

PURPOSE OF FARM BUREAU

Farm Bureau is an independent, non-governmental, voluntary organization of farm and ranch families united for the purpose of analyzing their problems and formulating action to achieve educational improvement, economic opportunity and social advancement and thereby to promote the national well-being.

Farm Bureau is local, county, state, national and international in its scope and influence and is non-partisan, non-sectarian and non-secret in character. Farm Bureau is the voice of agricultural producers at all levels. Farm Bureau, as a matter of principle and policy, will diligently work uniting divergent commodity interests.

FARM BUREAU BELIEFS

America's unparalleled progress is based on freedom and dignity of the individual, sustained by basic moral and religious concepts.

Economic progress, cultural advancement, ethical and religious principles flourish best where people are free, responsible individuals.

Individual freedom and opportunity must not be sacrificed in a quest for guaranteed "security."

We believe in government by legislative and constitutional law, impartially administered, without special privilege.

We believe in the representative form of government, a republic as provided in our Constitution, in limitations on government power, in maintenance of equal opportunity, in the right of each individual to freedom of worship and in freedom of speech, press and peaceful assembly.

Individuals have a moral responsibility to help preserve freedom for future generations by participating in public affairs and by helping to elect candidates who share their fundamental beliefs and principles.

People have the right and the responsibility to speak for themselves individually or through organizations of their choice without coercion or government intervention.

Property rights are among the human rights essential to the preservation of individual freedom.

We believe in the right of every person to choose an occupation; to be rewarded according to his/her contribution to society; to save, invest or spend; and to convey his/her property to heirs. Each person has the responsibility to meet financial obligations incurred.

We believe that legislation and regulation favorable to all sectors of agriculture should be aggressively developed in cooperation with allied groups possessing common goals.

We support the right of private organizations to require membership as a prerequisite for member services.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Preservation of Agricultural Land:

We support preservation of agricultural land, both as a means of preserving the character of our communities and of continued local production of food, fiber and ornamentals, but not against the will of, or at the expense of, the property owner.

We support the concept of transferable development rights as a means of preserving agricultural use of agricultural land, on condition of appropriate compensation to and voluntary agreement by the property owner.

Furthermore, we should investigate the possibility of transferring state or federal lands to the owner of agricultural land, for an in kind trade of development rights. The owner of agricultural land would then be able to sell or develop this land for monetary reimbursement of their agricultural ground development rights. (2011)

Notification of Adjacent Agricultural Use:

We support a notification process in future zoning cases throughout Arizona requiring all new development and businesses to acknowledge current and historical farming and ranching practices adjacent to their proposed new businesses and subdivisions. And further recommend stipulations be addressed in these zoning cases to notify, as a step in closing escrow notification, all prospective home buyers and businesses of the continuing agricultural uses.

We support the distribution of “The Code of the West” publications (rules for rural living) through city and county offices as a teaching aid for people transitioning from urban to rural settings. (2010)

Land Use Planning:

We urge farmers to become involved in all phases of land use planning, including zoning and regional comprehensive land use planning meetings.

No zoning regulation or ordinance should be adopted or amended by any agency or political subdivision without formal and adequate notice to all affected owners of real property or other private property right who, upon receiving such notice, should have ample opportunity to appear directly or through chosen representatives before the agency or governing body.

The definition of agricultural status on private land for zoning, tax or other purposes should be consistent between the state, counties and cities/towns. When inconsistencies occur, state law should supersede county law, and county law should supersede city law.

Local government should assess the impact that development puts on an existing business. If the existing business is forced to move due to re-zoning or an additional regulatory burden, the government entity should pay the cost of relocation.

Those who own or operate land have the major responsibility for its development. We believe that land use planning can best be accomplished at the local level of government and by private landowners. We urge all farmers and ranchers to become involved in land use planning processes currently undertaken by the U.S. Forest Service and other federal and state agencies.

Land use planning should provide for the utilization of land resources and the environment in a manner that will preserve and protect these resources while meeting the needs of our people.

Careful consideration should be given to the proposals to retain prime agricultural land in production of food, fiber and ornamentals.

Federal legislation for state land use planning should be limited to financial assistance to encourage state planning and funds available to the state under such a program should not be withheld as a weapon to enforce compliance with federal standards.

We oppose legislation which would authorize or permit federal agencies to make direct management decisions in the field of private land utilization, or to prescribe the contents of, or to judge the adequacy of state land use plans.

We recommend that zoning ordinances reflect the effects of general agricultural practices by precluding the building of new public facilities in active agricultural areas which would restrict agricultural activities on adjacent property except after location of such facility has been determined by public participation.

We encourage cities and towns to provide streamlined permitting and financial incentives for development of empty lots and economically depressed areas to encourage infill.

Municipalities and county governments should discourage unregulated lot splits within city and county planning areas. There should be cooperation between cities and counties regarding planning and zoning regulations.

We support the provisions in the Growing Smarter Act which states that a county shall not designate private or state land as open space, recreation, conservation or agriculture unless the county receives the written consent of the landowner or provides alternative, economically viable designation in the general plan or zoning ordinance, allowing at least one residential dwelling per acre.

We support legislation to prohibit government entities from developing land use plans that limit or deny an individual's private property rights and enforcing this prohibition through strict monetary penalties or fines on the governmental entity for non-compliance and the award of attorney's fees and other expenses to the landowner adversely affected. (2011)

Zoning and Subdivision Permits:

We believe that a property owner should not be coerced into giving up real property without fair compensation as a condition precedent to obtaining zoning changes, i.e. subdivision lot tie or lot split, special use and building and other permits. (2010)

Zoning Use By Right:

In counties where urban-rural conflicts exist or are emerging, zoning regulations should contain language that specifies uses-by-right for farms, ranches and equine properties. County Farm Bureaus should participate in developing the uses by right to assure that the regulations are reasonable and allow for the full use of rural properties. (2009)

Reservation Expansion:

We oppose the expansion of any current Native American reservation. We are also opposed to the creation of any new reservations. If the Native American tribes purchase land they must continue paying the property taxes. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Natural Resource Conservation Districts:

Candidates for Supervisor in a Natural Resource Conservation District shall be of legal voting age, an owner or partner in a farm or ranch operation within the boundaries of the district.

The criteria for approval of conservation projects funded through Natural Resource Conservation Districts should consider a balance of factors, not just environmental impacts. These factors include: conservation, economic, management, environmental and production impacts. Control of decision making concerning project funding, should remain at the local level to facilitate reasonable consideration of all projects, a project's priority, the resources affected and the benefits of a project.

We support NRCS Cost Share Funding qualifications being changed to a minimum of 20 acres or \$15,000 gross agricultural income.

We encourage Farm Bureau members to participate on Natural Resource Conservation District (NRCD) boards and we support full state funding for the NRCDs and NRCD Education Resource Centers. (2011)

Disclosure by Realtors:

There should be a provision in the application section of the real estate code requiring positive disclosure by the real estate subdeveloper of the close proximity of agricultural activity and acceptance of agricultural activity by the buyer. (2010)

Right to Farm and Ranch:

We support the producer's right to farm or ranch by being able to carry on normal agricultural practices and to be free from environmental regulations that are not based on sound scientific facts and are not economically feasible and/or not proportionately beneficial to the implementation cost.

We support establishing local ordinances protecting the producer's right to farm or ranch and freely market their products in and near municipalities.

We oppose any local ordinance that hinders a producer's right to farm or ranch for any reason or places upon any agricultural land operator undue burdens to maintain or clean easements and/or rights of way belonging to any local municipalities. We encourage Farm Bureau to work to change any ordinance that imposes undue restrictions on normal agricultural practices or any undue burdens on farmers, ranchers or agricultural land owners.

We support notification on deeds that inform any new owners of land or developments of existing agricultural operations and related practices and their right to continue such practices until that land is developed as well.

In the event that any agricultural practices are limited, taken away or any undue burdens are put on an agricultural operation, we believe that this constitutes the taking of property without due compensation. (2011)

Property Rights:

We affirm in the strongest language possible our belief in the constitutional right to private property ownership and to protect those rights.

We support the right of farmers and ranchers to hold on to their rights to own and use private property. We support legislation which affirms those rights.

Government entities should be required to perform an economic impact analysis before adopting new regulations or taking a government action that may result in a taking of private property such as open space or greenbelt requirements. We urge legislative bodies and the courts to recognize the reality and disastrous effects of partial takings through regulatory actions. We urge a national recognition that partial takings should be compensated.

We support a policy of no net loss of private lands in Arizona and of not having private lands removed from the property tax rolls. **WE SUPPORT LEGISLATION THAT REQUIRES THE CONSENT OF THE ARIZONA LEGISLATURE BEFORE ANY MORE PRIVATE PROPERTY IS TRANSFERRED INTO FEDERAL OR STATE OWNERSHIP.**

We strongly believe private landowners forced to provide certain riparian habitat, aesthetic views, wetlands, critical habitat and other costly management procedures on **ENTITIES/** lands near federal or state **parks and other wildlife areas LANDS** should either have that land purchased at fair market value by the agency requiring the restriction or be quickly and fully compensated for all expenses and/or loss of the use of said land, **WHICHEVER THE PRIVATE LANDOWNER PREFERS.**

~~We strongly support and will defend the Private Property Protection Act of 1992.~~ We consider public land leases and grazing permits to be private property duly worked and paid for. Any law change that would devalue these leases or permits is considered taking of private property.

We oppose any legislation that would allow public access to or through private property without permission of the property owner or authorized agent. We support legislation that requires government officials to notify property owners and obtain permission before going onto private property.

We oppose action by government agencies, acting individually or collectively, which would result in:

1. Involuntary net loss of private land in any state; and
2. Action that would increase the amount of land which is exempt from state and local laws and property taxes.

We call for review of all government regulations that encroach on the rights of property owners. We urge amendment or deletion of statutes or regulations that allow government agencies, either on their own determination or in collusion with other government agencies, to establish rules of control which interfere with individual property rights. Members or employees of government agencies acting outside the scope of their authority or in violation of the constitution should be held personally liable, either civilly or criminally, for any damage that might occur.

We should continue our effort to protect private property rights and the rights of those own land, timber or other valuable considerations associated with land ownership.

We believe that any action by government that diminishes an owner's right to use this property, including buffer strips, easements and viewsheds, constitutes a taking of that owner's property. Therefore, government should provide due process and compensation to the exact degree that an owner's right to use this property has been diminished by government action. Compensation will be paid from the budget of the specific agency responsible for the restriction on the right of an owner to use his property. We recommend legislation, which provides maximum protection through compensation when government projects devalue adjoining private property. Furthermore, we believe that the just basis for compensation in such cases is fair market value or the economic loss to the landowner.

We oppose any government action that will abridge people's right to use their property for legitimate purposes unless there is full and equitable compensation for the reduction in the use of property. Partial taking of the property shall be prohibited unless compensation is made for reduction in the value of the total property.

We oppose the taking of property for hike or bike trails through the power of eminent domain. Property shall be acquired for such purposes through mutual agreement between the property owner and the governmental entity and other organizations.

If a government agency or other organization establishes a hike or bike trail, it shall ensure protection of adjoining landowners by providing adequate fencing and protection from liability issues related to the use of such facilities.

We believe that businesses, industries and farmers who have to expend sums of money to prove they are meeting environmental regulations should be reimbursed their expenditures if they are meeting the requirements before the government agency questioned their performance.

When regulations or legislation regarding rare, threatened or endangered species, or environmental restrictions alter agricultural practices, agricultural producers should be compensated for the cost of these altered agricultural practices.

We support legislation that would protect innocent private property owners from property confiscation in the event that illegal substances are found, stored or growing on private property without the landowner's knowledge or consent. (2012)

Agricultural Protection Act:

Farm Bureau supports the Arizona Department of Agriculture in its efforts to obtain monies from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the State Parks Board and other sources to fund the Arizona Agricultural Protection Act and commission. (2010)

Improvement Districts:

We oppose municipal improvement districts, which place the burden of improvements on farmland. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Trespass Laws:

We support laws that hold property owners harmless of consequences of trespassing by others. Individuals who trespass should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

We oppose cross-country vehicular travel by trespassers. Fire fighting companies should not trespass on private property without permission from the landowner unless it is to stop a fire that is life threatening or that involves any dwelling or permanent structure.

Recognizing the expense and continuing maintenance cost of current posting requirements of A.R.S. 17-304, we support eliminating the ¼ mile property boundary posting but believe the posting of our property corners and points of entry should serve as sufficient legal notification. (2011)

Eminent Domain Condemnations:

We oppose the use of eminent domain to condemn property in a manner inconsistent with the Constitution of the State of Arizona for redevelopment purposes.

Eminent domain should not be used to take private property when the property ultimately winds up in the private hands. Increased tax revenue should not be used as definition of "public use" or "public benefit" under the powers of eminent domain.

We oppose the use of condemnation authority by government entities and electrical/water utilities to acquire water rights from private entities. (2008)

Mineral Rights:

If separate ownership of mineral rights exists, we favor legislation that mandates the return of those mineral rights to the land parcel, unless the owner of the mineral rights renews them every ten years. (2009)

Condemned Property:

The taking of property or easements from property owners should be permitted only for a public purpose when there is a clearcut need for the betterment of the public good and the completion of the project is guaranteed. In cases where private property is taken, we support prompt, just and fair market compensation. Any person owning property which is obtained by any governmental agency through condemnation procedures or by zoning regulation actions should have the options of being monetarily compensated or be offered an exchange of public property of equal value in another area of the county or state.

We further recommend, when parts of a parcel of land are seized through eminent domain, that not only the value of the part taken be considered for compensation, but also what future effect the taking will have on the entire parcel including future farming operations that may be hampered or permanently interrupted by dissecting fields into smaller and in some cases, unusable tracts.

Current landowners of properties, which include banks and beds to navigable streams, should be compensated by the state if the state claims title to such land.

If a municipality sells a condemned piece of land and a profit is incurred, the profit will be reimbursed to the owner of the property when it was condemned. (2010)

Flood Plain Condemnation:

We are opposed to condemnation of land and buildings and their uses, considered to be in a hypothetical one hundred year flood plain as declared by the Arizona Department of Water

Resources, Flood Plain Division, and/or any county flood control district, without due consideration of public opinion and past history of the communities affected.

We oppose the classification of property into a flood plain without notification of the property owner and an opportunity to dispute the classification. (2009)

Flood Plain Designation:

Designation of a flood plain, floodway, conveyance channel, or the establishment of any maps or narratives affecting private property should immediately be deemed a “taking” of the affected property and full and adequate compensation should be paid for all such takings and for all other detriments caused by such designations. (2011)

Annexation:

We oppose cities and towns dropping annexation signature requirements in areas adjacent to cities and towns.

We oppose cities regulating land outside their legal boundaries. This includes the use of eminent domain in all water transfer matters.

Involuntary annexation by a municipality should not impose a burden on existing agricultural activities or reduce the level of services received at the time of annexation, such as road maintenance. The failure of a municipality to provide full services, i.e. water, sewer and road maintenance, within 24 months will give the landowner the option to select de-annexation. Upon annexation, any governmental entity should not be allowed to change zoning on any annexed property without the landowner’s written consent.

If a municipality violates a landowner’s rights in a zoning or annexation proceeding, that municipality should pay the legal costs incurred by the landowner to protect his or her rights **EVEN IF THE MUNICIPALITY STOPS THE PROCEEDING.**

We oppose allowing cities and towns to buy state owned land at the appraised value without the currently required public auction.

We shall seek legislation to provide reasonable restrictions on cities and towns regarding annexation of government owned lands. Reasonable restrictions could include such things as requiring verifiable consent of a majority of the adjoining and nearby private property landowners, and allowing annexation of government land only if it is less than two miles distant from the nearest private land which is already included in the city or town.

Annexations made since January 1, 2000 of large expanses of government lands should be retroactively subject to ratification by adjacent and nearby private property owners. If the involved cities or towns fail to prove verifiable consent by a majority of such landowners within nine months of the law’s passage the annexation should be automatically reversed. (2012)

Airports and Military Air Bases:

We recognize the major impact of municipal airports and military air bases on the economies of cities, counties and the state of Arizona. We support the concept of governmental entities leasing the development rights of the properties negatively affected by the noise contours surrounding airports and air bases. A reasonable lease based on the value differential of farm lands and development lands would reduce the likelihood of continued development of lands affected by

airports and bases, ease the burden of landholders around the airports and bases who currently are forced to absorb the financial obligation of protecting them and reduce the potential of federal lawsuits, a major factor leading to airport and air base closures. There should be no restrictions on use of private property around military air bases without compensation at fair market value.

We support formation of agriculture preservation districts to prevent development of lands affected by airports and air bases. We support local, state and federal appropriations, to compensate landowners in agriculture preservation districts for lease or purchase of their development rights or purchase of land. (2010)

Multiple Use of Public Lands:

Urban Americans are pressing the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to meet their demands for increased recreation areas and facilities. These demands have complicated orderly multiple use management and production. Arizona is encouraged to enter into a “Section 8 Memorandum of Understanding” with the Bureau of Land Management State Director and the Regional Forester.

The U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management are urged to explain the benefits of domestic livestock production on U.S. Forest Service lands and Bureau of Land Management through their public education program.

The philosophy of multiple use management i.e. grazing, mining, forest and recreation use should be adhered to, therefore, the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management are required to seek input and incorporate the grazing industry’s needs when considering the demands of other, possibly conflicting, uses.

We support the protection of the historical sheep driveways in Arizona as they are presently used.

We oppose multiple designations of public lands such as wilderness, riparian, wild and scenic and critical habitat.

We oppose any new wilderness, national park or national monument designations.

We oppose the shift of rural lands from private ownership to public ownership for single use status because such shifts increase the tax burden on remaining property owners. We further oppose the transfer of public land from multiple use status to single use status when such transfers directly affect the integrity of the permittee’s ranching operations.

Groups purchasing property for the purpose of conservation and protection shall be required to pay property taxes on land they own. These groups should be prohibited from selling such land to the government for a profit.

Private lands taken from the property tax rolls shall be required to pay an in lieu tax equal to the tax on comparable property.

Acquisition of land by government entities should result in no net loss of private lands or tax base.

We support no net loss of private property in the State of Arizona to federal, state, county or municipal ownership. If a government entity or agency wants to purchase private property they must sell other property at equal value that supports the tax base.

We support the concept of permittee ownership of improvements on all public lands. If it becomes public policy to remove grazing from public lands, then compensation to lease holders should cover improvements and lease purchase cost. The compensation of lease purchase cost should be based on the value of the lease at the time of purchase or at the time of the public policy change, whichever is highest. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Closure Of The Telegraph Pass Hiking Trail/ Road To Public Access:

We oppose the closure of the Telegraph Pass hiking trail/road to public access. This hiking trail is only one of a few mountain trails in Yuma County. The hiking trail/road is used daily by locals, visitors and the military as a means of exercise and training for hiking trips in other parts of our state. Instead of spending the money to install a 6' fence to close off the area, we propose that the money be spent to make the area safer. Closing off the crossover that is used for u-turns and adding a parking area and a pull on lane at the Telegraph turnout could accomplish this. This would be beneficial not just to hikers, but people who service and repair the towers on top of the mountain. (2008)

Forest Management:

We support the Healthy Forest Initiative of the Department of Interior and U.S. Department of Agriculture and call for reintroduction of logging and other forest industries. We support range management practices, which advocate controlled burning and thinning.

We recommend the return of our western forests to their pre-settlement era tree and shrub densities. The unnaturally high tree and shrub densities caused by bans on logging, grazing, as well as restrictions placed on controlled burns, has led to the reduction of herbaceous grass in our forest. This unnatural change in the forest has led to decreased feed for herbivores, decreased water runoff in times of normal precipitation, and severe flooding in years that have above normal precipitation. The loss of herbaceous grasses due to unnaturally high tree and shrub densities, has led to the destruction of riparian habitat and the loss of valuable water in the arid west. The practices of logging, thinning, and grazing should be expedited as soon as possible to reverse the devastation that has occurred.

We support streamlining the process to do controlled burns for fire suppression and prevention.

