several financial incentives (rural loan interest exclusion, Opportunity Zone expansion, farmland-gain deferral) materially favor conventional animal agriculture and aquaculture. Coupled with potentially reduced charitable giving capacity, the net effect of this section is moderately negative for farmed-animal welfare unless advocates act quickly to shape implementation and redirect benefits toward humane and animal-free food systems.

---

### 21. Title VII - Subtitle A Tax - Chapter 5 Ending Green New Deal Spending Promoting

**SECTION SUMMARY** Chapter 5, Subchapter A & B of H.R. 1 eliminates or scales-back many clean-energy tax incentives and rewrites the Clean Fuel Production Credit (§ 45Z). For animal agriculture, the only material provisions are those that: 1) give special, premium treatment to transportation fuels made from animal manure and 2) expand or extend crop- and fat-based bio-diesel incentives while excluding indirect-land-use (ILUC) penalties.

All other energy-tax changes (wind, solar, nuclear, hydrogen, etc.) have no meaningful link to farmed-animal systems.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** Provision: § 70521(c)(1)(v) – authorises EPA/Treasury to assign an emissions rate "less than zero" ONLY for transportation fuels "derived from animal manure." Impact: Negative Significance: High Implications: • Creates a large financial premium for biogas/RNG made from CAFO manure (credits can exceed $1-$3 / gallon). • Directly incentivises new or expanded manure-storage lagoons and anaerobic digesters, locking in long-term confinement systems for dairy, swine and poultry. • Undermines advocate arguments that industrial animal agriculture's methane should be tackled by herd-size reduction rather than monetised. • Likely to draw capital toward "manure-to-energy" projects, crowding out funds for plant-based protein or true methane-reduction strategies (e.g., herd reduction, grazing transitions).

Provision: § 70521(b) – bans negative emissions rates for all other fuels; § 70521(c)(1)(iv) removes indirect-land-use-change (ILUC) penalties from lifecycle accounting. Impact: Negative Significance: Medium Implications: • Corn-ethanol and soy-biodiesel look "cleaner" on paper, gaining larger § 45Z credits. • Could expand U.S. corn/soy acreage, reinforcing feed crop dominance that supports livestock and limits land for specialty crops or pulse proteins. • Eliminating ILUC skews federal modelling against plant-based meats' comparative climate benefit, weakening an advocacy talking point.

Provision: § 70521(j) – doubles the "small agri-biodiesel producer" credit (10 ¢→20 ¢ / gal) and extends it through 2026; remains stackable with the § 45Z credit. Impact: Negative-to-Neutral Significance: Medium Implications: • Stimulates additional demand for soy oil or animal fats. • Rendering plants and slaughter by-product processors may capture added value, marginally improving the economics of intensive meat production. • Could marginally raise soy prices, with mixed effects on feed costs and land-use; directionally supports current animal-feed model over pulse or grain-for-food rotations.

Provision: § 70521(a)(1) – § 45Z credit available only if feedstock "was produced or grown in the United States, Mexico, or Canada." Impact: Neutral Significance: Low Implications: • Favors domestic manure and crop feedstocks; may marginally increase U.S. CAFO profitability relative to foreign imports of used-cooking-oil or tallow.

**Indirect Effects** Provision: General termination of multiple clean-energy and vehicle incentives (§ 70501-70514). Impact: Neutral for farmed animals Significance: Low Implications: • Slower decarbonisation of transport and power sectors could prolong demand for corn-ethanol/biodiesel as compliance tools, indirectly supporting feed-crop and animal-fat markets, but effects are second-order relative to the dedicated § 45Z changes.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Prioritise opposition or amendment of § 70521(c)(1)(v). Ask lawmakers to remove the manure-fuel exception or at minimum require: • full methane

leakage accounting (at lagoon, digester, pipeline, and combustion points); • herd-size caps for eligible facilities; • sunset of the negative-emission bonus within five years.

2. Re-insert ILUC factors into federal lifecycle models. Coalition with environmental NGOs can argue that the ILUC removal undercuts both climate goals and biodiversity—strengthening the case for plant-based proteins and habitat conservation.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** With the single—but very significant—exception of the manure-based fuel bonus, this energy-tax title is largely irrelevant to farmed-animal welfare. If enacted unchanged, § 70521 will channel substantial new subsidies into CAFO manure-to-energy projects, entrenching large-scale confinement systems and creating a headwind for advocates seeking herd-size reductions or plant-based transitions.

---

### 22. Title VII - Subtitle A Tax - Chapter 6 Enhancing Deduction And Income Tax Credi

**SECTION SUMMARY** Chapter 6 consists exclusively of federal tax-code changes (permanent limitation on excess business losses, partnership-payment rules, executive compensation deductibility, an excise tax on certain remittance transfers, new enforcement rules for the COVID Employee Retention Credit, SSN requirements for education credits, and a Treasury report on replacing IRS Direct File). No language addresses agriculture, food production, or animal welfare directly.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production Provision:** SEC. 70601 makes the §461(l) "excess business-loss" limitation for non-corporate taxpayers permanent and updates the inflation adjustors. **Impact:** Slightly Positive (indirectly restrains very large pass-through agribusinesses) **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** • Many large industrial livestock operations are organized as partnerships, LLCs, or sole proprietorships. A permanent cap ($289 k for single / $578 k for joint filers in 2024, indexed) limits how much of any annual operating loss they can use to offset other income. • Could modestly reduce tax-advantaged expansion or rapid write-offs after disease outbreaks, thus marginally diminishing financial incentives for high-risk, large-scale animal production. • Smaller diversified farms (including plant-based) are also affected, so welfare gains are incidental rather than targeted.