The mismanagement of the western forest by the U.S. Forest Service, BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has reached epidemic and catastrophic proportions. Raging wildfires, disease and insect infestations brought on by unnaturally high tree and shrub densities are killing millions of trees in the western states. Using existing scientific studies, the management of our forestlands needs to be reviewed to identify the barriers to proper management of our western forest. Immediate action needs to be taken to remove these barriers. One of those barriers has been the unending barrage of frivolous lawsuits brought by different organizations. Our forest management agencies do not have adequate funding to challenge the lawsuits brought forth by these groups. Because of this lack of funding, these agencies acquiesce to the demands made in these lawsuits to avoid eroding their operating budgets. We support a ban on these frivolous lawsuits. We support a separate operating budget to address these lawsuits

and recommend that the attorney general in the states sue the appropriate agency for gross negligence to recover:

1. The monies expended to fight the forest fires caused by improper management.
2. The lost value of our timber resources resulting from the devastating infestation of the European pine bark beetle. (2010)

Grazing Permits:

We oppose any federal buyout program or any permanent retirement of a grazing permit. We recommend that the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and other federal or state agencies be required, when making decisions regarding the administration of grazing permits to:

1. Cooperate in a timely manner with permittees;
2. Use proven and accepted scientific analysis methods;
3. Use prior and concurrent consultations with credible third parties;
4. Evaluate and make decisions on an allotment by allotment basis; and
5. Make specific resource driven recommendations to the Arizona Game and Fish Department regarding game management on the forest.

WE SUPPORT AN INCREASE IN LENGTH OF THE TERM OF THE LEASES FOR RANCHERS ON BLM, FOREST SERVICE AND STATE LANDS AND CONTRACTS THAT PROVIDE GREATER PROTECTION FOR THE RANCHERS AS LESSEES.

WE SUPPORT S. 1129, THE GRAZING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011. (2012)

State Trust Lands:

Sale of state trust land should be done with full consideration for all economic impacts of the development, such as water supply, roads, schools and other infrastructure.

We recommend that Arizona continue using the current grazing fee schedule. Due to the increasing incidence of gates left open and cut fences, farmers and ranchers are often faced with serious disruption of their operation and increased expenses. We recommend Arizona strictly enforce its current laws and regulations pertaining to state owned land, destruction of lease improvements, theft, licensing and permitting.

We request that the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, State Land Department, Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service inform other public land users, and the public in general, of the law.

We recommend that there be equal representation of stakeholders on the Governor's State Land Committee. (2011)

Fair Market Value on State Land:

Improvements on state lease land should be valued at current replacement value upon sale, transfer, condemnation or reclassification of the state lease land. In the event that state land is being condemned or reclassified with no buyer, the lessee should be compensated by the State Land Department. (2008)

State Land Exchanges:

We strongly support a constitutional amendment that will allow the exchange of state trust lands. Notification of bordering property owners of both parcels involved in the exchange shall be required. Public hearings in accordance with ARS 9-462.04 shall be held so bordering property owners can have input. We strongly encourage this process be used to acquire private buffer zone lands around military facilities. (2009)

State Land Leases:

We support the mission of the State Land Department given by the state's Enabling Act and Constitution that requires trust land to be managed for the benefit of the trust and its beneficiaries. We support the mission of State Trust Lands to maximize value and income for the beneficiaries, primarily the common trust, or K-12 education. We also recognize that in the interest of reform, in order to improve our methods of realizing top value for path-of-progress state lands, the public may also wish some limited set aside of lands from permanent development. We support this concept as long as these lands continue to be available for leases, assuming they have income potential, and as long as current uses may continue.

We support the State Land Department in its efforts to maintain long-term income and stability to the school trust fund through state land leases. We also support the State Land Department's requirement for new lessees to maintain and continue the intended use of the lease to benefit the trust and long-term stewardship of the land.

We support the lengthening of term grazing limits in Arizona to 30 years.

We support protecting the improvement investments on lease holds of public and state lands.

We oppose any process which allows the fragmentation or "cherry picking" of state land parcels from within a ranching unit or agricultural lease which would result in a devaluation of the total ranching unit or agriculture operation and the loss of long term revenue to the state school trust.

All leases of state land should provide for their preferential right of renewal, as provided in the Enabling Act, by current lessees, if they are in compliance with the provisions of the lease. Value and stewardship of land assets are enhanced when leaseholders have tenure. We strongly support this concept of stewardship in the leasing of our state lands.

We support reimbursement by plaintiffs for economic losses incurred by lessees of state land due to litigation by plaintiffs challenging state land agency actions on state trust land leases or other state land leases.

We support a cash bond being provided by the plaintiff equal to the full cash value of the permit when lawsuits are filed against a permittee and/or the managing land agency to reimburse lessees for loss of production and legal costs associated with legal actions pertaining to their state land leases.

We strongly recommend that the Arizona State Land Department institute a comprehensive program to evaluate agricultural/grazing leases on a fair and equitable basis for the welfare of both the state and the lessee. The cost of improvements on state leases should be weighed out so that the lessee is acknowledged financially as a major contributing factor toward making the land economically viable.

We support the current Administration and Management Discount Program in place by the Arizona State Land Department that is made available to lessees.

We are opposed to the Arizona State Land Department changing the lease classification without compensating the lessee for improvements. (2011)

State Farm Land Leases:

If state land, leased for agriculture other than grazing, is required to go to public auction, there should be no minimum bid requirement. (2008)

Fire Control:

We propose that in the interest of economy, and for the betterment of our public lands, that the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management suspend all fire fighting activities on the public lands except where human lives, homes, investment or commercial timber is at stake.

We support the use of controlled and prescribed burns as management tools where applicable. The agency should be able to use the wild fire funds if the burn goes out of control.

We support the use of grazing as a fire prevention tool on public lands. (2011)

Clean Up Public Lands:

We urge the agencies in charge of public or trust lands to clean up trash dumped on their lands and to maintain policies in management to discourage future dumping of trash on public lands not designated for trash dumping.

We urge the agencies in charge of public or trust lands along with local law enforcement agencies to remove any and all illegal inhabitants of their land that are trashing, destroying or otherwise not taking proper care of the land.

Farm Bureau urges municipalities to provide dumpsters or other large trash receptacles for use by residents, as means to help curb illegal dumping on public lands, farms or ranch lands. (2009)

State Sovereignty Over Public Lands:

We believe the federal government should acknowledge that Arizona has had ownership of all non-private lands within the state's boundaries since statehood. Therefore, we support efforts to establish state sovereignty over public domain land including Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service land. (2011)

Federal Land:

We oppose the establishment of a Sonoran Desert National Park, which would combine the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range, the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, and the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument into one huge national park.

[We oppose the expansion of the Walnut Canyon National Monument. The proposal, which covers more than 3,000 square miles, negatively impacts private land and recreational uses.](#)

Any proposed restrictions to use of or access to federal land should require approval by congress and passage, by majority vote, in a general election by each county(s) and the state where the land is located.

We believe the threat of litigation should not deter agencies from their current mission and mandate.

We support the sale of federal government lands to private entities. This would increase the tax base and increase revenues locally, state and nationally. **THOSE HOLDING ALLOTMENTS AND PERMITS SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.**

We oppose federal land grabbing including any additional designation, by executive order or other federal action that would restrict lands within the state of Arizona. **(2012)**

Public Land Access:

When public lands have had a history of being accessed for public use, and access through private property becomes closed, then the agency responsible for those public lands shall obtain where possible, and maintain an access to that property across public land. We oppose excessive fee increases for equine uses on federal, state and county lands. (2010)

Vehicle Barrier Fence At The Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument:

~~We support the continued building of the vehicle barrier fence on the Mexico border at the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument. The vehicle barrier fence is helping to protect the environment of the national monument from border crossers. In addition visitors are more willing to visit the monument because of the vehicle barrier fence.~~ **(INCORPORATED INTO "U.S. / MEXICO BORDER SECURITY POLICY")**

Off-Road Vehicles:

Section R12-4-13 of the state regulations on posting and access of state lands paragraph "F," now reads: "It shall be unlawful to utilize vehicular travel on state lands except: 1. On existing roads, 2. Pick up legally killed big game animals, 3. By lessee and permittee of the State Land Department acting within the limits of their permits and public employees acting in the scope of their duties."

We recommend that no special permits should be granted for recreational off-road vehicular use without the permission of the lessee involved.

We will seek the support of all parties interested in conservation of our public and private lands to require manufacturers and advertisers of off-road vehicles to provide programs, which will educate the users of such vehicles as to their damage to the environment and how to minimize such damage. We recommend land agencies make available to the public a map of specific roads for recreational use. (2010)

Legal Access:

The Arizona Department of Real Estate maintains that for sales purposes legal access to private lands must be by recorded easement or dedication. The Arizona Game and Fish Commission claims that any prior public use of a roadway across private lands constitutes legal access. Clarification of legal access for all purposes is needed to prevent serious trouble between landowners, sportsmen and recreationalists. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

Fencing Notices:

We oppose any changes in the current Arizona fence out laws. The urbanization of grazing land presents significant livestock management problems. We recommend that the "Subdivision Public Reports" issued by the Arizona Department of Real Estate for distribution to prospective

property purchasers include a statement of the law putting buyers on notice that the burden of “fencing out livestock” in fence out areas is on the property owner. We believe the fence out law does not require the livestock owner to provide an ordinary duty of care to a motorist or any other persons encountering his livestock. Further, we support legislation to clarify and strengthen the fence out law. (2011)

Wildlife Management:

We endorse and support those programs of wildlife harvest and population control which experience has proven beneficial to the maintenance of balanced range use by both domestic and wild animals. We support trapping on public and private lands for wildlife harvesting for fur and meat purposes, as well as population control and animal damage control.

We oppose the passage of any proposition pertaining to Wildlife management that would prohibit the taking of wildlife on public lands.

Excessive populations of wildlife may be destructive to wildlife habitat, cultivated farmland, rangeland and domestic livestock.

We urge the Arizona Game and Fish Commission to stabilize and maintain elk populations at levels compatible with multiple use and sustained yield principles. The program should be acceptable to range resource managers including host federal agencies, the Arizona Land Department and private farmland and rangeland owners. Such action is necessary for resource management, land use equity and the reduction of depredation on private lands.

WE OPPOSE THE STATE WILDLIFE ACTION PLAN BY THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT. IT NEEDS TO BE REWRITTEN USING PEER-REVIEWED SCIENCE WITH RESPECT TO LIVESTOCK GRAZING.

We believe the Arizona Game and Fish Department needs to coordinate hunting seasons to prevent constant, continuous and conflicting hunts for areas and/or animals.

We strongly support private property rights, therefore when elk are on private land, the property owner has the right to take action to protect his or her property and interests.

Where elk depredation exists resulting in economic impacts on private lands, we urge the adoption of legislation enabling aggrieved farmers and ranchers to recover reasonable reparations for damages and providing farmers and ranchers with a means of requiring the Arizona Game and Fish Commission to take preventative actions, remove offending animals and pay damages. Uncontrolled populations of predators, certain rodents and birds continue to inflict unnecessary losses on domestic livestock, game animals and agricultural crops. As Arizona is dominated by federal and state land ownership; we urge our elected state and federal representatives to provide state funds and increased federal funding to levels necessary to maintain an effective animal damage control program within the wildlife services budget under the USDA.

We favor resource-based management of wildlife. Farm and ranch land should be protected through accurate counting and corresponding harvest ratios that effectively manage wildlife. Depredation hunts should be implemented to maintain proper balance.

The Arizona Game and Fish Commission shall exterminate any predator after the first incident where human safety is jeopardized and adhere to and enforce the state livestock killer law, ARS 17-302.

We specifically support the right of producers to protect their property from depredation by stock killing predators as administered by the Animal Services Division of the Department of Agriculture and protect private property, crops and pasture, without fear of reprisal, from the Game and Fish Department or any other law enforcement agency. The private landowner or the Game and Fish Department should immediately deal with any wildlife exhibiting aggressive behavior.

We urge the EPA to allow the use of appropriate predator control devices and toxicant on all lands. We support the continued supervised use of the M44 coyote getter, and continued use of the steel trap and leg hold traps as essential tools in predator control.

Wildlife and range managers shall be required to have a certain amount of hands-on experience on a working ranch or livestock operation.

We recommend that all wildlife and range managers have or gain experience on a working ranch or livestock operation.

We recommend that at least one position within the Arizona Game and Fish Commission should be filled by a person who represents Arizona's range and livestock industry and whose private lands and water support much of Arizona's wildlife populations.

We are opposed to any introduction of additional wolf or bear species in Arizona. Anyone importing wolves and bears should be financially responsible for the damage they cause. We believe that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will not meet the population objectives and recommend that the Mexican Grey wolf reintroduction program be abandoned and all released wolves and all of their pups be captured and removed.

In light of budget deficits, livestock depredation and the non-attainment of population objectives, we urge immediate elimination of government funding of the Mexican Grey Wolf program. (2012)

Wildlife Ranching:

We support the development of a system in Arizona that would allow ranchers to sell hunting permits on private and permitted land. We support the establishment of an advisory board to oversee the administration of the program. The board should include representatives of the Arizona Cattle Growers Association, the Arizona Farm Bureau, the Arizona Wool Producers Association, the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, the Arizona Wildlife Federation, State and County Health Services and Animal Depredation Control Board. (2010)

Ranching for Wildlife:

We direct Arizona Farm Bureau to pursue ranching for wildlife legislation, to be introduced in the 2006 session and continue each year thereafter until passed. (2012)

HUNTING WITHIN CITY LIMITS:

WE SUPPORT SB 1334 (2011) AS WRITTEN AND OPPOSE ANY ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS BEING PLACED ON HUNTING OR TAKING OF WILDLIFE ON

PRIVATE LANDS WITHIN CITY OR MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES, GIVEN EXISTING LAWS ARS 13-3107 (1/4 MILE) AND ARS 17-312 (RECKLESS DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM). ADDITIONALLY, WE SUPPORT TAKING OF WILDLIFE IN NUISANCE, DAMAGE OR DEPREDATION SITUATIONS RECEIVES THE SAME CONSIDERATION AS LAWFUL HUNTING UNDER SB1334. (2012)

Wildlife Grazing Fee:

The Arizona Department of Game and Fish should pay trespass fees to the federal or state land permittee if grazing allotment numbers are reduced because of excessive population of wildlife on federal land. Additionally, the department should be accountable for the management of wildlife animals. (2011)

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):

We support the simplification and improvement of the NEPA process. Any simplification or improvement of the NEPA process should include categorical exclusions offered for projects that improve range health by controlling invasive woody plant species. (2010)

Endangered Species:

We support legislation under the Endangered Species Act that would require judicial review to be completed within “190 days” of actual filing of an injunction.

The burden of proof shall be placed on the entity seeking the injunction.

Judicial review should only be based on sound science and not on unsubstantiated opinion.

All appeals are subject to the same legislation as the original filing.

Farm Bureau believes that funding for the Multi Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) should be equitably shared by the water users that have created the habitat problem that MSCP is meant to address.

Any agency, organization or person requesting a rare and endangered classification to be placed on any species or requesting critical habitat designation in this state should be required to conduct DNA analysis on the proposed species, at their cost, to ensure it is a unique, genetically pure species. (*AFBF Policy*)

The Endangered Species Act should not disrupt historical uses of the land and it should respect a county’s land use plan. (2009)

WATER

We believe water rights are inviolate. We believe that a water right is a property right belonging to the land that may not be taken for another use without proper compensation. We believe any statewide water plan should be designed to support increasing city populations in the Active Management Areas (AMAs) while maintaining a significant agricultural industry in Arizona. Such a plan would maximize the amount of water available in the state.

We believe all water rights must be based on historical and/or continued use. We believe Arizona should adopt a water policy which encourages the effective utilization of all water resources and which encourages all water users to conserve as much water as economically feasible. Incentives should be developed to encourage use of reclaimed water (effluent) by agriculture.

The current laws and regulations of Arizona intend to foster safe yield, but in effect, they will increase consumption. We support the concept of converting water rights, as opposed to creating new water rights that compete with existing uses. Furthermore, water sufficiency decisions for new demands should be made at the state level by the Arizona Department of Water Resources. Established AMA's should utilize an acreage system of voting.

We oppose the establishment of new AMA's in Rural Arizona. Furthermore, we oppose any attempts by national, state, or local governments as well as private individuals or corporations to meter domestic wells.

We support the implementation and use of the Best Management Practices alternative conservation plan, as proposed by the agricultural community, as part of a workable, economically and environmentally sound plan for agricultural water management and conservation. A program such as this will provide for viability in agriculture and will allow for the orderly transformation of agriculture in the Active Management Areas.

State law should reflect policy that ensures value to land with a historic water use. This will encourage the conversion of farmland within AMAs to urban use, rather than converting desert lands with no historic water use. This method of water management is the most practical approach to maintaining balanced water use within AMAs.

Arizona Farm Bureau supports laws, rules, and regulations that encourage new residential and commercial development either:

1. To occur on lands historically using water, or
2. To directly use renewable water supplies rather than groundwater.

Conversion of irrigation grandfathered rights to Type I rights should continue to be allowed beyond the year 2025 in Active Management Areas as an incentive for urbanization of lands with historic water use. We oppose the diminishment of extinguishment credits for grandfathered irrigation water rights within AMA's. Conversion rights should be restored to prior irrigated lands to promote development on lands with water rights (ground or surface water rights) rather than lands with no history of prior water use.

The Gila River Indian settlement and its authorizing legislation is intended to settle all claims to the Gila River in Arizona. The current proposal excludes claims at or downstream from the diversions into the Gila Bend canal and the enterprise canal. These claims should be quantified and made a part of the settlement. (2011)

Augmenting Arizona Water Supplies:

With rapid population growth across the state, Arizona will need additional water supplies. The state needs a statewide coordinated effort to augment water supplies, including building water storage facilities and watershed management, rather than creating competition between urban and rural areas for available water. Any efforts to develop additional supplies should not negatively impact existing users.

We support adequate funds to rural Arizona for hydrological research to augment water. ~~GIVEN THE ONGOING UNCERTAINTY IN FUTURE WEATHER AND RUNOFF PATTERNS ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE IN ARIZONA AND THE WESTERN UNITED STATES, EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE TO INVESTIGATE~~

~~OPPORTUNITIES TO AUGMENT WATER SUPPLIES FOR ALL USERS. SUCH OPPORTUNITIES INCLUDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW REGULATORY STORAGE AND WATER BANKING. HOWEVER, ANY EFFORTS TO DEVELOP ADDITIONAL SUPPLIES SHOULD NOT NEGATIVELY IMPACT EXISTING USERS.~~ (2009)

Groundwater:

We support the use of groundwater on agricultural lands with historic water use (i.e. irrigation grandfathered rights). We believe that use of this water is an inherent property right attached to the land.

Groundwater should maintain its separate identity, whether used alone or in combination with another water resource. The groundwater withdrawal fee should be removed from lands used for agricultural purposes. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Renewable Water Resources:

We oppose ~~the continued~~ efforts by the legislature and the Department of Water Resources to obtain control over the use of surface water by regulation.

We support the use of renewable water resources whenever it is economically available, in lieu of the use of groundwater.

We support use of surface water supplies within irrigation districts to the limit of its economically feasible availability.

As an incentive to agricultural use, the use of surface water that is not co-mingled should not be included in the Arizona Department of Water Resources calculations of water duty allotments. (2012)

WATER SUPPLY

Reclaimed Water (Municipal Effluent):

We support the expanded use of reclaimed water (municipal effluent) by agriculture as a supplement to or replacement for other water resources and the coordination of water quality regulations to facilitate delivery and use of reclaimed water for agriculture. We support the development of partnerships between municipalities and agricultural water users to fully utilize reclaimed water supplies. We also support research on uses of reclaimed water.