**Economic & Trade Impacts Provision:** SEC. 70603 expands §162(m) executive-compensation deductibility limits across controlled groups, capping

deductible pay at $1 million per "specified covered employee" across related entities. **Impact:** Neutral (possible slight positive) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Publicly-held meat, dairy, or egg conglomerates can no longer "silo" executives in separate subsidiaries to preserve deductions. • Modestly higher after-tax labor costs could redirect some capital, but the effect on production volume or welfare practices is expected to be de minimis.

**Regulatory & Enforcement** No provisions in this chapter alter USDA, EPA, or FDA oversight, food safety, or labeling.

**Research & Innovation** No provisions add or remove funding for animal-free or animal-based R&D.

**Indirect Effects** No provisions influence nutrition programs, environmental rules, or healthcare policies related to animal products.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor future IRS data or GAO reports to see whether the permanent excess-loss cap materially changes the financial behavior of large pass-through livestock operations; use any findings to argue for broader subsidy or tax-expenditure reforms.
2. Because direct impacts are minimal, allocate advocacy resources to higher-leverage sections of HR1 or other bills (e.g., appropriations, Farm Bill titles) that more directly address animal-agriculture subsidies or welfare standards.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This portion of HR1 has only peripheral relevance to farm-animal welfare. The permanent limitation on excess business losses offers a small, indirect restraint on very large pass-through animal-agriculture enterprises, but no substantive animal-welfare, environmental, or plant-based innovation provisions are included.

---

### 23. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 1 Medicaid Subchapter A Reducing Fraud And Improving Enrollment

**SECTION SUMMARY** This portion of H.R. 1 creates a decade-long moratorium on two CMS "streamlining" rules and makes a series of technical changes to Medicaid / CHIP eligibility, enrollment verification, duplicate-enrollment prevention, and federal cost-sharing formulas. Its focus is entirely on human health-care administration and funding.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED (The section contains no provisions that regulate animal agriculture, affect farmed-animal welfare standards, subsidize livestock production, support plant-based foods, alter USDA/FDA/EPA authority over food systems, or otherwise meaningfully influence the categories outlined in the analysis framework.)

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. None required for farmed-animal, plant-based, or alt-protein advocates on the basis of this section alone.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section of H.R. 1 is effectively irrelevant to farmed-animal welfare and related food-system advocacy efforts.

---

### 24. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 1 Medicaid Subchapter B Preventing Wasteful Spending

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subchapter (Sections 71111–71113) addresses federal health-care spending. It (1) pauses new minimum-staffing rules for long-term care facilities, (2) shortens Medicaid/CHIP retroactive eligibility periods, and (3) bars Medicaid payments for one year to certain reproductive-health providers that perform abortions.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate engagement required on these provisions; allocate capacity to other portions of H.R. 1 that more directly affect agriculture or food systems.
2. Continue scanning later sections for funding or regulatory language tied to USDA, EPA, or FDA that could influence farmed-animal welfare.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** These healthcare-focused provisions have no discernible effect—direct or indirect—on farmed animals, animal agriculture, or plant-based food advocacy.

---

### 25. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 1 Medicaid Subchapter C Stopping Abusive Financing Practices

**SECTION SUMMARY** This portion of HR 1 deals exclusively with Medicaid financing reforms—altering FMAP incentives, tightening rules on provider

taxes, capping State-directed Medicaid payments, redefining redistributive tax criteria, and imposing budget-neutrality on Medicaid §1115 demonstration waivers.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED (The text contains no provisions that directly or meaningfully affect farmed-animal welfare, animal agriculture subsidies, alternative-protein research, food labeling, environmental regulation of livestock operations, or related advocacy areas.)

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action required for farm-animal or plant-based advocates on this section.
2. Continue tracking later sections of HR 1 for any agriculture, nutrition, or environmental language that might emerge.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This Medicaid-focused subsection has negligible relevance to farmed-animal protection or plant-based food systems.

---

### 26. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 1 Medicaid Subchapter D Increasing Personal Accountability

**SECTION SUMMARY** This portion of HR 1 creates mandatory "community-engagement" (i.e., work/service) requirements for many Medicaid expansion beneficiaries and, beginning in 2028, imposes new cost-sharing rules for certain Medicaid enrollees. It is entirely focused on eligibility, verification, and cost-sharing mechanics within the Medicaid program.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Indirect Effects** **Provision:** Imposition of 80-hour monthly work/community-service requirements and higher cost-sharing for Medicaid expansion adults who do not meet specified exemptions. **Impact:** Negative (indirect and speculative) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Rural regions with high concentrations of low-wage animal-agriculture labor (e.g., slaughterhouse, dairy, or concentrated feeding-operation workers) have disproportionately high Medicaid enrollment. Tougher eligibility rules could push some workers to remain in or seek additional hours in physically demanding, low-wage animal-agriculture jobs merely to maintain coverage, potentially reinforcing the existing labor supply that sustains intensive animal farming. • Stricter rules may also reduce disposable income and health security for low-income residents—including plant-based or animal-advocacy nonprofit staff—diverting personal resources away from civic engagement or advocacy. • However, the

connection to farmed-animal outcomes is attenuated; the policy does not target agriculture, and effects depend on state implementation choices.

No other provisions in this section influence farmed-animal welfare regulations, agricultural subsidies, research priorities, trade, labeling, or enforcement.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor state implementation in major livestock-producing states to see whether Medicaid work rules disproportionately affect slaughter-plant or CAFO workers; consider incorporating healthcare-justice framing when engaging rural communities about transitions away from animal agriculture.
2. Allocate limited advocacy bandwidth elsewhere; this section poses minimal direct threat or opportunity for farmed-animal welfare, so deeper legislative engagement is likely low priority.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** The Medicaid community-engagement and cost-sharing language has virtually no direct bearing on farmed-animal welfare, plant-based food systems, or animal-agriculture regulation. At most, it may slightly influence labor dynamics in rural animal-ag sectors, but any animal-welfare impact would be indirect and marginal.