As an incentive to agricultural users, use of reclaimed water should not be included in the Arizona Department of Water Resources calculations of water duty allotments. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Indirect Recharge:

Agriculture's contribution to replenishing the aquifer through indirect recharge should be fully recognized. Calculations of indirect recharge from land in agricultural production should be included in Arizona water budgets. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Recharge:

We support recharging groundwater aquifers with renewable water resources when such resources are surplus to direct beneficial uses. The capture and recharge of urban runoff can infringe on existing rights. Urban recharge should not ~~necessarily~~ be credited to the urban community if runoff from the same areas ~~has~~ contributed ~~to~~ surface water supplies of the

downstream right holders historically. ~~Upstream recharge can enhance the water situation locally while degrading the situation for a prior right holder further downstream.~~

Agricultural lands with irrigation grandfathered rights and agriculture-related industries using Type I, Type II or general industrial use permits must remain exempt from any state requirement to replenish mined groundwater. (2012)

Agriculture Conservation Programs:

Any conservation program for agriculture must be economically, agronomically and technically feasible and reflect differences in farming conditions and cropping patterns.

Alternative conservation programs for agriculture must allow growers the flexibility to take advantage of economic opportunities that present themselves and use water in as efficient a manner as economically practicable for those crops. Conservation programs must not preclude a farmer's response to future market opportunities. A Best Management Practices program would meet these needs.

We believe equivalency in conservation programs means that production agriculture in the future will use no more water in an AMA than production agriculture uses currently in that AMA (due to declining acreage in production as land is retired for development).

Flex credits belong to the owner of the property on which the credits were earned. Flex credit transfers should be allowed to occur during the second calendar year following the year for which the credit was registered, so that the farmers know the availability of credits before entering the growing season, and should be marketable within the same sub-basin. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Industrial Water Permits for Agriculture

Renewal of industrial water permits for agricultural operations should be determined solely by the Arizona Department of Water Resources, regardless of the operation's geographic location in relation to a commercial or municipal water provider. (2011)

Central Arizona Project:

We support the efforts of the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) to provide the lowest possible water rates, consistent with sound business practices.

We recommend that Central Arizona Water Conservation District develop and use its G.S.F. indirect underground storage and recovery program.

We support the resolution of Native American water claims. Any settlements would be final. If the Central Arizona Project water is used to fill the water requirement, the non-Native American agriculture customers should receive compensation and/or other benefits for their loss. At a minimum, non-Native American irrigation districts should retain access to enough water to allow them to reasonably retire their distribution system debts. Any water allocated to Native American water rights should be used only within Arizona.

We support the elements of the Arizona Water Banking Authority.

WE ARE OPPOSED TO CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT'S ADD WATER CAMPAIGN.
(2012)

Utilization of Colorado River Allocation:

We recognize the importance of the Central Arizona Project, in its current priority status to the state and encourage full utilization of Arizona's total Colorado River allocation.

Agriculture is currently the primary sector protecting Arizona's allotment of water from the Colorado River through the Central Arizona Project. Available CAP water should continue to be available for agricultural use at a cost that provides an economic incentive to users to forego the use of groundwater. Agriculture's continued use of significant quantities of Arizona's Colorado River allocation is the best protection of this right for future use by all Arizonans.

The Navajo generating plant's SO₂ credits should be applied solely to reduce the cost of CAP water.

We support acquisition and recharge of renewable water resources (i.e. CAP water) as a further protection of Arizona's Colorado River allocation.

We support the federal funding and operation of the Yuma desalting plant. This is necessary to provide relief to local valleys from the high groundwater conditions that exist, while still meeting the Mexican treaty obligations concerning salinity. The treated water from the Yuma desalting plant could then be used to meet treaty obligations. (2008)

Flood Control and Dam Safety:

There should be an increased effort to catch floodwaters that would normally go to waste as one way to increase Arizona's water supply. Arizona needs to make a statewide commitment to build flood control structures with water storage capability. This is especially important for major impoundments of water, but also includes diversion dikes and river channelization.

Arizona needs to build flood control projects on the Gila River and its tributaries wherever necessary to prevent flooding throughout Arizona. This includes the flood control structures of Camelback and Conners Dam on the upper Gila River, and Quail Springs Dam on the San Francisco River, the channelization of the Gila River wherever necessary from the New Mexico state line to the Colorado River. We believe scouring and channelization to be the most environmentally sound and economically feasible solution to the flooding along the lower Gila River. We support the channelization of the Gila River from Painted Rock Dam to the Colorado River to carry up to 25,000 cubic feet per second in-flows.

We should promote the education of various state and federal agencies, and private groups, as to the benefits of flood control projects.

Additional wilderness area designations should include provisions to allow adequate flood control measures to protect downstream areas. Arizona needs to maintain a channel for the Salt/Gila Rivers from Granite Reef Dam to Painted Rock Dam for: flood control, aquifer recharge, and water conservation by reducing and controlling water consumptive plants along and within the channel.

We support legislation to encourage the early and complete use of all Central Arizona Project water supplies through indirect recharge of Central Arizona Project waters on agricultural lands and by such other means as are feasible which do not interfere with agricultural use of Central Arizona Project water.

We are opposed to the absolute authority of the Dam Safety Division of the Arizona Department of Water Resources to condemn and breach dams declared unsafe on the hypothetical theory of a one hundred year flood without due consideration of public opinion and past history of the communities affected. (2010)

Weather Management:

We support research in Arizona to explore the feasibility of supplementing natural precipitation in order to stabilize and improve surface water supplies for all Arizona water users.

(REAFFIRM: 2012)

Water Retention Structures:

We support the construction of water retention structures in the upper Gila River water shed. These structures will increase recreational opportunities, increase water quality, reduce damage from large storms, floods, and other natural disasters, and restore the flow to its pre Euro-American settlement characteristics. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Fallowing Land During Drought:

Fallowing of farmland has been identified as a potential strategy to mitigate the impacts of severe drought. Any discussions regarding the implementation of a farmland-fallowing program must include the following concepts:

1. Individual grower participation in the program is voluntary;
2. Fallowing agreements should be at the irrigation district level and district members should have an equal opportunity to participate;
3. Agreements will be short-term;
4. Compensation should go to the grower/farm operator;
5. Compensation for fallowing should recognize district operating and maintenance costs and third party impacts;
6. Include provisions for compliance with particulate matter and noxious weed control; and
7. Allow farm operators to remain eligible for government farm programs and conservation contracts.

We support greater education efforts concerning the full economic impacts on the fallowing of farmland. (2010)

Lake Powell:

Lake Powell provides much needed electricity, irrigation and municipal water and recreation. Therefore, we oppose any plan to drain Lake Powell. We oppose releases of Lake Powell that are not in accord with water demands, hydroelectric power generation and/or flood control criteria.

(REAFFIRM: 2012)

Man-Made Lakes and Reservoirs:

We oppose any plan to drain or change the designation or scope of man-made lakes or reservoirs that provide much needed electricity, irrigation and municipal water. We oppose releases of water that are not in accord with water demands, hydroelectric power generation and/or flood control criteria. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

WATER RIGHTS

Surface Water Entitlement:

We recognize that the agricultural areas along the Colorado River are uniquely situated to take full advantage of that river, and that the farmers in those areas have established irrigation districts with adequate allocations of Colorado River water, and have perfected those water rights through decades of toil and hardships working their land. We realize also that any movement of this Colorado River water outside of those counties bordering the river could only be at a cost that would make such water prohibitively expensive for any kind of agricultural activity. As such, and as those Colorado River allocations are a crucial natural resource to western Arizona's municipal and industrial users as well as to agricultural interest, and as the agricultural production in western Arizona is increasingly valuable to all people throughout the entire state as well as the nation, we are opposed to the sale and/or transfer of Colorado River water entitlement in western Arizona outside of the irrigation districts to which those entitlements belong, or are contracted with the United States government.

We recognize that the agricultural areas along the Gila River have also perfected their water rights through decades of toil, decrees, litigation and hardships working their land. We realize that any movement of the Gila River water outside decreed areas or taking water rights away to give to someone else inside the decreed areas would make farming prohibitive. This would have a detrimental effect on economics in those areas. We should work toward protecting these rights.

Agriculture's use of water should be maintained as number one priority for Coolidge Dam.

Water rights for irrigation should take precedence over water claims for maintenance of riparian areas or for the benefit of endangered or threatened species. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Water Rights for Protected Farm Land:

Pursuant to the expressed public policies enumerated in both the Arizona Agricultural Protection Act and the Federal Farmland Protection Act and applying only to specified acreage of irrigated farmland recognized as being uniquely qualified for protection from development and for preservation as irrigated agriculture, We recommend that when such farm land is subject to a purchase of development rights contract or a conservation easement, then State Water Law (title 45) shall recognize the corresponding necessity and right of applying a sufficient and secure supply of irrigation water to sustain a viable farming operation, not to exceed the original water duty.

In advance of signing on to such special designation and forfeiture of development rights, farmers and ranchers must be able to apply to the Arizona Department of Water Resources for a determination, including the specified acreage and annual water right, according to which a new certificate of grandfathered groundwater right will be issued when the protected status has been accepted and is formally complete. (2008)

Upper Gila Water Issues:

We support the efforts of a legislative settlement for the Upper Gila River through the use of a resolution task force committee comprised of individuals that belong to the Gila Valley Irrigation District and tribal leaders.

The federal government should address the water quality problem and bring the upper Gila River into compliance for turbidity.

In the settlement, if the action of the federal government through the taking of water rights from the Upper Gila users occurs, the federal government must compensate those affected parties and buy the land and businesses according to the takings clause of the U.S. Constitution. (2012)

General Adjudication:

We should become involved in the adjudication of state waters. This process vitally affects agriculture in nearly every area of the state. Because the Arizona State Legislature has become involved in the adjudication process, we should play a major role in the development of legislation and in the legal process. Protecting the existing rights of users is a primary concern. (2010)

Native American Water SETTLEMENTS:

We urge prompt settlement of all Native American water claims. Arizona citizens should not be required to fulfill a federal commitment. We support resolving Native American water claims through negotiated water settlements. Native American water settlements should have the participation of all parties with interests in the affected water. In case of potential conflicting claims, the Arizona surface water general adjudication process should be allowed to settle those conflicts. Claims should not be settled with groundwater, and any surface water should be acquired from willing sellers without the federal government bearing the costs. The settlements shall consider historic water use decrees. The settlements must contain language to protect the water rights of the communities affected.

The federal government should bear all the monetary costs of both parties of any settlement and/or litigation.

Water allocated to Native American reservations should not be sold interstate. We do, however, support the right of Native Americans to use allocated water as they see fit within their respective reservations even though they may have multi-state boundaries. (2012)

Water Measuring Devices:

We support legislation that provides tax credits for the registration of water rights and for the cost, installation and maintenance of water measuring devices as mandated by Arizona's Groundwater Code. We urge all methods of alternative measuring devices be given consideration including the use of weirs and power usage. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Type I Right:

If a city or municipality leases water rights for municipal use, upon termination of the lease, the city or the municipality would lose the right to continue the use of the water and no new water right could be established and the area served with the leased water shall not be considered a service area. As cities expand into agricultural areas and provide for their water needs by securing groundwater through the drilling of new wells, the cities should be required to post bond to cover compensation for any damages to the existing wells in the area due to salt intrusion or lowering of water tables. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Municipal Water Transfers:

It is poor public policy for municipalities to purchase remote land for the associated water right with the intent of transferring this water. This practice results in severe economic hardships for affected rural areas. This is particularly true where municipalities have not implemented effective conservation planning techniques and strategies regarding groundwater, renewable

water and water that could be captured and stored. Cities should not be able to import remote non-recharging water, if the cities purchasing these remote waters have not reached conservation goals. In no event should a water transfer under a Type II right exceed 50% of water allocated under such right.

No water should be allowed to be transferred outside of Arizona. All Arizona water shall be used within the borders of Arizona, regardless of ownership. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Stock Waters:

We support the lessee's right to water developed by the lessee on public lands. We support a rancher's right to water they own on their property (base waters) and all water they own the rights to on state and federal lands. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

WATER CONSERVATION

We believe that the positive effects produced by water conservation efforts should be encouraged without reducing the water entitlement of the conserving district or area.

Arizona and its various agencies should be required to adopt landscape designs to conform with its distinctive arid climate.

Current technology should be developed and implemented regarding water conservation techniques and strategies. Educational programming to water users should be accelerated regarding available water conservation technology. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Department of Water Resources:

We believe the cost of operating an Active Management Area is too high. We urge the Department of Water Resources to improve and streamline the management of an Active Management Area to substantially reduce costs.

BECAUSE REGULATION OF WATER WAS ESTABLISHED TO BENEFIT THE GENERAL PUBLIC, THE ARIZONA LEGISLATURE SHOULD MAKE MORE FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR THE DEPARTMENT FROM THE GENERAL FUND. OPERATING THE DEPARTMENT SOLELY FROM FEES PUTS AN UNFAIR BURDEN ON REGULATED ENTITIES, INCLUDING AGRICULTURE.

No area may be declared an Active Management Area or a Non-Expansion Area without conclusive evidence of significant decline in the water table and a vote of those within the area to be designated.

The Department of Water Resources shall respond in a timely manner when acting upon applications for permits, certificates, other documents and upon application for a finding, determination or approval required by the Groundwater Act.

Farm Bureau believes that the Arizona Department of Water Resources and governor's office should continue to declare drought conditions in Arizona as long as the Colorado, Salt, Gila or Verde River system reservoirs remain below 65% of capacity. A drought designation allows the applicability of the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act for agricultural water use. (2012)

Water Conservation During Drought:

Farm Bureau supports current conservation requirements under state law. The Bureau of Reclamation regarding agricultural use of water should impose no further rules.(2009)

WATER QUALITY

Arizona water should be protected to a level consistent with its intended use. Water quality standards, and the enforcement of those standards, should not hamper normal agricultural operations. All irrigation canals should be exempt from the proposed unenforceable water quality standards.

We support the Department of Environmental Quality's non-point source committees that give local control over local problems.

When applying water pollution laws to agriculture, consideration must be given to the following:

1. Apply regulation to only those areas where there is scientific evidence of an identifiable problem.
2. Include all potential polluters: cities, parks, home-owners, golf courses, natural and industrial sources.
3. Develop solutions that are economically and technically feasible and administered with flexibility;
4. Provide a means of negotiated settlement for first time offenders found out of compliance;
5. The burden of proof must rest on the regulatory agencies involved;
6. Minimize paperwork and record keeping; and
7. Allow for an informal hearing prior to initiating enforcement action.

Best Management Practices (BMPs), to control nitrogen pollution, are to be a set of guidelines for farmers and ranchers, not rules. The compliance scheme shall emphasize education rather than penalties.

We support voluntary implementation of Best Management Practices regarding nutrient management.

Groundwater quality regulations should be based on health standards and peer reviewed, sound science.

In order to make informed decisions on reducing agricultural contributions to groundwater and surface water pollution, we need to press for more research to:

1. Determine how much agriculture contributes to non-point pollution; and
2. How various management practices influence pollution levels.

This research is essential to avoid imposition of strict regulations that are costly to farmers without solving pollution problems.

Agriculturalists should not be held liable for past or current practices and application of chemicals that were or are done in accordance with federal, state and local statutes or standard agricultural practices. Those individuals contributing to the underground storage tank clean-up fund should be allowed to use that fund for cleanup regardless of their financial situation. (2008)

Small Ag Systems:

We support water testing exemption for small agricultural operations of 25 persons or fewer. Farmers should be exempt from testing water monthly as required of public water systems.

(REAFFIRM: 2012)

Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations:

The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) should provide training and certification for CAFO operators to meet Clean Water Act permit requirements.

NRCS should prioritize the funding of the animal agriculture share of the environmental quality incentives program (EQIP) among CAFO operations that need assistance to meet pollution prevention requirements. NRCS should also provide training and/or certification to third party vendors to assist CAFO operators in complying with CAFO regulations in the development of comprehensive nutrient management plans (CNMP) and facility design. EQIP funding should be made available to pay third-party vendors for CNMP and CAFO facility design and engineering.

Any new rules, regulations or new enforcement of the Clean Water Act (CWA) as applied to concentrated animal feeding operations must take into consideration the unique climate and topographical conditions of Arizona, rather than apply those designed for other regions where the risk of groundwater nitrate contamination is more acute.

Any new rules, regulations or new enforcement of the CWA must preserve the 25-year 24-hour storm permit exemption.

Any new rules, regulations or new enforcement of the CWA must not extend point source regulations to non-point sources such as farm and ranch fields and pastures as that would exceed the authority granted by congress in the CWA.

Individual states should retain control of implementation of Clean Water Act regulations and compliance monitoring. Enforcement actions should be triggered only by an actual illegal discharge into the waters of the United States. The owner(s) of a CAFO should not be considered liable by any government agency for later actions of a person who assumes ownership of manure generated by the CAFO. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

RIPARIAN AREAS

We support efforts to preserve in a natural state those unique and pristine areas showing no appreciable evidence of use by modern man as currently designated.

Any further consideration of lands as riparian areas in Arizona should emphasize a requirement that there be no adverse economic impacts upon agriculture.

We support the continued protection of naturally occurring and pristine riparian areas.

The definition of a riparian area should be based upon meeting all requirements for consecutive days of surface saturation, hydric soils and the presence of a majority of wetland plants. A riparian area, even though it may meet all three criteria, may only be designated after a request for designation has been made by a state agency or interested parties. The definition of riparian should clearly state that all man-made water retention ponds, lakes and/or pump back systems are not to be designated riparian. Local jurisdictions should be allowed to challenge riparian

designation on public lands based upon a cost benefit analysis and the maintenance of the land's multiple use.

To clarify ownership of potential riparian areas, navigable stream designations should be limited to those streams with characteristics of a watercourse, which would have enabled Arizona to claim title to them as a result of their admission into the union. It shall clearly state that streams that only flow intermittently or during flooding are not navigable.

Local jurisdictions should not be allowed to designate riparian areas.

Riparian areas cannot be designated on private land unless the landowner gives permission.

In establishing riparian areas, existing surface water rights and groundwater usage must be protected; private property must be protected when access is sought to these designated riparian areas; the designation must not hamper the multiple use of the riparian area; and the designation must not damage the use of adjoining land or its value. The establishment of a riparian area shall not restrict flood control structures or public health control measures from being developed to protect private and public property, and public health and safety. One state agency shall be responsible for designating riparian areas. If a dispute arises regarding a riparian area, arbitration of state and federal agencies should be required in a timely fashion. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Wild and Scenic Rivers:

We support efforts to preserve in a natural state those unique and pristine areas showing no appreciable evidence of use by modern man as currently designated.

WE ARE OPPOSED TO ANY FURTHER DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

Any further consideration of lands as wild and scenic rivers in Arizona should emphasize a requirement that there be no adverse economic impacts upon agriculture. (2012)

ENERGY

Ag Preference Power:

We believe irrigation and electrical districts should continue to have top priority for power from the Arizona Power Authority when available power supplies are insufficient to meet pending power applications.

The first priority preference for allocation of power from the Arizona Power Authority should be limited solely to irrigation and electrical districts for service of agricultural loads.

We support power company pricing structures that offer load management discounts for agricultural producers.

We support the Irrigation and Electrical Districts Association of Arizona (IEDA) in their endeavors to maintain ARS Title 30, authorizing the Arizona Power Authority as it is currently written. We also support IEDA in maintaining the current eligibility requirements for participation under State Water Power Plan ARS Title 45.

Additionally, we support IEDA's efforts to ensure that conservation measures required of the districts are reasonable and that all conservation alternatives, including demand-side management, are available to them.

Power Generated at the Hoover Dam is vitally important to the state of Arizona and Arizona agriculture. We support the three state effort among Arizona, Nevada and California to introduce federal legislation entitled the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009, to ensure the continued availability and reliability for Hoover Power to the existing power customers and to provide a pool of power for new allottees. (2010)

Western Area Power Administration:

We believe that mandatory contractor advance funding should not be allowed to replace voluntary advance funding in the General Power Contract Provisions (GPCP) nor should the Western Area Power Administration administrator be given absolute discretionary authority to change power and energy allocations in contracts held by its irrigation and electrical district customers. If these types of provisions were adopted, the power purchase contracts we rely on through our irrigation and electrical districts will be contracts in title only. Production agriculture in several western states would be seriously threatened by the new uncertainty of affordable power. (2010)

NAVAJO GENERATING STATION (NGS):

THE NGS PROVIDES THE BULK OF THE POWER AND ENERGY USED TO OPERATE THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (CAP) AND IS A MAJOR FACTOR IN MAINTAINING CAP WATER AT AN AFFORDABLE RATE FOR AGRICULTURAL USE. FARM BUREAU URGES THE ENTIRE ARIZONA DELEGATION (U.S. CONGRESS) TO AGGRESSIVELY WORK TO PREVENT THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA) FROM PROMULGATING REGULATIONS REQUIRING INSTALLATION OF SCRS AND BAG HOUSE EQUIPMENT AT NGS. ENACTMENT OF SUCH REGULATIONS COULD RESULT IN THE CLOSURE OF NGS. THE RESULT WOULD NOT ONLY BE THE END OF ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF AGRICULTURAL WATER, BUT IT WOULD ALSO HAVE A DISASTROUS ECONOMIC IMPACT ON THE COST OF WATER AND ELECTRICITY FOR ALL ARIZONANS. (2012)

District Voting Policy:

We support legislation that amends A.R.S. allowing irrigation and electrical districts to adopt an acreage system of voting. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Energy Sources:

Farm Bureau favors alternative energy sources, including those that utilize agricultural products and by-products.

Farmers and ranchers should take an active role in understanding and utilizing renewable energy sources. We support and encourage the use of tax incentives to promote and develop the utilization of renewable energy on agricultural operations.

Any provision of law requiring a renewable energy portfolio shall give full credit for existing as well as future hydroelectric generation.

Because some types of energy development require larger quantities of natural resources than others, we recommend the amount of natural resources used should be carefully considered before recommending development of a particular energy resource. Federal policies should pursue sources other than natural gas for energy sources.

Local, State and Federal governments should encourage the construction of nuclear power plants.

We oppose any attempt by the Arizona Corporation Commission to mandate use of any particular form of energy or to impose taxes or fees on energy users to develop new energy sources. (2010)

LOW-HEAD HYDRO-POWER:

FARM BUREAU SUPPORTS THE DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF LOW-HEAD HYDRO-POWER UNITS WITHOUT GOVERNMENT REGULATION OR PERMITS. (2012)

Grain Ethanol:

We believe ethanol policies, including incentives, should not cause significant market distortions to the detriment of sectors within the Agriculture industry.

We support:

1. The phase out of the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit for grain ethanol while maintaining tax credits for cellulosic ethanol production;
2. The phase out of import quotas on all foreign ethanol;
3. The phase out of import tariffs on foreign produced grain ethanol, including Ad valorem and secondary tariffs on fuel ethanol and fuel mixtures containing ethanol;
4. A moratorium on the increases in annual target levels for grain ethanol in the Renewable Fuels Standard with the eventual removal of mandates for grain ethanol within the renewable fuels standard when non-grain ethanol production becomes economically viable; ~~and~~
5. Flexibility in the Renewable Fuels Standard to allow adjustments to ethanol production mandates in the event of short crop years and/or commodity shortages; ~~and~~
6. **WE OPPOSE ANY MANDATES ON ETHANOL BLEND REQUIREMENTS FOR FUEL. (2012)**

Petroleum Refinery:

We encourage the construction and operation of petroleum transporting and refining facilities within the State, especially facilities that could blend ethanol or bio-diesel products. (2009)

State Power Line Siting Committee:

We believe the County Board of Supervisors should have veto authority over the State Power Line Siting Committee relating to recommendations affecting their county.

We oppose the construction of transmission lines through agricultural fields when viable alternative options exist. We realize the necessity for construction of new transmission lines to keep up with growth but feel every effort should be made to site all new lines in areas that will not pass through existing farmland even if this placement incurs additional expense for the utility and its ratepayers. (2009)

ENVIRONMENT

County Departments of Environmental Quality:

We oppose creation of any new bureaucratic agency to address environmental issues. We oppose any legislation creating county departments of environmental quality. (2011)

Environmental Regulation:

We support uniform state and federal regulations governing agricultural practices and agricultural husbandry. In addition, we support uniform regulations among federal and state agencies. Further, we shall oppose more stringent regulations.

WE SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS WITHIN THE STATE BE DONE BY STATE OFFICIALS AND NOT FEDERAL OFFICIALS OR AGENCIES.

Environmental regulations that include enforceable, health-based standards should rely only upon readings taken in populated areas of impact to determine compliance. (2012)

Green Infrastructure:

Trees and plants in managed landscapes contribute significant environmental and economic benefits, in addition to their aesthetic value. As such, Farm Bureau should advocate for policies that would ensure the “green” movement includes landscape plants and trees. (2010)

WEED, INSECT AND DISEASE CONTROL

Agricultural Chemicals:

Agricultural chemicals and drugs are vital to supplying the United States and much of the world with safe and abundant, reasonably priced, nutritious, and high quality food, fiber and ornamentals. Farm Bureau supports the continued use of agricultural chemicals and drugs in a safe and judicious manner. We oppose any curtailment of the safe and proper usage of agricultural chemicals and drugs unless peer reviewed research and published scientific data determine that injury to health and well being would result from such usage.

Farm Bureau urges risk/benefits analysis be considered in the evaluations, restriction, or cancellation of any agricultural chemicals and drugs. We urge the use of actual data in any risk assessment process for the registration or re-registration of agricultural chemicals and drugs and urge rejection of risk assessments based on worst case and/or unrealistic default assumptions.

Pesticide and herbicide applications are performed only when necessary and always in a manner to minimize spray drift. Drift is undesirable for safety, environmental, and economic reasons. We support the development of safe standards in establishing the maximum amount of pesticide and/or herbicide drift away from the target area. We urge the regulating agency to utilize only peer-reviewed research and published scientific data to define drift and to establish reasonable standards for pesticide and herbicide applications.

The economics of registration and re-registration for agricultural chemicals to be used on minor use crops often does not justify the cost of such registration or re-registration. We support immediate legislative and non-legislative solutions, increased funding to the federal IR-4 project, and a streamlined section-18 registration process to ensure the availability of minor use agricultural chemicals in Arizona.

We support a balanced implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA) and caution that any failure to do so will result in serious negative effects on pest management and food, fiber and ornamental production in the United States, which in turn will lead to adverse impacts on the ultimate health and well-being of the American people.

Agriculture chemical tolerance and residue levels should be based on realistic levels of exposure or consumption. The setting of tolerances must be based on thorough, competent, peer reviewed

scientific research and based on actual agricultural chemical use and usage information. Tolerance revocation should only occur on those agricultural chemicals that are proven to show unacceptable risk and no tolerances should be revoked that only pose a theoretical risk based on worst case and/or unrealistic default assumptions.

Imported agricultural products should not be allowed to enter the United States unless such products have been proven to comply with all regulatory production, sanitation, and pollution standards and agricultural chemical restrictions and tolerance levels established for U. S. producers.

We support expanded biological pest controls research to determine where biological pest control measures can provide a practical, economic substitute for or supplement to chemical controls.

The proper use of antibiotics, feed additives, and hormones is essential to efficient, economic production of abundant, reasonably priced, high quality animal products. Usage of such supplements employs substantial safeguards by producers to eliminate potential harmful residues. Based on the benefits to both consumers and producers, such usage should be continued in livestock and poultry production unless it is found by scientific research and data to be detrimental to public health.

We support improved and periodically upgraded training and certification programs on the proper handling, application, and safe use of agricultural chemicals. We encourage the creation of local, state, and federal programs for nonagricultural users of pesticides and herbicides so that they may become better educated in the safe handling and application of these products.

We urge creation of a campaign to educate consumers, regulators, and environmental activists on the importance, use, and safety of agricultural chemicals in producing the abundant, reasonably priced, nutritious, and high quality food, fiber and ornamentals that the U. S. consumer has come to expect. (2009)

Pesticides:

We believe the producer must have every advantage to produce food, fiber and ornamentals at the lowest possible cost. The Environmental Protection Agency has removed tested and reliable insecticides, herbicides and fungicides from the market, leaving the producers at the mercy of the natural enemies of crops and livestock.

Therefore, we recommend that no registered pesticides that have been used according to label be removed from the market without due process of public hearings and review using sound science where the risk-benefit ratio is considered and duly weighed. Review of pesticide registrations should include a board review, with the board being comprised of stakeholders.

If a grower has a serious pest problem and must apply a highly toxic agricultural chemical immediately to prevent further extensive damage to his crop but is unable to because of a planned Saturday and Sunday activity on the school premise, he may apply for a waiver for Emergency Pesticides Application from the Arizona Department of Agriculture. An emergency would be defined as a grower suffering a significant economic loss if the grower is unable to apply the chemical immediately. The Arizona Department of Agriculture would take advice from

the grower's Pest Control Advisor and the Arizona Department of Agriculture staff to determine that an emergency exists.

The Arizona Department of Agriculture shall notify the school administrator and negotiate the best time to apply the needed pesticides. The grower would work within a specified time frame for the application of the pesticide. The Arizona Department of Agriculture would monitor the said pesticide application. We encourage agricultural producers to provide training to their employees concerning pesticides and other safety procedures. To insure farm workers have access to the best and most effective training we believe that the Arizona Department of Agriculture should provide training, training materials and seminars in major agricultural areas around the state on a quarterly basis. Seminars and written materials should be in English and Spanish.

The Arizona Department of Agriculture should be responsible for monitoring, regulating and enforcing use of pesticides by other governmental agencies. Governmental agencies should be required to follow the same policies and guidelines that agriculture producers must follow to prevent crop damage due to drift. The penalty should be the same for the governmental agency as it is for the private individual.

Farm Bureau supports changing the one-year private applicator certification and grower permit to a permit that is renewable biennially. Renewal and testing should be available via the internet.

We strongly urge the EPA to develop appropriate guidelines allowing specialized low volume applications of pesticides. In the event the EPA is unable to rapidly respond to the new technology, we urge the Arizona Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to develop guidelines and methods to allow the use of this new technology. Since this methodology has been proven to be environmentally and occupationally safer than current practices, we encourage the Arizona Department of Agriculture to impose a moratorium on the issuance of citations for low volume ground applications pending resolution of this issue.

We oppose all mandatory reporting of chemical use; however, we do support mandatory record keeping of restricted use chemicals and of those that are on the Arizona Groundwater Protection List. These records of use shall be kept on the farm for a period of two years, and may be inspected by the appropriate state pesticide agency after showing of just cause. These records should be kept confidential. We encourage farmers to use Form 1080 in recording chemical use. If any additional state agencies require chemical use data, the agency shall obtain that data from the Arizona Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture should create a secure system that allows farmers to file Form 1080's electronically.

We oppose mandatory electronic reporting systems for form 1080.

We support the exclusion of pesticide (insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, and rodenticide) application from permit requirements under the Clean Water Act when pesticides are applied in accordance with current regulations.

If mandatory reporting of all chemicals is required of agriculture, we support fair and equitable reporting for all non-agricultural uses of pesticides. These uses should be reported by the distributor to the Arizona Department of Agriculture or the Structural Pest Control Board.

In order to reduce the burden of pointless and unproductive paperwork on state government and our agricultural producers and to thereby improve the efficiency of both parties, we support legislation which would require the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to remove from the groundwater protection list any chemical which has been in use for ten years or more and has not been detected as a contaminant, at higher than acceptable levels, in our state's groundwater wells. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Worker Protection Standard Testing:

We adamantly oppose mandatory written competency testing for handlers of agricultural chemicals. (2008)

Special Local Needs:

We support the concept of Special Local Needs (SLN) registration of pesticides and encourage the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation to make application to sponsor SLN registrations when warranted. (2011)

Consumer Education on Pesticides:

We encourage active education of consumers on the use and importance of agricultural chemicals. (2010)

Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA):

Balanced and science-based implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) is of the utmost concern to farmers and ranchers. Failure to implement the FQPA in a balanced way will have serious negative effects on pest management and food, fiber and ornamentals production in the United States, with subsequent adverse impacts on the health and well-being of the American people.

Specifically, we support the following FQPA principles:

1. Sound science—implementation decisions must be based on peer-reviewed science founded on reliable and accurate information;
2. Transparency—the public must be informed of the criteria used to assess risk and the process by which decisions are reached;
3. Balance—as EPA considers canceling older pesticide products as a result of the tolerance reassessment and re-registration process, it must give high priority to the review and approval of new products; and
4. Workability—the law must be administered in a practical and realistic way. If EPA fails to follow congressional intent during the implementation process, we support the use of options such as litigation and legislation.

We will work aggressively to persuade EPA to find a workable and reasonable implementation of the FQPA. To achieve this, EPA must:

1. Use sound science and reliable information, as intended by Congress, in fulfilling the FQPA mandate to protect public health from unacceptable risk of exposure to pesticides;
2. Acknowledge to Congress and the public that sound science requires good data and validated methodologies, which require time to develop;
3. Not use unrealistic default assumptions in the tolerance reassessment process;

4. Abandon the idea of wholesale revocation of tolerances for the organophosphate insecticides;
5. Determine whether to apply additional uncertainty factors on a chemical specific, case-by-case basis, considering the weight of all available and reliable scientific evidence;
6. Use the most relevant toxicity endpoints in the tolerance reassessment process;
7. Establish and maintain a deliberate, consistent, and transparent decision-making process;
8. Give higher priority to making sound scientific decisions than to completing final tolerance reassessments by statutory deadlines. EPA should use the authority provided in the law to make preliminary decisions on tolerances and delay effective dates for a reasonable period of time to allow for data development;
9. Revoke only those tolerances that pose unacceptable risk, and avoid removing uses that only pose a theoretical risk based on worst-case assumptions;
10. Not revoke tolerances unless tolerance reassessments are based on actual pesticide use and usage information;
11. Propose and maintain policies and methods for risk allocation and make them available for public review and comment;
12. Allow adequate time for pesticide users to make a reasonable transition to alternative products and practices when existing product tolerances are revoked; and
13. Redress the current resource imbalance between tolerance reassessment and new chemical registration and accelerate the pace of making decisions on new products and uses. EPA should adopt an incremental risk approach to evaluating Section 18S.

To further achieve the goal of having a science-based workable implementation of the FQPA, which will assure producers' access to safe, effective and economical crop protection products, we support:

1. Giving top priority to streamlining the section 18 registration process so products become quickly and readily available for emergency use;
2. Grower input on products that may lose crops from labels, prior to the agency and the registrant reaching registration decisions;
3. Developing additional incentives for registrants to register new products and reduced risk products;
4. Utilizing negligible risk to speed the registration process for sections 3 and 18 registrations and to reduce the cost of registration;
5. Increased funding for the interregional research project #4 (IR-4) so land grant institutions may conduct the necessary research needed to meet legislated guidelines for product review; and
6. Working with industry groups and the appropriate agencies to reduce the impact of the implementation of FQPA on the farm community. (2010)

Food Quality Standards for Raw and Fresh-cut Fruits and Vegetables

We support the concept of national standards published by the USDA and USFDA that are based on reasonable and sound science and are practical to implement. We believe, however that these

standards should take the form of “Good Agricultural Practices” and not the form of marketing orders or federal or state mandates for domestic producers. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

DIRECT SALE MARKETING AND FARMERS MARKETS:

FARM BUREAU ENCOURAGES PRODUCERS WHO MARKET THEIR PRODUCTS DIRECTLY TO THE PUBLIC TO ADOPT USDA’S GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES (GAP) AND GOOD HANDLING PRACTICES (GHP) TO THE EXTENT THEY ARE FEASIBLE FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OPERATION UNDER EXISTING STATUTES AND LAWS. THE ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE’S AG CONSULTATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM OFFERS FREE TRAINING CERTIFICATION IN GAP AND GHP AND A COST SHARE PROGRAM THAT HELPS WITH THE COST OF THE USDA AUDIT FOR CERTIFICATION. (2012)

Support of USDA:

We support returning APHIS to the jurisdiction of the USDA. (2008)

State of Origin Labeling:

We believe that it should be mandatory for all fresh market vegetables, fruits, meat and fish sold at the retail level to be clearly labeled to identify state of origin for the consumer.

With the consolidation of the retail food industry and globalization of fresh market food supplies, the consumer has a right to know the harvest origin of fresh market food products purchased.

Consumers generally know of the relatively high level of environmental and pesticide regulations that U.S. producers must follow. State of origin labeling will further enable consumers to identify the seasonal movement of shipping regions and relative quality of their fresh market food. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Country of Origin Labeling:

We support timely implementation of Country of Origin Labeling as provided for in the 2002 Farm Bill. Country of Origin Labeling should be considered a separate and distinct issue from animal ID. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Protection of Non-Traditional Crops:

We oppose traditional program crop producers from receiving CRP payments and then using that acreage to produce non-traditional crops. If such a situation were allowed to occur traditional crop producers producing non-traditional crops would have an economic advantage over the non-traditional producers. (2008)

Special Use Labels for Agricultural Chemicals:

We strongly support renewal of special use labeling for agricultural chemicals such as Applaud. We also support a more equitable pricing formula for these chemicals. (2012)

Organic Food Standards:

To maintain the integrity of organic agriculture, we support the enforcement of established organic production standards.

IN AGRICULTURE’S EFFORTS TO ERADICATE HARMFUL PESTS, WE SUPPORT THE USE OF MARKED AND GENETICALLY MODIFIED STERILES, SUCH AS DS RED STERILE PINK BOLLWORM MOTH, TO AVOID THE USE OF HARSH CHEMICALS.

THE DISCOVERY OF THESE INSECTS ON AN ORGANIC GROWN CROP SHOULD NOT AFFECT THE STATUS OF THE ORGANIC CERTIFICATION. (2012)

Reusable Chemical Containers:

We support the use of reusable or dissolvable containers for the packaging of chemicals. We urge all Farm Bureau members to use chemicals packaged in reusable or dissolvable containers whenever possible. We suggest that chemical manufacturers and dealers use reusable or dissolvable containers for all chemicals as soon as possible. Until this occurs, we support the cost effective recycling of pesticide containers.

We support the establishment of amnesty dates for disposal of pesticides and pesticide containers. (2008)

Buffer Zones:

We support the current law that allows a farmer to determine whether he or she will provide a buffer zone for schools, day care centers or nursing homes to be developed adjacent to his or her property. Additionally, schools, day care centers, nursing homes and hospitals must bear the financial losses incurred to crop and agricultural landowners by the establishment of the buffer zone.

Developers should be required to provide the mandatory buffer zones created by new development adjacent to agricultural land. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Documentation of Injury:

Modern agricultural chemicals are necessary tools for growing agricultural products. We support reasonable regulations of pesticide use and application, based on peer reviewed sound science. Legitimate complaints of pesticide-induced health issues must be documented by medical tests. Also, all medical tests must be made by agencies and laboratories using nationally accepted testing criteria. (2011)

Pesticide Complaints:

We believe that most cases where pesticide applicators are accused of harmfully exposing nearby residents to pesticides should be properly substantiated. We therefore request that state or county agencies require complainants to submit to appropriate medical testing procedures as dictated by sound science. (2009)

Crop Protection:

We support legislation to require the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to use established data from other states in the registration of new more environmentally friendly crop protection chemicals.

We support a comprehensive benefit-risk assessment of pesticide uses prior to any cancellation actions. We further urge a periodic review of restricted chemicals not now in use for the purpose of possible reinstatement. Therefore, we oppose legislation or regulation based upon emotional, non-documented complaints. Documented medical tests should be required to substantiate legitimate complaints. (2011)

Soil Chemical Tolerance Levels and Clean-Up:

Standards for soil contamination shall be based on research supported by verifiable scientific data. Agriculturalists should not be held liable for practices and application of chemicals that were and are done in accordance with federal, state and local standards.

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality should be required to utilize bio-remediation or composting for solutions on property with chemical contamination when these methods can be successful. (2011)

Public Education About Safe Use of Pesticides:

In order to educate and inform the public concerning the use of agricultural chemicals by Arizona farmers and ranchers, we encourage the chemical manufacturers and retailers to use advertisements of pesticides and pesticide application on radio, television and the Internet to explain the safety and benefits of agricultural chemicals. (2008)

Agricultural Inspection Stations:

Arizona and adjoining states should jointly fund 24-hour commercial vehicle inspection stations along state borders to prevent importation of pests.