---

### 27. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 1 Medicaid Subchapter E Expanding Access To Care

**SECTION SUMMARY** This section expands Medicaid's Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS) waiver program, allowing states to create stand-alone waivers (starting July 1, 2028) that cover additional HCBS for certain populations and appropriates funds to help states implement and administer these services.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

The provisions exclusively address Medicaid health-care policy, eligibility criteria, waiver mechanics, and federal funding for HCBS. They do not reference agriculture, food systems, animal welfare, environmental regulation, trade, or research priorities that could directly or indirectly affect farmed animals or plant-based alternatives.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action needed from animal-advocacy, plant-based, or farm-animal-welfare organizations regarding this section.

2. Continue monitoring later sections of HR1 for agriculture-related language; this portion can be deprioritized in advocacy resource planning.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This HCBS expansion provision is healthcare-focused and has no discernible relevance to farmed animal welfare, animal agriculture, or plant-based food systems.

---

### 28. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 2 Medicare

**SECTION SUMMARY** This portion of HR1 addresses Medicare eligibility (restricting coverage to certain immigration categories), a one-year temporary payment bump in the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule for 2026, and adjustments to the orphan-drug exclusion in the federal drug-price–negotiation program.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

The text concerns health-insurance eligibility, physician reimbursement, and pharmaceutical pricing. It contains no language that touches on animal agriculture, farmed-animal welfare standards, food production systems, agricultural subsidies, trade, labeling, or research funding relevant to animals or alternative proteins. Any fiscal or budgetary ripple effects for agriculture are too indirect or speculative to register.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action required on this section for animal-welfare or plant-based food advocates.
2. Continue monitoring later sections of HR1 (and accompanying appropriations language) for any agricultural, nutrition, or environmental provisions that could materially affect farmed animals.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This Medicare-focused chapter has no discernible relevance to farmed-animal advocacy or to plant-based or alternative-protein stakeholders.

---

### 29. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 3 Health Tax

**SECTION SUMMARY** This portion of HR 1 (Chapter 3 – Health Tax) modifies eligibility rules, verification procedures, and related tax provisions for the Affordable Care Act's premium tax credit and Health Savings Account (HSA) rules. It focuses on immigration status, fraud prevention, tele-health

deductibles, use of bronze/catastrophic plans with HSAs, and treatment of direct primary-care arrangements.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED After reviewing the text, none of the provisions materially affect farmed-animal welfare, animal-agriculture subsidies, plant-based foods, trade in animal products, or related regulatory frameworks. All changes pertain strictly to human health-insurance eligibility and administration.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action required; track future amendments to ensure animal-agriculture riders are not added in later stages of the bill.
2. Maintain focus on other sections of HR 1 or parallel legislation (e.g., Farm Bill, appropriations) that more directly influence animal agriculture.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section is essentially irrelevant to farmed-animal advocacy work and poses neither risks nor opportunities for improving animal welfare.

---

### 30. Title VII - Subtitle B Health - Chapter 4 Protecting Rural Hospitals And Providers

**SECTION SUMMARY** This section establishes a $50 billion "Rural Health Transformation Program" (FY 2026-2030) under the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to fund State initiatives that improve rural human-health care infrastructure, workforce, technology, and service delivery.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED The text addresses human medical services only. It does not reference farmed animals, animal agriculture operations, veterinary care, food production, environmental regulation, or any other provision that would directly or meaningfully affect farmed-animal welfare, subsidies, trade, or related enforcement.

Potential, highly speculative indirect effects (e.g., healthier rural populations helping to stabilize agricultural labor forces) are too attenuated to classify as relevant under this framework.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action required; continue to monitor future guidance or implementing rules in case any funds are later allowed to flow to mixed human/veterinary rural "health hubs."

2. Maintain focus on other sections of HR1 or separate bills that explicitly address animal agriculture or food-system funding.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This chapter is effectively neutral for farmed-animal advocacy; it concentrates on human rural health and does not create new incentives, subsidies, or regulations impacting animal agriculture.

---

### 31. Title VII - Subtitle C Increase In Debt Limit

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle simply raises the statutory federal debt ceiling by $5 trillion. It does not authorize or appropriate any new spending, nor does it amend any programs or regulations.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

Because the provision is strictly fiscal (altering the Treasury's borrowing authority) and does not change agency budgets, programs, or regulatory authority, it has no direct or discernible indirect effects on farmed animal welfare, agricultural systems, or related advocacy work.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor subsequent appropriations or budget reconciliation bills. While the debt-limit increase itself is neutral, it enables future spending decisions that could positively or negatively affect animal agriculture or alternative proteins.
2. Use the broader budget discussions that follow a debt-limit increase to advocate for federal funding that favors plant-based research, enforcement of animal-welfare laws, and climate-smart agriculture programs.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section is fiscally procedural and holds no immediate relevance for farmed animal advocacy, but it sets the stage for future budget negotiations where substantive impacts could arise.

---

### 32. Title VII - Subtitle D Unemployment

**SECTION SUMMARY** Section 73001 prohibits the use of any federal funds to pay unemployment-insurance benefits—or the associated administrative costs—to individuals whose wages in their "base period" equal or exceed $1 million. It also directs states to add self-certification and wage-verification steps and to recover any overpayments.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED • The provision deals solely with eligibility rules for unemployment insurance and the mechanics by which state agencies verify high-income claimants. • It contains no language addressing agriculture, farmed animals, food production, trade, research, or environmental regulation. • Any conceivable link—e.g., an agribusiness executive earning over $1 million being denied unemployment benefits—has no material effect on farmed-animal welfare, subsidies, or plant-based alternatives.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. None required; the provision is functionally irrelevant to farmed-animal or plant-based advocacy agendas.
2. Advocates can safely allocate analytical bandwidth to other sections of the bill with more direct implications for animal agriculture or food systems.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section has no substantive relevance to farmed-animal welfare or the broader food and agriculture landscape.

---

### 33. Title VIII Committee On Health Education Labor And

**SECTION SUMMARY** This section amends the Higher Education Act so that, beginning in award year 2026-2027, the net value of (A) a family-residence farm, (B) a family-owned small business with  100 employees, and (C) a family-owned commercial-fishing business will be excluded from the assets considered when determining a student's eligibility for federal financial aid.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production / Economic & Trade Impacts** **Provision:** Adds "a family farm on which the family resides" to the list of assets excluded from the federal-student-aid needs analysis. **Impact:** Negative-to-Neutral (indirect) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Makes it easier for families who own farms—including animal farms—to qualify for or receive larger federal student-aid packages. • Effectively confers a modest financial advantage to keep or maintain ownership of a family farm, potentially prolonging small-scale animal agriculture operations. • No direct change to animal-welfare standards, but advocates should note that every incremental financial benefit to animal farming can slow long-term shifts toward plant-based agriculture.

**Indirect Effects (Education & Socio-economic)** **Provision:** Same as above, but viewed through the lens of educational access. **Impact:** Neutral **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Increased college access for farm-family

students could, over time, expose them to alternative career paths—including plant-based or cellular-ag innovation—yet the asset exemption itself is not designed to encourage such transitions. • Opportunity for advocacy groups to target scholarship, internship, and outreach efforts toward these students.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor implementation: Track any subsequent rule-making or guidance that could broaden the exemption or add other agricultural asset categories.
2. Outreach to farm-family students: Use the increased educational access as an entry point for programs that highlight plant-based agriculture, alternative proteins, and higher-welfare farming models.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This provision offers a modest financial benefit to families who own farms—including animal farms—by shielding farm asset values from student-aid calculations. It does not alter animal-welfare regulations or materially shift the economics of animal agriculture; therefore, the direct impact on farmed animals is minimal and largely indirect.

---

### 34. Title VIII - Subtitle B Loan Limits

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle amends the Higher Education Act to cap or eliminate certain federal student-loan programs for graduate, professional, and parent borrowers beginning July 1, 2026. It ends Grad PLUS loans, lowers annual and aggregate borrowing limits for Direct Unsubsidized Stafford loans, and imposes new lifetime caps.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Indirect Effects – Veterinary & Animal-Science Workforce Provision:** Termination of Federal Direct PLUS loans for graduate/professional students (after July 1, 2026) and new, lower annual ($50,000) and aggregate ($200,000) borrowing limits for professional degrees (e.g., Doctor of Veterinary Medicine). **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Low–Medium **Implications:** • Veterinary medicine is classified as a "professional" degree. Capping total borrowing below today's typical cost of D.V.M. programs (often $250k–$350k) may deter some students or push them toward higher-cost private loans. • A reduced pipeline of food-animal veterinarians could hamper oversight of on-farm health, welfare, and food-safety practices, particularly in rural areas already facing vet shortages. • Animal-advocacy and welfare groups that rely on veterinary expertise (e.g., for undercover investigations, legislative testimony, or sanctuary care) may find fewer qualified partners.

**Indirect Effects – Graduate Research Capacity Provision:** Annual ($20,500) and aggregate ($100,000) loan caps for non-professional graduate programs and an overall lifetime limit of $257,500 for any one borrower. **Impact:** Neutral–Slightly Negative **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • Students pursuing animal-welfare science, alternative-protein R&D, or agricultural-policy graduate degrees could face tighter personal financing. This may modestly shrink the pool of researchers entering these fields, though most research-track students receive stipends rather than rely heavily on loans. • Could mildly disadvantage advocacy organizations that recruit recent graduate talent in economics, law, or public-health disciplines relevant to farmed-animal work.

**Indirect Effects – Parent Borrowers and Undergraduate Pipeline Provision:** New $20,000 annual / $65,000 aggregate Parent PLUS caps for each dependent student. **Impact:** Neutral **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Minimal direct effect on farm-animal issues; could slightly affect access to undergraduate animal-science or pre-vet programs, but scholarship/grant aid is a larger driver.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Support state or federal scholarship/loan-forgiveness programs targeted to food-animal veterinarians and animal-welfare researchers to offset tighter federal loan caps.
2. Engage with land-grant universities and philanthropy to expand grant-funded graduate fellowships in animal-welfare science and alternative-protein research, reducing reliance on federal loans altogether.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section is primarily higher-education finance policy with only indirect, low-to-medium significance for farmed animals. The main concern is a potential contraction in the food-animal veterinary workforce and, to a lesser extent, in graduate research talent relevant to animal welfare and alternative proteins. Otherwise, no direct provisions affect animal agriculture, welfare regulations, or food-system subsidies.

---

### 35. Title VIII - Subtitle C Loan Repayment

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle C—Loan Repayment rewrites large portions of the Higher Education Act to transition borrowers into new income-based repayment options, create a "Repayment Assistance Plan" (RAP), revise deferment/forbearance rules, expand loan-rehabilitation opportunities, and clarify that RAP payments count toward Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF). The entire subtitle focuses exclusively on student-loan policy.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Indirect Effects – Workforce & Advocacy Capacity Provision:** Creation of the Repayment Assistance Plan (RAP) and mandatory transition of most borrowers into income-based repayment by July 1, 2028 (Sec. 82001(d)). **Impact:** Positive **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Easier, more predictable loan payments may make it financially feasible for graduates—especially veterinarians, animal-science majors, and early-career advocates—to accept lower-paying positions at nonprofits, sanctuaries, and plant-based start-ups. This could modestly enlarge the talent pool for farm-animal-focused organizations.