We support cross training between U.S. Department of Agriculture inspectors and Arizona Department of Agriculture inspectors on Arizona rules and regulations as they apply to border crossings of agricultural commodities coming across the Arizona-Mexico border. Arizona should reserve the right to inspect all agricultural commodities crossing the Arizona-Mexico border. (2011)

Phytosanitary Inspections:

We support maintaining the cooperative agreement between the Arizona Department of Agriculture and the USDA to provide phytosanitary inspections and certification.

The Arizona Department of Agriculture needs adequate staff, provided through General Fund budgets, to perform inspections in a timely manner for Arizona grown products to be transported out of state or exported. (2009)

Prepass:

We oppose allowing commercial carriers entering the state of Arizona that carry agricultural and horticultural commodities to qualify for the “prepass” program. We also urge the Arizona Department of Agriculture to continue working with the prepass program and the Arizona Department of Transportation to exclude agricultural carriers from the prepass program. Should the administration of the prepass program not respond in an effective manner, we would support the state of Arizona discontinuing the prepass program. (2008)

Medfly Trapping:

We support the funding of medfly trapping and/or eradication using the state’s General Fund. This pest would not only be devastating to Arizona agriculture, but also to Arizona’s urban areas. (2011)

Screwworm:

We urge continuation of the screwworm eradication program as needed. (2011)

Blister Beetle:

We request that the University of Arizona continue to monitor any changes in possible infestations of the blister beetle in Arizona, and should one occur, continue research efforts to combat the pest. (2008)

Whitefly:

We support research and other activities to help control the whitefly. (2009)

Mosquito Abatement:

Mosquito abatement requires the cooperation of property owners, but it should primarily be the responsibility of county and local health officials. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Bees In Agriculture:

Bees are essential to production agriculture. Domestic and wild bees provide an important pollination service to farmers and ranchers. We feel that bees are a normal agricultural tool and any restrictions on the use of bees would be a violation of the nuisance protection afforded farmers and ranchers under the state right to farm law. We oppose any efforts to hold farmers and ranchers liable for bees foraging or harboring on their property.

Bees are also important to the urban dwellers that enjoy growing plants and vegetables, which require pollination. ~~We support activities to control the Africanized Honey Bee as well as efforts to educate the public.~~ (2009)

Citrus Quarantines:

We will actively support the implementation of quarantine barriers to control the infestation of citrus by introduced pests and diseases. In addition, other states and countries must be required to actively work to control their pest infestations prior to any consideration being given to relaxing any quarantine regulations. (2010)

SWEET ORANGE SCAB:

THE USDA – APHIS REQUIREMENT FOR DISINFESTING CITRUS FRUIT UNDER THE SWEET ORANGE SCAB QUARANTINE SHOULD BE REMOVED FOR FRUIT BEING SHIPPED TO NON-CITRUS PRODUCING STATES. (2012)

CITRUS DISEASE RESEARCH:

FARM BUREAU SUPPORTS USDA APHIS RESEARCH ON PESTS AND DISEASES IN CITRUS FRUIT, INCLUDING ASIAN CITRUS PSYLLID AND THE RESULTING CITRUS GREENING DISEASE. (2012)

Salt Cedar Biocontrol Research:

We support the expansion of the USDA Agriculture Research Service salt cedar (tamarisk) biocontrol research program into Arizona, with the understanding that the biocontrol insect shall not be declared an endangered species when the salt cedar problem has been controlled. (2008)

Public Rights of Way

Public property should be considered first for rights of way for utility transmission lines as well as roadways and rail lines.

Utility transmission lines should be routed in ways to minimize the impact on private property. (2008)

Control of Rights-of-Way:

We recommend that state, county and local municipalities shall control weeds on borrow pits, rights-of-way, fences and their vacant lands.

In the interest of traffic safety, special effort should be made to keep all intersections clear of weeds and other growth on the right-of-way. Additionally, rights-of-way adjacent to agricultural land should be mowed before seed formation and shall be kept free of noxious weeds.

Utility companies and railroads shall be required to effectuate control of weeds within their rights-of-way where requested by residents in cultivated areas.

In rangeland areas, when any entity applies pesticides on rights-of-way or easements, they shall notify adjacent landowners two weeks prior to application. (2011)

Weed and Pest Abatement:

Anyone purchasing farmland, including a political subdivision, and retiring it from agriculture shall be made legally responsible for keeping that land clear of ~~ANY the Russian Thistle as well as other~~ noxious weeds, in order to protect adjacent farms and irrigation canals from wind-blown debris and seed contamination. (2012)

Noxious Weeds:

The laws prohibiting the planting of noxious weeds, especially for wildlife or riparian management should be vigorously enforced. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Invasive Plants:

We support monitoring, education and regulation of invasive insects and plants and discourage the use of invasive plants that have spread or may spread into native ecosystems and dominate or disrupt those ecosystems. We also encourage the use of native and non-native plant material, provided such material is adapted to a particular site. When determining the invasive potential of plants, we support assessments by qualified experts prior to the plant's introduction, sale or regulation in Arizona. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Weed Control in Waterways:

We request that the Arizona Game and Fish Commission consider the stocking of weed infested lakes, ponds, and irrigation and drainage canals with the White Amur (*Ctenopharyngodon I della-gal*). We support the continued stocking of the White Amur ~~in the Yuma main canal and west canals and the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation District.~~ **IN ALL OF ARIZONA AT NO CHARGE TO THE LAND OWNER.** (2012)

Animal Disease Lab:

Be it resolved that we strongly urge the continuation of a state controlled Animal Disease Diagnostic and Toxicology Laboratory. (2010)

Plant and Animal Sanitation and Residue Testing:

We should meet with and seek the cooperation of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to inform their agents of plant and animal diseases that may be spread by their enforcement activities and their potential liability. (2010)

Trichomoniasis

We recommend the Arizona Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the cattle industry develop regulations for testing bulls 12 months of age or older that have not been designated for slaughter at time of sale or importation for trichomoniasis.

Samples will be obtained by an accredited 3rd party and be submitted to an ADA approved lab.

Bulls testing positive for trich must be consigned to slaughter. Owners of bulls testing positive and their cattle producing neighbors must be notified.

Further, be it resolved that Farm Bureau, in cooperation with all livestock groups and universities, provide training and certification to producers for self-testing of breeding bulls. (2009)

Aflatoxin:

We support continued efforts to manage and reduce aflatoxin in all affected crops and to resolve conflicts between the buyers and sellers of said crops. (2011)

TAXES AND SPENDING

Definition of a Farm or Ranch:

A farm or ranch is land under common ownership with appurtenant improvements which includes all activities by the owner, lessee, agent, independent contractor and supplier conducted on such farm or ranch for the production of crops, nursery stock, livestock, poultry, livestock products, poultry products, agri-tourism or agricultural education activities with a commercial market value of not less than \$10,000 as customarily produced each year. (2009)

AGRICULTURAL VALUATION FOR SMALL FARMS:

VIALE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION CAN BE CONDUCTED ON PARCELS OF LESS THAN 10 ACRES. ALL LANDS IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION SHOULD BE ASSESSED FOR AGRICULTURAL VALUATION. ARIZONA FARM BUREAU WILL WORK WITH STATE AND COUNTY OFFICIALS TO CHANGE ASSESSMENT PRACTICES TO ACKNOWLEDGE PARCELS LESS THAN 10 ACRES THAT INCLUDE COMMERCIAL FARMS AND COMMERCIAL EQUINE OPERATIONS AS AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES. (2012)

Priority Lien:

We support legislation that would provide ag producers a priority lien on crop, livestock, specialty crops and other ag products that are sold to brokers, processors, accumulators and end users to protect producers from losses due to non-payment or bankruptcy.

We support the ability of producers to repossess commodities before items are filed in bankruptcy if the commodity is identifiable.

Any producer should have the right to lawfully retrieve his product if payment is not made on that product under the terms of the contract or pursue any other legal remedy available to him. Farm Bureau strongly recommends that producers obtain signed agreements under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) before delivering products on credit. (2011)

Government Taxes and Spending:

Tax revenues should not be raised except as attributable to increases in economic activity and population growth.

We support the concept of reducing and restricting spending and taxes at all levels of Arizona government as long as it reduces agriculture's overall tax burden and does not shift more taxes and fees to agriculture.

The state's total budget continues to escalate. Fiscal restraint, prevention of waste, increased efficiency and reducing government regulations continue to be needed in reducing government spending. (2008)

State Property Tax on Real Property:

We oppose a state property tax levy on real property.

We recommend that in setting the value for agricultural lands, value be based upon current use; and oppose efforts to impose retroactive taxes and penalties on farm land sales based on future land uses.

The state of Arizona's income approach formula for the calculation of property tax is unfair to Yuma County. Factors that include value of water, rotation and amount of leases available are not considered in this valuation. We recommend that the tax committee continue to work with the Department of Revenue, and association of county assessors and our legislature, in finding wording that could permanently fix the inequities Yuma County has with the current formula.

We will seek legislation allowing retroactive application and awarding of agricultural tax status in cases of repossessed farmland.

We support repeal of the requirement that all lessors and lessees of agricultural land submit annual lease information.

If annual lease information is required, it shall come through the agricultural land use classification affidavit. We believe farm and ranch land value should be determined by evaluating typical leases, typical landowner expenses and typical farm lease frequency and practices in an area.

We support the agricultural tax classification for high-density operations including but not limited to production nurseries, concentrated feeding operations, ratite operations and cotton gins. Further, we believe agricultural packing sheds, storage facilities and elevators are also agriculture and should be reclassified as such.

We support measures that simplify the appeals process regarding property taxes and want to eliminate unnecessary assessments based on automatic classification when an agricultural property is sold. Furthermore, we are opposed to regulations requiring agriculture operations to renew their agricultural tax status on a regular basis. (2011)

AGRICULTURAL STATUS FOR PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT

THE ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE MUST RECOGNIZE THAT THE MAJORITY OF ARIZONA FARMERS AND RANCHERS NEED OFF-FARM INCOME TO SURVIVE. IF THESE FARMERS AND RANCHERS ARE TAXED OFF THEIR LANDS THE REPERCUSSIONS TO AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY WOULD BE GRAVE.

WE REQUEST THE LEGISLATURE REVISE THE STATUTES CONCERNING AGRICULTURAL STATUS FOR TAX CLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTIES SO THAT THE LANGUAGE CONCERNING A "REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF PROFIT" BE ELIMINATED AND REPLACED WITH LANGUAGE REQUIRING A MINIMUM LEVEL OF AGRICULTURAL USE, WHILE ALLOWING FOR PERIODS OF YEARS WHEN LAND

MUST BE TAKEN OUT OF PRODUCTION. THE DEFINITION OF A “HOBBY” FARM MUST NOT BE MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN THE DEFINITION SUPPLIED BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

AGRICULTURAL STATUS MUST BE BASED ON AGRICULTURAL USE.

ASSESSORS MUST BE PROHIBITED FROM DEMANDING EXCESSIVELY INTRUSIVE AND IRRELEVANT INFORMATION FROM AGRICULTURAL STATUS APPLICANTS SUCH AS BUT NOT LIMITED TO LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS. SPECIFICALLY, ASSESSORS MUST BE PROHIBITED FROM DEMANDING STATEMENTS OF NON-AGRICULTURAL INCOME FROM APPLICANTS FOR AGRICULTURAL TAX STATUS. NON-AGRICULTURAL INCOME OF THE APPLICANT IS IRRELEVANT TO WHETHER OR NOT A PROPERTY IS BEING USED FOR AGRICULTURE. (2012)

Personal Property Tax:

We support repeal of the personal property tax. In the event taxes are required, taxes should be prorated for those who move equipment from one state to another.

Until such time as this tax is repealed we support legislation that would exempt farm machinery and farm supplies from personal property taxes. (2011)

Tax Base Protection:

Removal of valuable property from the tax rolls by governmental acquisition reduces total assessed valuation on the tax rolls, thereby increasing the tax rates on other property. Legislation should be enacted, requiring the governmental entity or Native American tribe acquiring property outside its jurisdiction to pay an equal amount in lieu of taxes. (2009)

Sales and Use Tax:

We believe the following should be exempt from sales and use tax:

1. New and used agricultural machinery and equipment, supplies and unlicensed farm vehicles;
2. Fertilizer and chemicals used for agricultural purposes;
3. Raw agricultural products used to produce a finished product;
4. Agricultural lease;
5. Agricultural improvements that have any wildlife benefit;
6. All inputs necessary to conduct normal farming or ranching activities including fuel; and
7. Equipment necessary for the production, extraction, and cooling of milk, cow feeding, and comfort.

We support the return of sales tax on food only if other forms of taxation are eliminated or decreased. We believe the sales tax on food was a fair and equal tax for all.

We support simplification of the process required to utilize sales and use tax exemptions.

We oppose efforts to expand the scope of the sales tax to cover all business services.

We oppose the elimination of the sales tax exemptions for agricultural and mining industries. (2010)

Possessory Interest Tax:

We oppose the implementation of a possessory interest tax on any agricultural lease. (2010)

State Income Taxes:

We support continuation of the state income tax as a mix of taxes collected by the state for operation of the state. Government needs to maintain a sound fiscal policy.

We support tax credits that support small business. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Legalized Gambling:

We oppose casino-style gambling in Arizona and the Arizona Lottery.

If gambling continues on the Native American reservations, the state should receive casino benefits for the state of Arizona on a percentage of profit basis. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Estate and Capital Gains Tax:

We support the complete, immediate and permanent elimination of inheritance and estate and capital gains taxes. (2010)

Arizona Income Tax Returns:

We oppose Arizona income tax returns being processed outside the state of Arizona. (2010)

Heritage Fund:

We recommend that Heritage Fund monies be removed from the Arizona Game and Fish Department budget and returned to the General Fund. (2011)

REGULATORY

Arizona Department of Agriculture:

We support an adequately funded, director driven Arizona Department of Agriculture.

The agricultural groups shall have input into selection of the director. The director shall have agricultural advisory committees. The director shall formulate the program and policies of the Department and adopt administrative rules to affect its program and policies. Special fees and assessments are funds held in trust by the state of Arizona and should be treated as such. Funds collected for specific services from producers shall be used for those services and remain with the commodity program from which they are derived and should cover only direct costs and should not cover Department administrative costs nor be remitted to the state general fund. All Department inspections performed to ensure food safety are a benefit to the general public and should be paid for from the General Fund. Forcing the inspection fees on the producer of raw product (who has no mechanism for passing the costs on to anyone else) would disproportionately apply the costs of a program that benefits consumers and many business entities. The Department's primary role shall be that of serving and regulating the agricultural industry to protect the public's health, protect agriculture from economically damaging pests and diseases and regulating services on which agriculture depends.

We believe that the Arizona Department of Agriculture should provide ample inspection services for facilities that require inspection. Lack of inspectors should never be a limiting factor in the

expansion of existing agricultural operations or new agricultural operations or facilities in the state. Furthermore, state inspections should be sufficient to allow for interstate commerce where appropriate. We support the cross training of inspectors where appropriate and efficiencies can be realized within the department of agriculture.

We believe the Arizona Department of Agriculture should conduct an effective, ongoing education program to help farmers and ranchers comply with all existing department laws and rules.

Enforcement of the Department's regulations shall emphasize helping the agricultural industry learn what the regulations are and what the industry can do to come into compliance. To that end, department personnel should be moved from the enforcement to the consultation and training office within the department.

After the Department's primary role of serving and achieving regulatory compliance is fully accomplished, its secondary role will be to stimulate, encourage and foster the Arizona agricultural industry. The Department should promote a better understanding and more efficient cooperation among producers, dealers, buyers, food editors and the consuming public. The Department shall encourage and support the promotion efforts of commodity promotion councils, as well as, other public and private entities interested in promoting Arizona agriculture. These activities should only be undertaken after the primary role of protecting and achieving regulatory compliance is fully accomplished.

Legal counsel should be a staff representative from the Attorney General's office who has an agricultural background. The Arizona Department of Agriculture should be authorized to employ independent legal counsel if needed for a specific issue.

All agricultural regulatory authority in statutes, currently under the jurisdiction of state agencies, as appropriate should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Arizona Department of Agriculture. Each agricultural regulatory issue must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Those agricultural laws and regulations that are placed within the Arizona Department of Agriculture should only be technically changed. No additional regulatory authority should be added to these existing statutes and regulations.

We recommend that the five member advisory council of the Arizona Department of Agriculture include no more than two members from any one county. Because of the importance of the activities of the Arizona Department of Agriculture to agricultural producers, we encourage the director to work closely with the advisory council. To make the Department more responsive to farmers and ranchers, we support giving the advisory council more policy-making authority, including veto power over the director's decisions. Farm Bureau members should be encouraged to interact with advisory council members to lend them support from the industry. The Arizona Department of Agriculture should follow the lead of the agricultural industry. (2010)

Office of Pest Management:

We encourage the Office of Pest Management be brought under Department of Agriculture management and oversight. (2011)

Department of Agriculture Permits:

There are some inconsistencies in permit regulations by the Arizona Department of Agriculture with respect to producers selling direct to retail markets. These inconsistencies should be addressed.

We support the Arizona Dept. of Agriculture streamlining permitting processes by going to biennial renewals and a single renewal of multiple permits for appropriate permits and licenses.

Additionally, we support licensing renewals to be set on the same renewal date. (2010)

Laboratory Testing:

All laboratory functions of the state department of agriculture should be outsourced.

Where Feasible, testing should be assigned on a rotating basis among several laboratories so there is no exclusive contract and competition is encouraged. (2010)

Proof of Citizenship:

We believe requiring proof of citizenship by the director of the Department of Agriculture for renewal of licenses or permits is not dictated by law and should not be required by the department. (2009)

County Fair and Department of Agriculture Funding:

We support the allocation of funds from pari-mutual racing in Arizona, to support county fairs, the Arizona National Livestock Show and a partial source of funding for the Agricultural Consultation and Training program. (2010)

Fund Sweeps

Special fees and assessments collected from individual industries should be held in trust by the department who collects them for the purposes for which they were collected and any surpluses shall be carried over from one year to the next. Funds collected for specific services from producers should be used for those services and remain with the industry from which they are derived and should cover only direct costs and should not cover Department administrative costs nor be remitted to the state general fund. (2011)

Recognition of Equine Industry:

The Arizona Revised Statutes section governing the Animal Services Division of the Arizona Department of Agriculture includes horses, mules and burros in the definition of livestock. Therefore, the Arizona Department of Agriculture should recognize the equine industry as an agricultural commodity and include equine activities as normal agricultural activities. (2010)

Equine Rescue Registry:

Farm Bureau supports the Equine Rescue Registry established in the Arizona Department of Agriculture and development of programs in relation to this registry. (2010)

Livestock Warranties:

We favor legislation exempting the sale of Arizona livestock from implied warranties of merchantability and fitness. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Agricultural Warranties:

We favor state legislation exempting raw agricultural products from implied warranty laws. (2009)

Leash Laws:

We urge the government entities to enforce their leash laws **AND PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS ADDRESSING FOOD SAFETY IN VEGETABLE PRODUCING COMMUNITIES.** (2012)

Stub Cotton:

We favor the continued prohibition of the practice of stubbing cotton in Arizona. The Department of Agriculture should strictly and vigorously enforce its plow-down and planting dates. The State Land Department should develop regulations to insure all state lands are in compliance with the Department's ban. The Department should work with the eastern counties in California, the adjacent Mexican valleys and the Indian Reservations to establish cotton insect host-free periods comparable to those of Arizona. (2008)

Cotton Remnant Destruction and Pest Management:

We support continued enforcement of host free periods for insect pest suppression in all cotton producing areas of Arizona.

We support the plow-down incentive known as the Plover Program initiated in 1991.

We support the ongoing boll weevil eradication program but feel there should be better communication between the growers and the program administrators.

We support the ongoing Integrated Pest Management Pink Bollworm Eradication Program and full federal funding for that program.

We support full federal funding for the sterile moth program.

We urge all cotton growers to participate in the 100% Bt option for the duration of the program. (2010)

Colored Cotton:

We support the Arizona Cotton Growers Association's position on colored cotton, as found in ACGA's statement of policy #113. (2009)

Biotechnology Regulation:

The Arizona Department of Agriculture should be the agency responsible for regulating agricultural biological advancements including irradiating food. Genetically modified organisms (commonly referred to "transgenic") are organisms derived from somatic cell fusion or direct insertion of a gene construct, typically but not necessarily from a sexually incompatible species, using recombinant DNA techniques and any transformation technology (e.g., bacterial vectors, particle bombardment, electroporation).

We urge the adoption of a nationally and internationally accepted definition of biotechnology-derived products. We also urge international harmonization of scientific standards and trade rules.

We support increased efforts through biotechnology to more rapidly develop consumer beneficial traits, to increase the marketability of our products to solve environmental concerns, to increase net farm income by decreasing input costs and to improve product quality.

We urge state and national political leaders to develop a positive national strategy for biotechnology research, development and consumer education. Part of this strategy should include an open and frank dialogue with all interested parties. We believe that competitive advantage in world markets will be maintained only by the continued support and encouragement of technological advancement. We encourage USDA to take the lead in coordinating efforts to evaluate and move approved products and technologies to the marketplace in a timely manner. The approval of new products should be based on safety and efficacy criteria. U.S. government agencies, particularly the USDA and the food and drug administration (FDA), should continue to serve their respective roles in providing unbiased, scientifically-based evaluations concerning the human and animal safety and wholesomeness, as well as the environmental impacts of biotechnology-enhanced commodities. U.S. government agencies should evaluate whether there are improvements in the regulatory approval process that could be made to further enhance consumer confidence.

Consideration of socio-economic criteria should not be required. We favor strong patent support to encourage these new technologies. Patents should be broad enough to provide reasonable protection of development costs, but should not be to so broad as to grant one developer the right to a whole class of future developments. (2010)

Animal Rights:

We oppose initiatives/referendums/legislative movements that move to create animal welfare public policy that dictates standards above sound veterinary science and best management standards. (2010)

Animal Care:

Proper care of livestock, poultry and fur-bearing animals is essential to the efficient and profitable production of food, fiber and ornamentals. No segment of society has more concern for the well being of poultry and livestock in accordance with commonly accepted agricultural practices.

Animal-based medical research benefits both humans and animals including pets, farm animals and endangered species. Vital research utilizing animals is necessary to ensure more effective human and veterinary medical practices. We oppose legislation and regulations, which would prohibit or unduly restrict the use of animals in research and education.

We support properly researched and industry-tested poultry and livestock practices that provide consumers with a wholesome food supply and enable farmers to improve the care and management of livestock and poultry. We oppose legislation that restricts or imposes specific handling, feeding and housing requirements.

We are opposed to the concept of animal “rights” and oppose the expenditure of public funds to promote the concept of animal rights. We support the humane treatment of animals; however, we oppose any group or movement seeking to elevate concerns for the well being of animals to a similar status as the rights of people.

We support increasing the penalties for individuals and groups that violate and destroy property, both public and private, in the name of animal rights.

We support an aggressive, comprehensive educational program presenting the facts of animal and poultry production for educational purposes to the general public and to schoolchildren.

We strongly oppose the use of educational materials in our public schools that discourage use of animal products.

We support the Animal Enterprise Protection Act of 1992.

We continue to cooperate with other agricultural and agricultural-related organizations to address the animal care issue.

We encourage companies in the business of providing animal feeds, shelter and health products to advertise the positive aspects of animal production rather than advertising the products used for animal production.

We support industry-coordinated, non-ambulatory animal handling educational activities and oppose additional unreasonable regulations.

We recommend:

1. The livestock industry opposes the shipment of non-ambulatory livestock from the farm to livestock markets or auctions;
2. Non-ambulatory livestock be properly handled or treated on the farm to avoid unnecessary suffering;
3. If the proper professional treatment on the farm fails, non-ambulatory livestock be humanely transported to slaughter or be euthanized on the farm and disposed of properly;
4. If livestock becomes non-ambulatory during transportation or while being held at livestock markets, such livestock receive appropriate veterinary treatment, and special arrangements be made to have such livestock immediately disposed of properly; we deplore illegal dumping of dead animals and insist that local and state authorities cooperate to prosecute to the fullest extent those who illegally dump dead animals;
5. The livestock industry supports additional research and evaluation of livestock husbandry including humane methods for the movement of non-ambulatory livestock, design of livestock production, handling and transportation systems;
6. The livestock industry encourages aggressive initiatives within its ranks to communicate the best modern animal husbandry and handling practices, including but not limited to:
 - a. Methods to prevent livestock from becoming non-ambulatory;
 - b. Information on practical and acceptable methods for the humane movement of non-ambulatory livestock; and
 - c. Facility designs that promote the safe and humane production and movement of livestock.
7. The continued support of non-inspected custom kill operations that is so vital to the livestock industry. (2010)

Livestock Health:

Farm Bureau supports legislation that assures continuation of veterinarians' ability to prescribe drugs and accepted extra-label usage of drugs needed for proper animal care. Veterinarian-

prescribed and FDA approved animal medication should be permitted to be stored at livestock production facilities in properly secured enclosures.

Any restrictions on preventative use of F.D.A-approved antibiotics for livestock must be based on scientifically proven evidence and not on anecdotal speculations.

Livestock producers should strictly follow dosages prescribed by veterinarians and/or livestock nutritionists and strictly observe withdrawal requirements. (2010)

Animal Identification:

We oppose animal identification as a mandatory government program. NAIS should always remain a voluntary program and not be tied to funding for other government programs in a mandatory manner. Animal identification programs should be driven by market considerations as opposed to government mandates. Any animal identification system must have the following elements:

- Requirements placed on domestic producers shall be required of any country wishing to ship live animals or processed meat into the United States.
- Animal identification systems should incorporate existing identification and tracking systems already in use, such as brands.
- In any animal identification program enacted, RFID (radio frequency identification) Technology, including implants, should be allowed for animals in the food chain.
- **A LICENSED VETERINARIAN OR GOVERNMENT INSPECTOR SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO PHYSICALLY READ IDENTIFICATION TAGS PRIOR TO MOVING CATTLE ACROSS STATE LINES.**
- The producer shall determine the number of premise identifications.
- The animal identification process should be confidential and privatized with animal movement information available only to state and federal animal disease authorities and to the owners of the animals.
- The program should be modeled after the Brucellosis program currently in place.
- There must be mandatory follow through from live carcass to box identification.
- The cost of the program should be borne by the federal government.

We oppose the implementation of the NAIS or any national animal identification – movement tracking system for equines. It is neither practical, nor possible given trail riding and other traditional practices.

Since no national system of livestock identification currently exists, Arizona Farm Bureau opposes any action or regulations by the Arizona Department of Agriculture to require proof of location of birth of any livestock being imported into Arizona from other states.

We oppose mandating some costly new system when existing software could be modified to access and cross-reference available databases for a tiny fraction of what producers would otherwise have to spend on an animal by animal basis. (2012)

GRAIN INSPECTION PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION:
WE REQUEST THE GRAIN INSPECTION PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION (GIPSA) REFRAIN FROM PROPOSING ANY RULES THAT WILL HAVE MARKET DISTORTING IMPACTS ON THE BEEF INDUSTRY.

WE REQUEST THE GRAIN INSPECTION PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION (GIPSA) PROVIDE ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE BEEF INDUSTRY A THOROUGH AND COMPREHENSIVE PRACTICAL, LEGAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PROPOSED RULES. FOLLOWING SUCH DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS, WE REQUEST THAT GIPSA ISSUE SEPARATE, APPROPRIATE, CLEAR AND LEGALLY SUPPORTABLE RULES, CONSISTENT WITH CONGRESSIONAL GRANTS OF AUTHORITY, FOR EACH OF THE POULTRY, CATTLE AND HOG INDUSTRIES, RECOGNIZING THAT EACH SEGMENT OF THE MEAT INDUSTRY IS UNIQUE.

WE OPPOSE ANY RULE THAT LIMITS SALES, OR PROHIBITS PACKER TO PACKER SALES OR SALES TO AFFILIATED COMPANIES. (2012)

Brand Inspection: (NON-DAIRY)

We support the livestock brand inspection programs, which promote self-inspection. We support increased accountability for the non-range self inspection process by requiring official identification and site inspection for all non-range applicants.

Self inspection fees should be charged on a per book fee basis rather than per head as is current practice.

State brand inspections should be required when beef cattle are sold, slaughtered, or moved out of state.

Livestock inspectors should only deal with state statutes rather than county ordinances.

Funding for inspection services for abandoned or neglected animals should come from the state general fund and/or penalties assessed on the offending party.

We support the Arizona Department of Agriculture's efforts to work with registered equine shelters to manage neglected or abandoned horses after the department has lawfully taken possession of the animals and all applicable waiting periods have expired.

We encourage the Department of Agriculture to employ livestock inspectors who are experienced in the livestock industry.

We recommend the placement of livestock inspectors throughout the state of Arizona (not just rural areas) with at least one inspector per county. Furthermore, we believe cattle should be inspected at feedlots when there is a change of ownership.

Arizona's brand inspection is working for trace back purposes of animal identification.

Animal identification systems should recognize and incorporate existing identification and movement tracking systems already in use, such as brands.

IF SOMEONE IS CONVICTED OF RUSTLING CATTLE OR ALTERING BRANDS; THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO USE A SELF-INSPECTION BOOK. (2012)

HERD SHARE PROGRAMS:

WE SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEGISLATION AND REGULATION RECOGNIZING HERD SHARE PROGRAMS TO BE LEGAL. HERD SHARES ARE CONDUCTED DIRECTLY FROM THE PRODUCER TO THE END CONSUMER AND THE INTEGRITY OF FOOD SAFETY IS NOT SACRIFICED. (2012)

Certified Nurseries:

We support ~~only~~ voluntary certification of nurseries. (2012)

Seed Mediation:

We support seed mediation or arbitration procedures that will be beneficial to the seed industry and users. (2008)

Corn Borer:

We should discontinue testing when a county is proven to be free from corn borer. (2008)

Hay Standards:

We support continuing the voluntary inspection and/or grading of hay sold in Arizona. Grading and analysis are currently available to anyone who desires this service through laboratories providing the information ~~THROUGH SOUND SCIENCE PRACTICES~~. Requiring new regulations on all hay sold would be an unnecessary and expensive tax on producers and buyers. (2009)

Karnal Bunt:

Karnal bunt should be immediately deregulated and handled as a quality issue. (2011)

Scale Certification:

Arizona DEPARTMENT OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES should certify private scales at a reasonable charge. (2012)

Mountain Standard Time:

We recommend that the State Legislature keep Arizona on Mountain Standard Time. (2010)

Hazardous Waste Disposal:

We favor the development of a comprehensive hazardous waste disposal system for Arizona. We are in support of county hazardous waste collection centers so that all county residents have a place to take hazardous waste. We believe the most environmentally sound and economically practical approach is to establish regional detoxification sites. Hazardous waste, if practical, should be neutralized or detoxified prior to being transported to permanent disposal sites. This approach reduces public hazard during both transportation and ultimate disposal. Arizona should provide an approved method to dispose of outdated or banned pesticides.

Manure shall not be classified as a hazardous waste. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Tire Recycling:

We believe Arizona should continue to encourage and facilitate the private development of a tire recycling facility in the state. (SUNSET: 2012)

Urban Conservation:

In an effort to conserve water and protect the environment, we urge all governmental bodies to reevaluate their landscaping requirements. Excessive landscaping requirements result in wasted water and disposal problems for plant clippings. (2008)

Illegal Dumping:

We support the use of state superfund money for cleanup of hazardous waste illegally dumped on private property by unknown persons. (2010)

Sanitary Landfills:

We are opposed to the rigid inflexible standards imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality and some counties. These create greater, more dangerous problems than they solve. These problems include:

1. Numerous closures of landfill sites;
2. Excessive distances to travel to remaining sites;
3. Indiscriminate disposal of garbage and live or dead animals on public lands, private lands, along roadways, etc., creating definite, serious health hazards; and
4. Refusal to accept empty pesticide containers that have been prepared for sanitary land fill disposal according to label directions.

We favor further legislative and regulatory changes, which will liberalize rules for operation of sanitary landfills in low-density rural areas. We oppose regulations for farm or ranch resource areas.

Landfills need to be developed in areas where there will be no negative impact to groundwater or aquifer quality.

We strongly urge legislation increasing the penalties for illegal dumping. We urge increased enforcement on this matter and support the posting of signs similar to that of highway markers stating no dumping and also the penalties. Penalties should include a minimum amount of mandatory public service for anyone convicted of illegal dumping in addition to the monetary fines.

The State of Arizona should require all county governments to provide adequate public refuse collection sites at no charge to the public. In the past this service was paid for by general tax revenues and should continue as such in the future. All refuse collection sites need to be open seven days a week. The charging of dumping fees, lack of refuse collection locations and restrictions of dumping hours all lead to illegal dumping on farms and in desert areas the expense to clean up the illegal dumping far outweighs the cost of operating the refuse sites. (2010)

Property Lien Release:

Any entity filing a lien against real or personal property for recording of debt(s) will be required by law to file a lien release within ninety (90) days of satisfaction of the debt. A lien holder may be exempt for one year from filing the release if the debtor signs an exemption. (2011)

Regulatory Reform:

We favor repeal of unenforced and/or unenforceable state and local laws. Those laws, while unenforced, may create potential civil liability and be used as political hammers or bargaining chips. We encourage passage of state and local laws which will sunset such regulations. (2009)

Regulatory Rules and Enforcement:

All local, state and federal agencies that write and promote rules and regulations should be required to base regulations on sound science and proven facts. This policy applies to the BLM, Fish and Game, Forest Service, Endangered Species Act, EPA rulings and the State Land Department.

We support policy and legislation that would require federal, state and local government to fully analyze and protect current and ongoing local customs, cultures and communities and the ability of people to thrive economically. It does not make sense that we need to fight these current rulings and edicts after the fact to make them workable and effective.

We should at all times challenge bureaucratic entities to ensure that they are following the intent of the law. Legislation granting authority to regulatory agencies should be more specific for the purpose of limiting agency interpretation of the law. Agencies should not constrict permit qualifications beyond the letter of the statute, regulate beyond their authority or construct requirements which are beyond those enforceable by statute.

When government entities conduct hearings on proposed rules, regulations, or legislation, the intent of those hearings must be to gather testimony from experts, not to hold managed hearings to promote what the entity has already decided to do. (2011)

Regulatory Compliance Inspections:

Regulatory agencies using police authority to seize private property or the use of private property for the purpose of regulatory inspection is an unconstitutional police action against the citizens of the United States of America and Arizona.

We shall seek legislation which will bolster our constitutional freedoms and rights as citizens by specifically prohibiting these kinds of “policing actions” and:

1. Require regulatory agency inspectors or auditors to give advance notice of inspections or audits with details of the items to be inspected or audited;
2. Require that regulatory agencies and inspectors or auditors shall follow due process when taking action against a citizen or business;
3. Require that a complete copy of any and all regulatory inspection or audit reports shall be promptly furnished without charge to the citizen or business inspected or audited; and
4. Require regulatory agency inspectors or auditors to apply regulations in an equitable and consistent manner. (2010)

FDA Advisories:

The Food and Drug Administration should have the responsibility to issue a statement advising the public when a food safety recall issue has been resolved and when a threat to the public no longer exists. This statement should be made with the same emphasis that food safety warnings are initially issued to the public. (2010)

Federal Funding:

We oppose the withholding of federal monies, grants or matching funds to force local or state compliance with federal rules or regulations. (2009)

Weather Information:

We support the accurate and timely reporting of weather information and the maintenance and adequate funding of current weather analysis and information dissemination systems, including agricultural fruit frost forecasting.

We encourage federal, state and private agencies to work to improve these systems and the coordination of user support and federal funds to assure continuity and improvement.

We support the re-opening of the Yuma weather station and its link to the AZMET program. (2008)

AZMET Program:

We encourage the further development and implementation by the University of Arizona of the AZMET (Arizona Meteorological Network) weather reporting system for the purpose of providing current and historical weather data to farmers to assist them in farm management decisions. (2011)

Air Pollution Controls:

We are in favor of having normal agricultural practices exempt from air pollution controls; including, but not limited to, livestock facilities (including equine facilities), open controlled agricultural burning, and ditch burning and normal field operations.

We request a fair and justifiable definition of “offensive odors” in Arizona air quality control legislation.

Any existing gin operating 90 days or less should not be required to install expensive equipment to decrease dust. All out-of-state commercial vehicles engaged in intra state activity in Arizona should meet our air pollution rules.

We oppose mandatory manure removal requirements for all agricultural operations. We support on-site manure management remaining an acceptable strategy and it should remain a voluntary option. (2010)

Methane Emissions:

We oppose any attempt to regulate methane emissions from ruminant animals under the clean air act or any other legislative vehicle. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Particulate Air Pollution:

We support the rule drafted by the governor-appointed Best Management Practices (BMP’s) Committee, which creates a menu of best management practices for reduction of particulate matter.

We encourage state governmental entities to challenge the Environmental Protection Agency mandates on dust that are not supported by peer reviewed sound science.

Best Management Practices should be tailored to each specific Non-attainment area and account for geographical differences. (2011)

Air Quality:

Any air quality regulations should be drafted based on local geographical weather and soil conditions and must be based on sound scientific facts. (2008)

Air and Water Quality Regulations:

Within ADEQ, we propose consolidation of air and water quality regulatory actions for agriculture within a specific jurisdiction having specialized agricultural expertise. (2010)

Cell Phones:

We oppose a ban on the use of mobile communication devices while driving. ~~ANY RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS DEVICES SHOULD ALLOW HANDS-FREE OPERATION WHILE DRIVING~~ (2009)

GPS BAND:

THE MOBILE SATELLITE SERVICE BAND SHOULD BE RESERVED TO MILITARY AND AGRICULTURAL GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEMS (GPS). GPS HAS IMPROVED PRODUCTION AND EFFICIENCY IN AGRICULTURE AND SHOULD BE PRESERVED FOR AGRICULTURE'S FUTURE USE.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES SUCH AS LIGHTSQUARED SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO DEGRADE THE GPS FREQUENCY BANDS WE CURRENTLY USE. (2012)

Agricultural Improvement Districts:

We oppose legislation that would bring Agricultural Improvement Districts or other instrumentalities of the State under the control of the Corporation Commission. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Mail Delivery:

We endorse and support the Uniform Rural Addressing program in all fifteen Arizona counties. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Native Plants:

We support the licensing and tagging of native plants as required by state law.

We oppose extending the licensing and tagging to native plants that have been propagated and grown as nursery stock. (2011)

ArgentinaE Citrus:

We oppose the import of ArgentinaE citrus into the United States, until that citrus is certified free of all harmful phytosanitary problems and pests. (2012)

Giant Salvinia and Quagga Mussel:

The giant salvinia and the quagga mussel have been discovered in the lower Colorado River. Because of their rapid and destructive growth potential, in order to protect the bio-diversity of the lower Colorado River and to sustain its recreational, wildlife and economic usefulness, we encourage the United States Bureau of Reclamation to take immediate action to enact a program of control and/or eradication of these pests. (2010)

LAW AND ORDER**Criminalization of Environmental Law:**

To obtain a conviction under state or federal environmental law, an agency must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a person knowingly and with specific intent violated the law. (2009)

Natural Disasters:

When natural disasters occur that lead to declarations of disaster areas, the designation should not be limited to state or county lines. Some infrastructures or facilities damaged by these disasters may be located across jurisdictional boundaries. We believe it is unjust discrimination to deny aid in cases where a jurisdiction on one side of a boundary is declared a disaster area, and an adjoining jurisdiction is not declared, and the facility in question that serves the declared area is located in the undeclared jurisdiction.