**Indirect Effects – Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) Provision:** RAP payments will qualify as "on-time payments" for PSLF eligibility (Sec. 82004). **Impact:** Positive **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Employees at 501(c)(3) animal-advocacy organizations and certain public agencies (e.g., USDA veterinarians working on humane-handling enforcement) will accrue PSLF credit while on RAP, reducing long-term debt burdens and aiding staff retention.

**Indirect Effects – Administrative Funding for Loan Servicing Provision:** Additional $1 billion for servicing student loans (Sec. 82005). **Impact:** Neutral **Significance:** Very Low **Implications:** Better-funded loan servicing could lower processing errors for borrowers in RAP or PSLF, indirectly benefiting nonprofit employees, but the effect on farmed animals or their advocates is minimal.

NO other provisions in this subtitle materially affect farmed-animal welfare, animal agriculture subsidies, alternative proteins, trade, or relevant regulatory structures.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Update recruitment materials to highlight that RAP payments qualify for PSLF, making advocacy roles more financially attractive to debt-burdened graduates (e.g., veterinarians, scientists).
2. Engage with veterinary schools and agriculture programs to publicize these loan-repayment options, encouraging graduates to consider careers in farm-animal welfare and plant-based innovation.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle C on Loan Repayment has virtually no direct bearing on farmed animals or agricultural policy. Its primary relevance is indirect: by lowering student-loan stress, it could marginally help animal-advocacy and plant-based organizations attract and retain talent.

---

### 36. Title VIII - Subtitle D Pell Grants

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle D of HR 1 modifies Pell Grant rules, creates a new "Workforce Pell Grant," and changes funding and eligibility formulas. Its purpose is to expand or limit higher-education aid; it does not expressly address agriculture or animal issues.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** Agricultural Systems & Food Production Provision: Creation of "Workforce Pell Grants" for short-term (8–14-week) programs that a Governor certifies as leading to employment in "in-demand industry sectors or occupations" (sec. 83002). Impact: Neutral–to–Negative (indirect) Significance: Low Implications: States could certify slaughter, meat-processing, or industrial-livestock-production certificate programs as "in-demand." If that occurs, federal funds would subsidize workforce pipelines into animal-agriculture jobs, modestly reinforcing the labor infrastructure of factory farming. Conversely, the same mechanism could fund plant-based-food or alternative-protein certificates, but only if states choose to list those sectors as "in-demand." Animal advocates may wish to engage state workforce boards to influence which programs receive certification.

Regulatory & Enforcement Provision: Workforce Pell requires programs to meet completion, job-placement, and tuition-value metrics (70 % thresholds, sec. 481(b)(3)(A)(iv)). Impact: Neutral Significance: Low Implications: These quality controls do not reference welfare or environmental externalities, so an animal-agriculture certificate that meets the labor metrics would still qualify even if the jobs involve poor animal-welfare practices.

Indirect Effects Provision: Higher cap on authorized Pell funding (sec. 83003) and new aid-exclusion rules (sec. 83004). Impact: Neutral Significance: Very Low Implications: Broader student aid shifts could marginally affect the talent pool entering all food-system sectors, but no clear directional effect on animal agriculture or plant-based fields.

Overall finding: No language affects animal-welfare regulation, subsidies for livestock operations, or research priorities; any impact arises only if states elect to channel new Workforce Pell dollars into animal-agriculture training.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Engage state Governors and workforce boards to ensure alternative-protein and plant-based-food certificates are listed as qualifying "in-demand" programs, thereby steering Workforce Pell resources toward animal-free food systems.
2. Monitor state submissions and challenge or counter-lobby any efforts to certify slaughter or intensive-livestock programs without comparable opportunities for humane, sustainable food sectors.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Subtitle D on Pell Grants is largely outside the farmed-animal arena. It presents only a minor, indirect risk (or opportunity) stemming from possible state-level certification of short-term training programs that could favor either conventional animal-agriculture or alternative-protein sectors.

---

### 37. Title VIII - Subtitle E Accountability

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle E—Accountability, Sec. 84001 amends the Higher Education Act to make any college program whose graduates earn less than comparable working adults for two out of three consecutive years ineligible for Title IV student aid beginning July 1, 2026. It establishes the calculation method, cohort size rules, an appeals process, student-notice requirements, and a pathway to regain eligibility.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

The section deals exclusively with post-secondary program earnings thresholds and student-aid eligibility. It contains no language on agriculture, food systems, research funding, or related workforce programs. Any possible effect on animal agriculture or plant-based food systems would be too indirect or speculative to assess meaningfully.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No action needed; monitor future iterations of the bill only if agricultural-specific education carve-outs are introduced.
2. Allocate advocacy resources to other sections or bills with clearer relevance to farmed animals and food systems.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section is not pertinent to farmed animal welfare, animal agriculture policy, or plant-based food advocacy.

---

### 38. Title VIII - Subtitle F Regulatory Relief

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle delays the implementation of the Department of Education's 2022 borrower-defense-to-repayment and closed-school discharge rules for federal student loans until July 1, 2035, reverting to the 2020 rules in the interim.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS** None needed for farmed-animal or plant-based food advocates, as this subtitle does not touch agriculture, food systems, or animal welfare.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section pertains solely to student-loan regulations and has no discernible direct or indirect implications for farmed animals, animal agriculture, or related advocacy efforts.