We urge the Arizona Division of Emergency Management Policy to grant exceptions in this kind of situation. (2011)

Firearms:

Since the Constitution of the United States guarantees to each citizen the right to keep and bear arms, we believe state or federal regulation of firearms to be an infringement on the rights of citizens.

We strongly reaffirm our right to bear arms.

We support mandatory imprisonment of any person convicted of a felony involving use of firearms.

No political subdivision can pass an ordinance regarding the control or use of a firearm, which nullifies, infringes or supersedes 2nd Amendment rights. (2010)

Drug Education and Enforcement

We support effective enforcement of present laws and the enactment of new legislation where needed to prevent the importation, manufacturing, and distribution of such materials.

We support effective penalties including rehabilitation measures for first offense users and urge increased penalties, ~~including capital punishment~~, for those engaged in the illegal distribution or sale of narcotics and drugs.

We oppose legalization of marijuana. (2012)

Felons:

We request and support legislation to require felons convicted of first-degree murder be executed to prevent further threats to public safety. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Court Compensation:

We support legislation requiring the courts to recover costs of court -appointed attorneys whenever possible. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Compensation for Victims:

We encourage the judicial system to require the convicted criminal to make restitution to the victims of the crime with costs of prosecution reimbursement to appropriate governmental entities. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Frivolous Lawsuits:

We recognize the right of individuals to seek redress. However, when individuals file frivolous suits, we feel this is a flagrant violation of this right, and that the person who filed the suit should pay the cost of such actions, including court costs. (2010)

Equine Facilities:

Owners and/or operators of equine facilities should be encouraged to post signs informing users of the facility of the legal limits of liability. The signs should reference Arizona Revised Statutes 12-553, “Limited liability of equine owners and owners of equine facilities.” (2008)

Equine Processing:

Arizona Farm Bureau supports development of an equine processing facility in Arizona.

WE SUPPORT A POLICY THAT ALLOWS EQUINE SLAUGHTER FACILITIES TO BE BUILT IN THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPLY MEAT FOR CONSUMPTION BY ZOO ANIMALS. (2012)

Equestrian Property Use and Regulations:

Arizona Farm Bureau believes that all Arizona County Planning and Development Departments should recognize horses as livestock and exempt equestrian normal-use activities in rural areas from requiring permits. If the nature of a proposed commercial equine activity in rural zoned areas demands a special use permit, the owner’s property rights should be recognized and the owners should not be subject to continually changing requirements and unnecessary, exorbitant costs. (2008)

Limited Liability of Irrigation Districts:

We support legislation limiting the liability of irrigation districts from claims or lawsuits arising from recreational or other incidental users of irrigation district property. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Pornography/Prostitution:

We support the elimination of prostitution and pornography. (2010)

Preservation of Marriage:

We oppose any initiatives/referendums/legislative movements that move to give married status or anything that is similar to that of a marriage, to any joining, union, or common agreement between any individuals that is not specifically a marriage of one man and one woman legally and lawfully married. (2011)

Dogs:

Dogs running loose are a serious problem in some areas of the state. We request an expanded effort in the control of dangerous or aggressive animals that roam off the owner’s property. (2008)

Prairie Dogs:

Prairie dogs are becoming a nuisance statewide and are causing serious deterioration of farm and rangeland and are a danger to horses and their riders. Prairie dogs are also a potential carrier of deadly diseases. We call on the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to help in the control of these pests. We should negotiate with these agencies to cooperate with the Board of Supervisors in each affected county for a plan and personnel to carry out a prairie dog control program. (2008)

ELECTIVE OFFICE AND REFERENDUMS

Line Item Veto:

We support line item veto authority for the governor. (2010)

County Authority:

We believe that counties should be granted powers commensurate with the responsibilities with which they have been charged. Counties should not be allowed to impose codes or laws which are more stringent than state or federal standards. (2010)

County Board of Supervisors:

Rural counties containing less than 500,000 people should be allowed to set salaries of county board of supervisors and other elected county officials. (2008)

Intergovernmental Agreements/ Joint Action Agency:

We support efforts to create a Joint Action Agency (JAA) in the Arizona Legislature.

Arizona, like most states, authorizes public agencies to combine forces to provide services or jointly accomplish purposes common to the public agencies. This joint effort is accomplished through a contract known as an Intergovernmental Agreement.

The JAA is designed to encourage increased utilization of Intergovernmental Agreements as a method of cutting costs through combined efforts and the resulting economies of scale without losing oversight of agency programs.

The JAA authorizes selected public agencies to create a separate legal entity, which would be a political subdivision, and which could issue revenue bonds payable solely from a revenue-producing activity of the separate legal entity.

The Joint Action Agency would give electrical districts and irrigation districts greater flexibility to provide reasonably priced power to consumers. (2010)

Election vs. Appointment:

We favor the election, rather than appointment, of all public officials. (SUNSET: 2012)

Pro-Tem Judges:

We support the use of non-attorney pro-tem judges in the justice court system. (2010)

Election Activities:

We believe that limitation on the amount of contributions on political campaigns is an unrealistic and unjust restriction of constitutional rights. (2008)

Elections:

In a political election, in which there are two or more candidates from one party vying for the same political office, and there is no other candidate running for the same political office from any other political party, or any legal write-in candidate, then the political race is subject to the general election where the race is decided by the community as a whole. (2009)

Public Funding Of Campaigns:

We oppose the use of public funds to finance a candidate's campaign. (2009)

Arizona Initiative Process:

Arizona Farm Bureau believes that the Arizona citizens' initiative process in its present form results in "taxation without representation". In 2009, Arizona had the highest budget deficit to expenditure ratio of any state in the union. Over fifty percent of Arizona's annual budget

expenditures are a direct result of initiative compliance funding mandates yet most initiatives have been passed by less than twenty percent of registered voters. To achieve a fairer and more accountable citizens' initiative process, Arizona Farm Bureau generally supports the "Arizona Reform the Initiative Process (2010)" and further supports an Arizona Constitution amendment that includes the following:

1. The number of validated signatures necessary to qualify a ballot initiative is to be determined and required for each County and based on the highest number of qualified votes cast in any of the previous five general elections.
2. Funding disclosure requirements for initiatives are to be the same as those for state office candidates.
3. Initiatives must designate full funding source(s) that do not include the state general fund as a revenue source.
4. Five years after passage of a statutory initiative it must be reaffirmed by passage in the legislature and its sources of funding are to come under the control of the legislature. (2010)

Legislative Districts:

We oppose the arbitrary division by legislative boundaries of rural towns, communities and areas where common economic and social bonds exist. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Non-Taxpayer Office Holders:

We oppose counties being zoned in supervisory districts that will permit non-taxpayers to hold office enabling them to set policy for taxation. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Governmental and Elected Officials' Health, Welfare, and Fiscal Responsibility:

We believe that elected officials, governmental employees, and public officials should be held accountable to the same safety requirements, inspections and standards as private citizens and companies, and believe that they should be held accountable for any errors affecting the health and safety of people.

We believe governmental and elected officials and employees should be held fiscally responsible for operating within budgets. They don't need to have new vehicles to accomplish their job responsibilities.

WE BELIEVE THAT ALL ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS AND GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO ADHERE TO THE SAME LAWS, POLICIES, PROCEDURES, REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS AS PRIVATE CITIZENS AND BUSINESSES, AND THAT THEY SHOULD BE HELD FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR OPERATING WITHIN BUDGETS. (2012)

LABOR

Cost Plus Contracting:

We urge that "cost plus" contracting be prohibited for procurement contracts involving a government agency, political subdivision or public service utility. (2009)

Right-to-Work:

We will continue to insist on rigid enforcement of Arizona's Right-to-Work Law. (2009)

Labor Availability:

We support a program to fill the shortages of agriculture's labor needs on a continuing basis.

We support an alien A work program that does not discriminate against any industries requiring foreign labor such as technology, hospitality, farming and ranching. The requirements and regulations should be the same for all entities. This will increase productivity for all U.S. industries and take the pressure off our border communities and U.S. agencies involvement.

(2012)

Guest Worker Program:

We highly support the implementation of a guest worker program that will allow foreign workers with legal identification to work in the United States. Guest Workers are encouraged to learn English. This program should provide for realistic wage scales and flexibility in providing housing, for example, a stipend in lieu of housing and waiver for close proximity to the border. This program should be developed and implemented soon.

We believe that the open ended language in the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker's Protection Act (MSAWPA) holding producers responsible for off-the-farm transportation of seasonal workers be removed and not be repeated in any new legislation that addresses "Guest Worker Program" issues. The practical effects of the language in the MSAWPA renders producers guilty until proven innocent and consequently creates an undue burden on producers and their insurance companies to defend themselves. (2012)

Multi-Year Work Permits:

We support a one-time opportunity for workers currently working but not authorized to work in the U.S. to earn an adjustment of status if they fulfill appropriate prospective work requirements in agriculture. Requirements to be eligible for a three year temporary work permit should include:

- A clean Record (no criminal charges).
- Encourage the learning of English.
- Have been employed for a minimum of three years.
- A business owner is willing to contract with them.
- Have paid income withholding taxes.
- Any business they operate is properly licensed.

The temporary work permit should be renewable with re-certification of the above conditions. (2011)

Labor Needs For Arizona Agriculture:

Farm Bureau supports increasing border security, functional identification documents that are reliably legal and workplace compliant. These are necessary features of homeland security and criminal enforcement of a comprehensive work permit program. Agriculture not only needs access to legal labor, but there must also be an orderly transition to legal labor.

- **Commuter work permits:**

Many labor-intensive agricultural businesses in close proximity to the Mexican border currently use workers who return to Mexico nightly or weekly. Any federal guest worker legislation should recognize these commuter workers and their families and the needs of these businesses by inclusion of provisions, which enable and facilitate such work protocol.

Agriculture's needs are often seasonal and concentrated within tight time frames for highly perishable crops. This permit should be renewable, on an unlimited basis, assuming original application criteria were met and terms of the permit were not violated. These permits should limit workers to agricultural employers, but should be portable between employers. The number of permits could initially be established by employer survey requests and later adjusted by the department of labor based on demonstrated usage.

- **Short-term work permits:**

This permit would provide seasonal labor requirements of longer duration than the daily commuter permit. These short-term worker permits would be valid for up to 12 months and include features that would allow the worker to go home and return legally. It would be renewable, assuming original application criteria were met and terms of the permit were not violated and it would limit workers to agricultural employers, but would be portable between employers. These permits should be generated by specific employer request.

- **Long-term work permits:**

Long-term work permits should be issued. These permits would limit workers to agricultural employers, but would be portable between employers and would be generated by specific employer request. (2012)

State Immigration Reform:

We believe that the Arizona legislature should do whatever it can to encourage federal guest worker program legislation. Immigration policies should be dictated by the federal government and not at state and local levels. The Arizona legislature should not attempt to conduct its own foreign policy by threatening agriculture, construction and other business activities with draconian penalties for employing undocumented workers. We believe that tasking state service and regulatory agencies as policemen in immigration reform is very poor and misguided public policy. ALL LAWS THAT PREVENT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS FROM HIRING QUALIFIED, HARD-WORKING EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE REPEALED.

DUE TO THE FAILURE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ACT ON AGRICULTURAL WORKER REFORM, WE SUPPORT ARIZONA'S RIGHT TO FORMULATE ITS OWN AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROGRAM. THESE STATE WORKER PERMITS SHOULD MODEL THE PROGRAM OUTLINED UNDER ARIZONA FARM BUREAU POLICY "LABOR NEEDS FOR ARIZONA AGRICULTURE" BUT WOULD ONLY APPLY TO AGRICULTURAL WORK WITHIN THE STATE. (2012)

U.S. / Mexico Border Security

The violence taking place on our border with Mexico has escalated to a point where it can be characterized as terrorism by foreign nationals. Farmers and ranchers on our southern border are in danger for their lives in the course of their daily activities.

~~We support the Arizona Cattle Growers' efforts for securing the U.S. Mexico Border.~~

Homeland Security must enforce border security and stop all illegal entries into the United States by all means necessary.

We need to secure our United States borders through the following methods. We further support maximum funding for these programs to assist in securing our border:

- Complete fencing or other barriers where possible on U.S. - Mexico border including an adjacent roadway allowing better access for the border patrol and any other agencies to secure the border.
- **WE SUPPORT THE CONTINUED BUILDING OF THE VEHICLE BARRIER FENCE ON THE MEXICO BORDER AT THE ORGAN PIPE CACTUS NATIONAL MONUMENT. THE VEHICLE BARRIER FENCE IS HELPING TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE NATIONAL MONUMENT FROM BORDER CROSSERS. IN ADDITION VISITORS ARE MORE WILLING TO VISIT THE MONUMENT BECAUSE OF THE VEHICLE BARRIER FENCE.**
- Department of Homeland Security enforcing and maintaining the barriers on the border.
- Military presence on the border with rules of engagement defined and expanded.
- An emphasis on deploying technology and personnel based on the unique needs of enforcement agencies on a sector by sector basis, including electronic surveillance technology, fixed wing and helicopter and implementation of unmanned aerial systems for night and day surveillance.
- Increased penalties for drug or human trafficking and other illegal entrance into the United States.
- Full communications coverage for civil, law enforcement and military including phone tower construction throughout the border region.
- The use of a virtual fence or other electronic surveillance technology across Ag lands where a physical fence is not practical.
- Operation Stone Garden which would give local law enforcement agencies the technology to work more effectively with border patrol.
- Operation Streamline to process and detain illegal persons through the Department of Justice. (2012)

Harmful Union Activities:

We vigorously oppose the tactics used by the leaders of the United Farm Workers (U.F.W.) and other labor unions. ~~These strong arm methods are currently being used on workers and include the malicious destruction of property and the threat of physical harm to the workers and/or members of their families.~~ The result of these actions causes the loss of extremely perishable agricultural commodities. This method of handling a labor disagreement is not in the public's best interest.

WE SUPPORT THE RIGHT TO WORK LAWS. (2012)

Union Elections :

United States citizenship and state residency should be prerequisites for voting in union elections. (2009)

Secondary Boycotts:

| We strongly favor action to prevent the use of secondary boycotts of agricultural products as a means to coerce producers and employees in joining labor organizations. Such activities deprive consumers of their free choice in purchasing food, fiber and ornamental products.

If a boycott is initiated, we direct the American Farm Bureau Federation to use all available resources to inform and influence the public's opinion on the real issues. (2009)

Public Employee Bargaining:

We favor legislation prohibiting collective bargaining, strikes and work stoppages by public employees. Public employees who participate in work stoppages and strikes should be subject to loss of Civil Service Benefits and/or dismissal. No tax money shall be made available for strikers. (2009)

TRANSPORTATION

Implements of Husbandry:

Propane movable fuel storage vehicles, trailers and all portable tanks used by agriculture on public roads should be classified as implements of husbandry.

We believe anhydrous ammonia tank trailers should not be required to have brakes and that growers should be required to move these trailers at a slower speed to ensure safety.

We believe farm chemical tank trailers should be considered implements of husbandry. (2010)

Transportation Deregulation:

We support the deregulation of all phases of Arizona's transportation industry exclusive of safety and licensing requirements.

We support free and open competition in the interstate and intrastate trucking business including the elimination of the wasteful practice of empty back-hauls.

We support standardized truck and truck equipment inspection within Arizona on which compliance would be recognized by all political jurisdictions within the state. All trucks and equipment passing inspection shall be issued an inspection sticker signifying compliance good for six months. Display of a current sticker shall exempt the truck and truck equipment from routine roadside or spot inspection. Agricultural truck drivers should be exempt from hourly driving restrictions and be allowed to drive enough hours to complete the normal harvest cycle. (2008)

Transportation of Equine:

Transport of equine should not be regulated by federal law but rather is a states' rights issue. Farm Bureau supports the need and right to transport equine animals for any purpose, i.e. recreational activities, attending shows, aiding in the movement of cattle, processing, etc. (2010)

Highway User Taxes:

Taxes related to transportation, collected from Arizona's highway users, should be used exclusively for building and maintaining Arizona's roads and bridges. We believe that tax money allocated for county roads should be used solely in the county area. If roads are to be constructed in and around incorporated areas, the incorporated areas should provide the greater portion of the funds for such projects.

We are opposed to the taking of HURF Funds designated for roads and using them to fund law enforcement or other projects in urban counties. We advocate the continued support of the Casa Grande Accord for allocating funds for rural roadways.

We oppose the use of highway user taxes for the construction of bicycle, pedestrian, equestrian paths or for mass transportation systems. (2008)

Rural Road Improvement Districts:

We support the establishment of Rural Road Improvement Districts (RRID) as authorized by ARS Title 48 (Special Taxing Districts) Article 5. Once established, an RRID should be entitled to a share of Highway Users Revenue Funds (HURF) to fund road development and maintenance in addition to the taxing authority granted in the statute. Furthermore, the State Land Department should be required to cooperate with RRIDs to allow reasonable use of state land in the development of rural roadways.

Within an RRID, if HURF were used and the improved land is removed from agricultural status, the full-value of the improvements should be reimbursed to the RRID by the developer. (2011)

Highway Beautification:

In view of our severe statewide shortage of highway funds we favor legislation to prohibit the use of federal monies in Arizona that are solely highway beautification projects and redirect these funds for highway maintenance. (2009)

Grade Separation Structures:

We urge the Arizona Highway Department to consider the construction in appropriate locations of grade separation structures adequate to permit crossing of freeways and other highways by farm equipment and livestock. In the agricultural areas the County Farm Bureaus should participate in selection of specific locations for such structures.

Grade separated crossings provide for safe and efficient crossing of railroad tracks at heavy-traffic intersections. We support the continuation of the Arizona Corporation Commission's monitoring of double tracking by the railroad and the assessment of needed grade crossings.

When grade separations become necessary due to increased rail traffic, costs of grade separations shall be borne by the railroad and not the local communities. (2008)

Slow Moving Vehicles:

~~We recommend that the Slow Moving Vehicle (SMV) emblem be included in the Arizona State Motor Vehicle Manual and driver license tests to familiarize all drivers to its meaning. We recommend that in high density farming areas caution signs with a tractor and the SMV sign on it be used to warn of potential dangers ahead.~~

We recommend all farms be encouraged to place the SMV signs on equipment and all blinkers and lights be in working order. (2012)

Littering:

We recommend that legislation be enacted to effectively control the littering of our highways, roadside and public and private property with beverage containers, plastic bags and other trash. We support legislative action requiring a deposit on all beverage containers.

We support penalties for littering, including restitution for loss of livestock and production. (2011)

Discarded Road Signs:

Construction barriers used by road construction crews and road departments should be picked up following road work. Discarded signs clutter easements, create road hazards and make it difficult to move equipment on roadways. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Survey Markers:

Survey Contractors should be required to remove survey markers in a timely manner after surveying property. Survey companies should pay for damages caused by their markers. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Driver's License Issuance:

We oppose the new ANY law that prohibits possession of a valid driver license until the age of 18 years. (2012)

Farm/Ranch Truck License:

We support legislation to establish a farm/ranch license truck rate, which would be based on assessed value rather than on weight for vehicles used in the production/marketing of foods, fibers and ornamental plants. (2009)

Arizona Department of Motor Vehicles:

We support agriculture license plates issued by the Arizona Department of Motor Vehicles with a clear definition of eligibility. We support the inclusion of any and all farm, agriculture business, custom harvesting, manure spreaders, agriculture product haulers, and all agricultural related hauling under the definition for eligibility for agricultural plates.

The conditions of use of the agriculture CDL exemption should be extended to the greater of the entire state boundaries or the current 150-mile limit.

We support CDL drivers being eligible for the Arizona Defensive Driving Program as a means to dismiss traffic tickets when the violation occurs while operating a non-commercial vehicle. (2011)

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations:

There should be no restrictions, record keeping or notification as to quantities or types of vehicles in which fuel, agriculture chemicals, or fertilizers are transported, when used in a normal agriculture manner. Furthermore, we believe that farm vehicle drivers as defined in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety regulations be exempt from the driver qualifications when transporting production inputs while conducting normal agricultural operations.