---

### 39. Title VIII - Subtitle G Garden Of Heroes

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle appropriates $40 million (FY 2025–2028) to the National Endowment for the Humanities to purchase statues for the "Garden of American Heroes," as referenced in three executive orders. It is strictly a cultural-heritage spending measure.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action needed; advocates may simply track future amendments to ensure no unrelated agricultural riders are added.
2. Allocate limited advocacy resources toward sections of HR1 (or other bills) that contain direct agricultural, environmental, or food-system provisions.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section is not relevant to farmed animal welfare, animal agriculture, or plant-based food systems.

---

### 40. Title VIII - Subtitle H Office Of Refugee Resettlement

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle appropriates $300 million (FY 2025–2028) to the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to strengthen vetting of potential sponsors for unaccompanied alien children, conduct home studies, identify trafficking or child-labor risks, and coordinate with state child-welfare agencies.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Indirect Effects / Regulatory & Enforcement** Provision: Funds may be used for "data systems improvement and sharing" that assist "with the identification and investigation of child labor exploitation and child trafficking." Impact: Slight Positive (indirect) Significance: Low Implications: • Some unaccompanied minors have been found working in slaughterhouses and animal-agriculture

facilities. Better detection of child-labor exploitation could reduce the availability of underage labor in these operations, marginally increasing compliance costs for factory farms and potentially decreasing the scale or speed of production. • Advocates can leverage any ORR-generated data on child-labor incidents in meatpacking or livestock operations to highlight overlapping human-rights and animal-welfare concerns and to push for stronger enforcement throughout the supply chain.

(No other provisions in this section affect subsidies, welfare standards, research funding, trade, or environmental regulation related to animal agriculture.)

### ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Engage with ORR and state child-welfare agencies to obtain anonymized data on sectors where child-labor violations are found; use any cases in animal agriculture to advocate for stricter oversight of factory farms.
2. Partner with labor-rights organizations to present a unified case that industries relying on exploitative labor practices often also have poor animal-welfare records, strengthening arguments for comprehensive reform.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** The section's primary focus is child safety, not agriculture. It carries no direct animal-welfare or subsidy provisions. The only conceivable connection is a low-significance, indirect effect via improved detection of child labor that could touch animal-agriculture facilities. Otherwise, this subtitle is largely irrelevant to farmed-animal advocacy.

---

### 41. Title IX Committee On Homeland Security And Gover

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle appropriates tens of billions of dollars (FY 2025–2029) for U.S. border-wall construction, added Customs and Border Protection (CBP) personnel and facilities, expanded immigration detention capacity, advanced screening technologies, and related State and local security grants.

### FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Regulatory & Enforcement** **Provision:** $4.1 billion for additional CBP officers/agents and $6.17 billion for non-intrusive inspection equipment, AI-enabled screening, and other border-inspection technologies (Secs. 90002 & 90004). **Impact:** Positive (disease-prevention angle) **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** More officers and better scanners can strengthen enforcement of existing USDA/APHIS and FDA rules on imported meat, eggs, dairy, and live animals. Better interception of illegal or improperly declared animal products reduces the risk of foreign-animal-disease outbreaks that typically result in mass

on-farm culling. Advocates may frame this as a public-health and animal-welfare co-benefit and encourage CBP/USDA collaboration on bio-security training.

**Economic & Trade Impacts** **Provision:** Border-wall expansion, new checkpoints, and heightened screening may slow or complicate cross-border movement of live animals and perishable animal products (Secs. 90001, 90004, 90005). **Impact:** Negative for animal welfare (transport stress) / Uncertain economically **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Longer wait times or rerouting could increase transport duration for cattle, pigs, and poultry trucked between Mexico, Canada, and the U.S., elevating heat/cold stress and mortality in transit. Advocates can press DOT and USDA to issue transport-time limits or require contingency plans at border crossings.

**Indirect Effects – Labor & On-Farm Care** **Provision:** $45 billion for expanded immigration detention and stricter enforcement (Sec. 90003). **Impact:** Potentially Negative for farmed animals **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** U.S. animal agriculture is heavily dependent on immigrant labor (especially dairies, feedlots, and slaughter plants). Heightened detention and removal could aggravate already acute labor shortages, leading to understaffed barns and processing lines, which historically correlates with higher morbidity, rough handling, and delayed veterinary care. Advocates may cite this risk when arguing for humane-worker policies or for transitions toward less labor-intensive, plant-based production.

**Indirect Effects – Bio-security & Smuggling** **Provision:** Restrictions on untested autonomous surveillance towers (Sec. 90004(b)) and a funding emphasis on proven tech. **Impact:** Slight Positive **Significance:** Low **Implications:** Ensures that only validated surveillance systems are deployed, reducing the chance of "false positives/negatives" that could miss illegal animal-product smuggling or misallocate enforcement resources.

**No Direct Farmed-Animal Welfare Standards** The subtitle contains no language altering on-farm welfare regulations, slaughter standards, antibiotic use, or subsidies for animal or plant-based agriculture.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Engage DHS, CBP, and USDA to ensure new inspection resources include animal-product-specific bio-security training and rapid response protocols, thereby minimizing the need for mass depopulations should a disease threat be detected.
2. Highlight to lawmakers and the public how aggressive immigration enforcement can unintentionally worsen on-farm animal care; advocate for complementary labor reforms or incentives that support higher-welfare, lower-labor plant-based production systems.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This portion of HR 1 is not expressly about agriculture, but its substantial boost to border infrastructure and enforcement carries modest, mostly indirect consequences for farmed animals. Stronger screening may help prevent disease incursions (a welfare plus), while stricter immigration measures and potential transport delays pose welfare risks. Overall relevance to farm-animal advocacy: limited but worth monitoring for the above knock-on effects.

---

### 42. Title IX - Subtitle B Governmental Affairs Provisions

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle B provides administrative and oversight measures unrelated to agriculture: (1) the "FEHB Protection Act of 2025" (eligibility audits for the Federal Employees Health Benefits program); (2) additional funding and an extended sunset date for the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee (PRAC); and (3) a one-time appropriation for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to pursue government-wide "budget and accounting efficiencies."

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** Regulatory & Enforcement Provision: $88 million for PRAC and extension of its authority from 2025 to 2034 to oversee all Coronavirus-related expenditures, including those in this and prior Acts. Impact: Slightly Positive (potential) Significance: Low Implications: Some COVID-relief programs funneled sizeable sums to meatpacking plants, livestock producers, and related agribusinesses (e.g., USDA Commodity Credit Corporation outlays, Defense Production Act payments to poultry processors, etc.). Enhanced PRAC funding and a longer oversight window could allow advocates to: • Push for audits that uncover misuse of pandemic funds by industrial animal agriculture; • Highlight connections between poor animal husbandry, zoonotic risk, and future pandemic spending; • Promote stronger conditions on any future emergency outlays to factory farms. Because the bill merely supplies money to PRAC without dictating audit priorities, tangible welfare gains will depend on advocates' ability to steer PRAC's attention.

Indirect Effects Provision: FEHB Protection Act—tightening eligibility verification for federal employee dependents. Impact: Neutral Significance: Low Implications: No discernible link to farmed-animal issues.

Indirect Effects Provision: $100 million for OMB to locate "budget and accounting efficiencies." Impact: Neutral Significance: Low Implications: In theory, OMB reviews could touch USDA, FDA, or EPA accounts, but the text is wholly non-specific. No immediate animal-welfare consequences.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Submit formal requests to PRAC urging audits of pandemic-era payouts

to meat and egg producers; provide evidence of welfare violations, worker-safety problems, or environmental harms tied to those funds.
2. Monitor OMB's efficiency initiatives for any proposed cuts to USDA enforcement divisions (e.g., FSIS humane-handling activities) or, conversely, for opportunities to highlight cost savings from shifting subsidies toward plant-based or cultivated-protein research.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** No direct provisions on animal agriculture or alternative proteins appear in this section. The only meaningful—but still modest—lever for farmed-animal advocates is the additional PRAC funding, which could be used to scrutinize pandemic relief received by industrial animal operations. Otherwise, Subtitle B is administratively focused and largely neutral for farmed animals.

---

### 43. Title X Committee On The Judiciary

**SECTION SUMMARY** Title X creates or raises a wide range of immigration-related fees (asylum, parole, TPS, employment authorization, visas, etc.) and channels most of the revenue to DHS, DOJ, or the Treasury. It does not address agriculture, food systems, or animal welfare.

#### FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

**Indirect Effects – Farm-Labor Availability** **Provision:** Across §§ 100002-100017, the bill sharply increases application, parole, work-permit and other fees for asylum seekers, parolees, TPS holders, non-immigrants, and migrants apprehended at the border. **Impact:** Neutral–to–Slightly Negative for farmed animals (by reinforcing the status quo) **Significance:** Low **Implications:** • U.S. animal-agriculture relies heavily on immigrant labor (an estimated 50 %+ of dairy workers and a large share of slaughter/processing employees). Making legal status and work authorization costlier may deter or delay some workers. • In the short term this could tighten labor supply, but industrial operations can respond by: a) intensifying production pressures on remaining staff (often correlated with poorer on-farm animal-care oversight), or b) accelerating mechanization (e.g., larger rotary parlors, automated feeders) that may remove human observation and possibly reduce early detection of welfare problems. • Any overall contraction of the livestock workforce could modestly raise production costs, but the fee levels involved are small relative to farm-gate prices; major sectoral shifts are unlikely. • Plant-based and cultivated-protein companies also employ immigrant labor (especially in produce processing), so the effects are not uniquely targeted to animal agriculture.

**Economic & Trade Impacts** NO DIRECT PROVISIONS IDENTIFIED

**Farmed Animal Welfare & Protection** NO DIRECT PROVISIONS IDENTIFIED

**Agricultural Systems & Food Production** NO DIRECT PROVISIONS IDENTIFIED

**Regulatory & Enforcement** NO DIRECT PROVISIONS IDENTIFIED

**Research & Innovation** NO DIRECT PROVISIONS IDENTIFIED

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor downstream labor trends in slaughterhouses and CAFOs; if staffing shortages cause documented welfare lapses, use the evidence to press for stronger enforcement or transitions to higher-welfare or plant-based systems.
2. Build alliances with immigrant-worker justice groups; supporting humane labor standards strengthens the credibility of farm-animal advocates and can create joint pressure on industrial animal operations.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** Title X is largely an immigration-fee package with minimal, indirect relevance to farmed-animal issues. It neither advances nor rolls back animal-welfare law, subsidies, research, or environmental rules. Any impact would come indirectly through changes in immigrant labor availability, which is likely marginal relative to other structural drivers in animal agriculture.

---

### 44. Title X - Subtitle A Immigration And Law Enforcement Matters - Part 2 Appropriations

**SECTION SUMMARY** This section of H.R. 1 is a large, immigration- and law-enforcement-focused supplemental appropriation. It injects roughly $45 billion into the Department of Homeland Security (CBP, ICE, Secret Service, Federal Law-Enforcement Training Centers), Department of Justice (EOIR, BOP, grant programs, litigation), and related entities for FY 2025–2029. No language refers to agriculture, food policy, or animal welfare.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** Indirect Effects Provision: Overall expansion of immigration-enforcement funding (hiring 20,000-plus new DHS/ICE staff; large removal-operations budgets; State-and-local cooperation incentives). Impact: Neutral → Potentially Negative for farmed animals (via worker shortages) Significance: Low Implications: Roughly half the U.S. livestock-processing and dairy labor force is composed of recent immigrants, many undocumented. Stepped-up enforcement could (1) tighten labor supply,

raise costs, and slightly reduce overall output of some animal products, or (2) intensify pressure on remaining workers, increasing line-speeds and decreasing oversight—both scenarios with uncertain but potentially adverse welfare outcomes. Advocates may wish to monitor plant closure/automation claims made by industry as enforcement ramps up.

Provision: $5 billion for Bureau of Prisons, including facility upgrades and new programs. Historically, several BOP and State prisons operate "prison farms" that raise cattle, pigs, and chickens for institutional food service or sale. Impact: Potentially Negative Significance: Low Implications: Additional staffing and infrastructure funds could allow expansion or modernization of prison-run agricultural operations. Because these programs are largely exempt from external welfare auditing, an expansion could lock in low-welfare practices unless advocates press for transparent standards.

NO other direct references to farmed-animal welfare, agricultural subsidies, research, environmental regulation, or food programs were identified.

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Monitor ICE/BOP rulemakings and budget justifications for references to food-service or prison-farm expansion; seek inclusion of third-party welfare certifications if agricultural programs grow.
2. Track any meat-industry lobbying that links labor shortages to requests for relaxed line-speed or inspection rules; prepare counter-analysis emphasizing worker and animal-welfare safeguards.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This portion of H.R. 1 is primarily an immigration-enforcement spending package. It contains no explicit provisions on animal agriculture, welfare standards, or alternative proteins. Only minor, indirect impacts—immigrant labor availability for factory farms and potential prison-farm expansion—appear relevant, and both are speculative and low-significance at this stage.

---

### 45. Title X - Subtitle B Judiciary Matters

**SECTION SUMMARY** Subtitle B—Judiciary Matters provides new, targeted appropriations (FY 2025-2028) to two judiciary entities: (1) the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AO) to collect and publish data on court orders granting "non-party relief" (e.g., nationwide injunctions) against the federal government, and (2) the Federal Judicial Center (FJC) to train judicial personnel that such relief purportedly lacks statutory or constitutional basis and to develop strategies for "mitigating" its fiscal impact.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**Regulatory & Enforcement / Indirect Effects** **Provision:** $1.25 million per year to the AO to analyze, track, and publicly report on preliminary injunctions and temporary restraining orders that provide non-party (nationwide) relief against the federal government, including their "aggregate cost impact." **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** Medium **Implications:** • Animal-protection lawsuits frequently seek nationwide injunctions to halt or delay harmful USDA, FDA, or EPA rules (e.g., poultry line-speed waivers, weakened organic-livestock standards, reduced Clean Water Act protections for CAFO discharges). • Codifying a separate tracking system for these orders and emphasizing their taxpayer "cost" can politically stigmatize such relief and furnish opponents of public-interest litigation—animal advocacy included—with data to argue for statutory limits. • Advocates may face greater judicial skepticism or added procedural hurdles when requesting broad injunctive relief that protects farmed animals or the environment.

**Regulatory & Enforcement / Research & Innovation (Judicial)** **Provision:** $1 million per year to the FJC for judicial training programs that emphasize "the absence of constitutional and statutory authority" for non-party relief and teach "strategic approaches for mitigating" its fiscal impact. **Impact:** Negative **Significance:** High **Implications:** • Embedding this viewpoint in official FJC curricula risks normalizing a narrow reading of courts' equitable powers. Federal judges and clerks may become less willing to grant nationwide or system-wide injunctions that benefit farmed animals (e.g., stopping USDA from issuing illegal slaughter inspection rules across all plants). • Could chill future litigation strategies that rely on broad relief, pushing advocates toward piecemeal, plant-by-plant suits—slower, costlier, and less protective for animals. • Potentially undermines a key enforcement tool when agency rulemaking violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, or the Animal Welfare Act.

## ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Lobby for amendment or removal of language that presumes lack of authority for nationwide injunctions; at minimum, seek balanced FJC curricula that include precedent supporting such relief.
2. Develop alternative litigation frameworks (e.g., class actions, declaratory judgments, state-level claims) and contingency plans if nationwide injunctions become harder to secure.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** While this subtitle does not address agriculture directly, it meaningfully threatens a core mechanism—federal public-interest litigation—that animal advocates use to curb harmful USDA, FDA, and EPA actions affecting hundreds of millions of farmed animals. The training and data-collection directives could tilt judicial attitudes against nationwide relief, making this section relevant and potentially damaging to farmed-animal protection efforts.

---

### 46. Title X - Subtitle C Radiation Exposure Compensation Matters

**SECTION SUMMARY** This subtitle amends and extends the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA) to keep the compensation fund open through 2028, expand eligibility, and adjust payment amounts for people harmed by atmospheric nuclear testing, uranium mining, and Manhattan-Project waste.

**FARMED ANIMAL IMPACT ANALYSIS** NO FARMED ANIMAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

(The subtitle exclusively concerns human health compensation and does not create, modify, or repeal any provisions related to farmed animals, animal agriculture, food production, or related regulatory frameworks. At most, the lands referenced in uranium-mining or Manhattan-Project waste areas may overlap with rangeland, but the bill provides no environmental remediation or livestock-specific measures. Therefore any effect on farmed animals is indirect, speculative, and outside the scope of this analysis.)

**ADVOCACY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. No immediate action is required from farmed-animal or plant-based advocates on this subtitle.
2. If advocates maintain environmental justice alliances, they may wish to monitor future legislation that addresses cleanup of contaminated sites, which could eventually intersect with livestock or land-use issues.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT** This section of H.R. 1 is not material to farmed-animal welfare or plant-based food systems.

---