We further believe that law enforcement officers should be restricted from attempting to conduct comprehensive commercial vehicle safety inspections unless they are qualified to do so. There are at least five levels of commercial vehicle inspection.

Commercial vehicle citations should only be issued by officers that have received the necessary technical training and have been appropriately certified to conduct the level of safety inspection necessary to write a legal citation. (2011)

Licensing on Vehicle Fleets:

We support current Arizona Department of Transportation Policy, which enables entities that have fleets of motor vehicles or other licensed vehicles to have the option of renewing all of their vehicles at only one time, rather than the present staggered registration policy. **Any commercial vehicle engaged in intra-state activity in Arizona should be licensed in Arizona.** (2012)

Pro-rated Commercial Vehicle Fee:

We support pro-rating commercial license fees for vehicles used for only a portion of the year. (2011)

Wide Load Permits:

We support legislation that would allow wide load permits to be intact even when a permittee leaves and returns to the state within the time the permit allows. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

Fuel-Use Permit Charge:

We support legislation that would repeal the fuel-use permit charged Arizona registered heavy trucks as they enter the state. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

Truck Safety:

We recommend that all commercial trucks using Arizona highways, regardless of country of registration, be required to meet federal and state safety requirements for drivers and equipment. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

Abandoned Vehicles:

The last owner of record of abandoned vehicles should bear financial responsibility for their disposal. (2010)

Mexico Entry Inspection:

We support legislation requiring all persons and vehicles entering Mexico to be inspected by U.S. border guards to verify the ownership of all vehicles and cargo before allowing them to pass into Mexico. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

Punto Colonet Rail Line Through Yuma County:

Freight coming from the proposed Punto Colonet port on the western coast of Baja California should use the most direct route in passing from Baja California into California to connect to Union Pacific's main east/west rail line.

Agricultural areas in Yuma County are highly unsuitable for such a rail line due to food safety, air quality, and transportation issues. Such a rail line passing through established agricultural areas would also negatively affect existing farms, homes, and businesses, and would denigrate quality of life and property values in those areas.

As such, we are adamantly opposed to any rail line originating in Mexico crossing through or in close proximity to agricultural areas of Yuma County. **(REAFFIRM: 2012)**

Yuma ASH Highway

A controlled access route through the farm land of the Gila Valley would potentially destroy its productivity. Therefore, Arizona Farm Bureau encourages the ADOT Board to select a bypass route connecting I195 to Highway 95 using the alternate H as this route. Once selected Fortuna Road should be designated as a temporary route, a tunnel/overpass on Fortuna at the Union

Pacific Railroad should be designed into the Highway 95 widening north of 9E that is scheduled to begin design in the next two years. (2010)

ADOT WILDERNESS CORRIDOR PROGRAM:

WE OPPOSE THE ADOT'S WILDERNESS CORRIDOR PROGRAM. (2012)

HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Health Insurance:

We oppose mandated health insurance. (2011)

School Financing:

We are in favor of local control of school systems. We support the concept of a complete overhauling of the school finance system within Arizona.

We support school funding equalization, with a dual system of property tax and general fund expenditures that protect local control.

We oppose mandating statewide centralized purchasing of equipment or supplies for the school system.

In light of state budget deficits that eliminate or seriously reduce funding of the State School Facilities Board, a forum should be developed within Farm Bureau to further evaluate problems with financing school construction. (2010)

School Districts:

We recommend that school districts remain under local control, and only be reorganized by a vote of the residents of those districts involved.

School districts should make provisions to allow students time off from school to participate in their county fair and 4-H and FFA Expos. (2011)

~~Creation Emphasis~~ EVOLUTION THEORY:

We strongly urge **THAT EVOLUTION BE TAUGHT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AS A THEORY RATHER THAN AS FACT AND INCLUDE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE THAT IS CONTRARY TO THE THEORY. IF ONE THEORY OR OPINION ON HOW THE EARTH WAS FORMED IS TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS THEN ALL THEORIES OR OPINIONS MUST BE GIVEN EQUAL TIME. to that the biblical perspective of creation be given emphasis along with the theory of spontaneous generation in our public school system.**(2012)

Vocational Agriculture Programs:

We strongly support vocational agriculture programs and the FFA. Full time executive and support staff should be funded by the state. Farm Bureau should work with all other state agriculture groups to promote the vocational agriculture programs and the FFA. When hiring a new executive secretary, members of the agricultural community should be involved in the screening and interviewing process. We will encourage every high school district to have an FFA program.

Agricultural education needs to include environment and conservation education with adequate funding provided for both programs.

We support the legislative mandate for teaching of a free enterprise course at the secondary level. (2010)

Teaching:

We advocate a return to teaching the basic educational skills of reading, writing and arithmetic at the elementary level. (2010)

Agriculture Teacher Shortage:

We recognize that there is an extremely serious shortage of qualified Agricultural Education teachers entering the teaching profession on the state and national level. We will work closely with the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, the Arizona Department of Education, the Arizona Agriculture Teachers Association and the University of Arizona Department of Agricultural Education on initiatives that promote the recruitment and retention of quality teachers of Agricultural Education and FFA advisors. We will support state and national efforts already in place to address this issue being undertaken by the National FFA Organization, the National Association of Agricultural Educators and the National Council for Agricultural Education. We will investigate new ways to address this problem in Arizona and we will allocate financial resources where helpful. (2008)

Agriculture Education:

We support efforts to promote accurate scientific information on the positive effects of agriculture to be incorporated into all education curriculums. (2011)

General Education:

To assure quality education for our children, who are our country's future, we urge that the tenure system be terminated and replaced with a modified tenure and merit pay system that will serve as a reward for good performance and an encouragement for capable instructors to continue in the educational field. (2010)

Requirements for Medical License:

We urge that Arizona require that a course in the diagnosis of and treatment for the exposure to pesticides and fertilizers be a prerequisite for the issuance of a medical license from the State. We shall encourage the introduction of legislation to require this course. We urge Arizona to establish educational requirements in diet and nutrition for the issuance of a medical license. (2008)

School Lunch Program:

We support the use of a balanced, ~~nutritional~~ nutritious and affordable school lunch program and support the utilization of Arizona agriculture products where available. (2009)

Veterinary Training:

Numerous Arizona students who have qualified for, and desire to pursue, academic courses leading to veterinarian careers, are now precluded from doing so because of the already overloaded facilities for such training at the available regional schools of veterinary medicine. We should initiate action and work with all other interested bodies to provide the most practical means of providing veterinary medicine training to qualified applicants.

We support the establishment of a large animal veterinary training and certification program in the state of Arizona to help alleviate the shortage of large animal veterinarians in the state.

(REAFFIRM: 2012)

Terrorism:

We believe local terrorism such as urban gangs and eco-terrorists are of equal concern to local communities as is international terrorism. Agri-terrorism should be considered a felony offense. Agricultural producers should be vigilant in observing and reporting all suspicious activities on or around surrounding property. (2011)

Range Management Education:

We support requiring any government employee or contract employee assigned to develop or implement regulations that impact livestock grazing management be certified as land management/environmental science professionals, by having formal training and a minimal level of experience in range monitoring and utilization management. (2008)

Cooperative Extension:

We strongly support the University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Service. We ask our state legislature to fund the University of Arizona at levels that allow adequate funding to support cooperative extension.

As Arizona grows in suburban areas cooperative extension has met and continues to provide programs for suburbia as well as rural Arizona.

We strongly urge the state to provide the funding that allows the University of Arizona to fill vacant cooperative extension agent positions throughout the state. (2010)

Research:

Research is essential for agriculture to keep up in the technological frontier. As the nature of farming continues to change as a result of economics, political and regulatory changes, a renewed emphasis must be placed on research. Emphasis should be placed on applied research particularly on changing cropping patterns and high value crops. Additionally, we should work with the universities of Arizona in identifying and conducting other needed agricultural research in the following areas:

1. Biotechnology in all areas of production;
2. Expanded uses of existing crops;
3. Research on less labor-intensive crops;
4. Ways to expand and/or make use of mechanical harvesting; and
5. Vegetable, citrus and nursery crops in areas where expanded production of these crops is expected. (2008)

Native American Education:

We call for EACH TRIBE ~~the federal government~~ to reimburse local school districts for the full cost of educating Native Americans. (2012)

Unemployment and Welfare Benefits:

We support legislation limiting the period of time that persons may receive unemployment or welfare benefits, and that the amount of such benefits shall not exceed the national minimum wage scale.

The use of WIC coupons at farmers' markets should not be limited to vegetables, fruits and grains. Meat, poultry and dairy at farmers' markets should also be included for WIC.

Payments of unemployment benefits should be prohibited to persons participating in a labor strike.

Non-citizens of the United States should not receive unemployment benefits while not living in the United States.

Undocumented aliens should not receive unemployment benefits.

Recipients must pass a drug test in order to obtain benefits. (2011)

Unemployment Tax:

We support the raising of the minimum quarterly wage level from \$20,000 to \$40,000 at which an employer is required to pay for the unemployment tax, and favor the adoption of a formula that will keep pace with current wages paid. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

COMMODITIES

Farm Programs:

We believe that the federal farm program policies and features in place since the 2002 Farm Bill should be continued without any structural changes. The current programs reflect several years of negotiations and compromises that all sectors of agriculture have learned to live with. Tinkering with the existing formula can only hurt agriculture in one form or another. For example, Congress should not punish productivity by ignoring the fact that world commodity price competitiveness demands ever greater economies of scale. If budget restraints call for a reduction in agriculture's budget baseline, we believe that ~~all~~ COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND CROP INSURANCE programs should ~~be~~ **COULD** be **ELIMINATED** reduced equally by some identified percentage. **ENTIRELY IN EXCHANGE FOR CALCULATION OF INCOME TAX ON A 7 YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE AND A FAIR AND RELIABLE WAY TO PASS OUR BUSINESS ON TO OUR KIDS. A \$5 MILLION LIFETIME ASSET TRANSFER EXEMPTION, ADJUSTED ANNUALLY FOR INFLATION WITH NO MORE THAN 20% TAX BURDEN AFTER \$5 MILLION, WOULD REASONABLY AND FAIRLY SERVE THAT PURPOSE.** (2012)

Milk Pricing:

We oppose any form of a national quota system for the U.S. dairy industry.

We oppose the Continuation of the M.I.L.C. Program.

IF THE PROPOSED MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED, IT SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- **IN THE BASE PORTION OF THE PROGRAM, A BUILT IN ALLOWANCE FOR 2% GROWTH.**

- USDA FARM SERVICE AGENCY SHOULD NOT ADMINISTER THE INSURANCE PORTION OF THE PROGRAM. THIS SHOULD BE PRIVATIZED.
- THE PROGRAM SHOULD APPLY TO ALL DAIRIES, REGARDLESS OF SIZE.
- THE STABILIZATION PORTION OF THE PROGRAM SHOULD BE BASED ON INTERNATIONAL PRICE TRIGGERS RATHER THAN MARGIN SPREAD.
- THERE SHOULD BE NO PAYMENT CONFISCATION IN THE PROGRAM, REGARDLESS OF MILK FLUCTUATIONS.

WE OPPOSE ANY PROGRAM FOR MANDATORY SUPPLY CONTROL OF MILK.(2012)

Commodity Promotion:

We recognize the right of producers to promote increased research, sales and consumption of the commodities they produce.

We support all commodity promotion programs if the enabling legislation provides:

1. Individual producers the right to vote in a referendum on the initiation of any program for a commodity which they produced in the last three years;
2. For a referendum to be valid, a majority of votes cast must be affirmative in a well-publicized referendum;
3. An individual, partnership or corporation shall have only one vote;
4. At any time upon a petition of 10 percent of the producers of the commodity, a referendum will be conducted to determine if the program should be discontinued. To terminate the program, only producers shall be allowed to vote and a majority of those voting must vote in favor of discontinuance;
5. A refund provision cannot be removed from a commodity check-off program making the voluntary program a mandatory program without a referendum to the producers;
6. That collected funds shall be used only for promotion, research, pest abatement and market development of the commodity being assessed and as directed by the producers of these products; and
8. That only those persons who contribute monies to the respective programs shall be eligible to serve on the boards which administer such programs. (2010)

Fruit And Vegetable Standardization:

We continue to support the implementation of an opt-out program for fruit and vegetable standardization that insures a representative number of growers support the opt-out proposal. (2008)

Liaison with Agriculture Commodity Organizations:

The highly varied circumstances and problems encountered in American agriculture have necessitated formation of many commodity organizations to address specific needs. Therefore, when a commodity group or Farm Bureau promotes, supports or opposes a particular issue that affects a specific commodity group, there must be close liaison with the commodity group involved. We must always seek reconciliation of divergent viewpoints and a position of mutual support.

We will support a commodity activity program that qualifies the Arizona Farm Bureau to participate in the American Farm Bureau commodity advisory committees.

We support the participation of the Farm Bureau in a council, which promotes communication among all Arizona agricultural groups. We also support the participation of Farm Bureau in the Annual Ag Summit.

We urge the Arizona Farm Bureau to contact all commodity groups prior to a delegate session to determine commodity concerns, needs and legislative priorities. As a result of this action, the Arizona Farm Bureau delegates can act on commodity issues with more complete knowledge. We request similar information and courtesy be provided to the Arizona Farm Bureau by the commodity groups.

We urge the Arizona Farm Bureau to contact all commodity groups immediately after a delegate session and inform them of policy actions taken. (2011)

Ag Economic Development:

We support the Arizona Department of Agriculture in their efforts to coordinate an agriculture economic development program after the Department's primary roles of serving and regulating are fully accomplished.

We support the addition of a program that will close the gap reflected between farmer and consumer of gross receipts, per crop, animal, ornamental or fiber entities.

We need to work with economic development groups to get agricultural value added industries into Arizona. (2011)

World Crop Reporting:

The United States Department of Agriculture should promptly release to American producers all satellite and other sources of information on crop acreage and conditions such as production estimates, effects of weather and insect pressures in the United States and foreign countries. The lack of such pertinent information from the United States Department of Agriculture on acres planted through out the world on major crops, results in wide swings in market prices, which are very costly to the American farmer. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Agricultural Products:

We support the efforts of all groups in promoting the consumption of all agricultural commodities. We urge the development of a program to promote the image of agriculture by the Arizona Farm Bureau. (2010)

GOATS AND GOAT PRODUCTS:

ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES (3-561) SHOULD RECOGNIZE "GOAT AND GOAT PRODUCTS" AS A FOOD PRODUCT, THE SAME AS IT DOES ALL OTHER LIVESTOCK SECTORS AS GENERATING FOOD PRODUCTS. (2012)

WINERIES:

WINE GRAPE GROWING AND WINERIES WHERE GRAPES ARE PROCESSED INTO WINE IS VALUE-ADDED AGRICULTURE. WE SUPPORT FARM WINERIES, THE EXPANSION OF VINEYARDS, AND THE SELLING OF WINE PRODUCED IN ARIZONA DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS ON PREMISES. WE ALSO SUPPORT THE ABILITY OF FARM WINERIES TO SELL, DELIVER, AND SHIP WINE DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS OFF PREMISES OR DIRECTLY TO RETAIL STORES AND RESTAURANTS. WE SUPPORT AND WILL WORK WITH ARIZONA RURAL GOVERNMENTS TO ENSURE

THAT FARM WINERIES, VINEYARDS, AND ON-FARM TASTING ROOMS ARE DEFINED AND REGULATED CONSISTENTLY AS AN AGRICULTURAL USE, AGRIBUSINESS USE, AND/OR FARMING. WE SUPPORT EFFORTS BY THE USDA OR OTHER ENTITY TO MEASURE THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE GRAPE-GROWING AND WINE INDUSTRY. (2012)

Sustainable Agriculture

Agriculture provides society numerous benefits including but not limited to food security, a safe and healthy food supply, environmental benefits and community stability. It is important to remember that agriculture needs the flexibility to alter cropping patterns and practices to meet the demands of operating in an open marketplace where our competition comes from farmers worldwide. When considering sustainable agriculture, there is only one constant and that is agriculture is only sustainable when it is profitable. Sustainable agriculture should recognize the benefits of accepted management practices that American agriculture currently employs. Sustainable agriculture should be flexible enough to fit America's diverse climates, cropping patterns, land use standards, and regulatory requirements. Regulations should not limit agricultural practices without strong scientific and economic justification. Sustainable agriculture should rely on measurable results and focus on adaptive management for continual improvements rather than a rigid set of practices.

We support scientific research and education that encourages all participants in the agricultural industry to produce, process and distribute safe food, feed, fiber and fuel in a manner that is economically viable and enhances the quality of life for present and future generations.

Over 200 years of increasing productivity has proven modern American agriculture to be sustainable. The term "sustainable agriculture" should not be used as a label for any niches within the agriculture industry. (2010)

New Crop Support:

We support legislation that increases research, promotion and financial aid for new crops in our state. (SUNSET: 2012)

Arizona Grain Council:

Wheat and barley produced in Arizona should be subject to A MANDATORY, NON-REFUNDABLE CHECK OFF BY the Arizona Grain Council. ~~check-off. Corn and sorghum should be exempt from the check-off. Producer sales should not be exempt from the check-off.~~ No remuneration should be given to first PURCHASER buyers for collection fees. ~~Arizona growers do not need the duplication of fees by the Arizona Grain and Research Promotion Council and the Wheat Growers Association. The Arizona Grain Research and Promotion Council should continue with research and promotion and the Wheat Growers Association should pursue the legislative work of the wheat growers and should be funded by voluntary contributions only.~~ (2012)

Lending Institutions:

We support new legislation or regulations that would prevent lending institutions from including an "on demand" clause in term loans.

For credit worthy borrowers, allowances should be made to enable the lending institution to maintain a carryover note without putting the old and new loans into a non-performing status.

We support changing the rules and regulations covering lending institutions to allow more readily accessible funds for agricultural operations.

We approve the current GSE (Government Sponsored Entity) status for the Farm Credit System (FCS). Farmers and ranchers should continue to serve on the board of directors of the FCS. We oppose commercial banks having access to money procured by virtue of the agency status enjoyed by the FCS. (2008)

INSURANCE

Automobile Insurance:

We support the law requiring proof of bodily injury (BI) and property damage (PD) insurance coverage before an automobile may be licensed to operate on the streets, roads and highways of Arizona. We encourage the strengthening of this law so that fewer uninsured drivers will be on the road. (2011)

Tort and Insurance Reform:

We support tort reform at the state level that would require the non-prevailing party in lawsuits to bear the costs of litigation ~~unless partition of cost is deemed necessary by the judiciary body handling litigation.~~ (2012)

Pro-rated Insurance:

We support insurance companies pro-rating for occasional use vehicles. (2011)

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Farm Bill:

We should work cohesively with other agricultural organizations ~~both in maintaining the integrity of the current Farm Bill and also in addressing the needs of Arizona agriculture,~~ while working on the next Farm Bill. (2012)

Specialty Crops and the Farm Bill:

The Farm Bill should ~~include an increase in-~~EXPAND the market access program to include specialty crops. ~~increased~~ THIS SECTOR SHOULD HAVE funding for the mitigation, eradication and recovery strategies regarding invasive pests, and research funding for integrated projects that combine research, extension and education ~~for the specialty crop sector.~~ (2012)

Tell Ag Story:

We should work with other agriculture and commodity organizations to establish programs and legislation in the best interest of agriculture. We feel that the public should be more thoroughly informed of agriculture's role in the economy and welfare of our community and nation.

We support studies that are currently being conducted to adequately quantify agriculture's economic benefit to the state.

We need to focus as much on promoting our country as having the safest food supply in the world as we do working to introduce new food safety laws. Advances in food safety requirements should be based on peer-review and sound science.

We will develop a multimedia program that will promote the activities and positions of the farm community. A committee, comprised of all agricultural commodity groups shall be formed to

work out commercials, grants and other funding to educate and promote the benefits of agriculture on television.

We should develop a program on the use of farm chemicals and water that could be presented by members to civic organizations and groups. (2010)

Food-Water-Fiber:

Farm Bureau and other agricultural organizations should join to educate the citizens of our communities on the wise use of water in the production of food, fiber and horticulture products. (2008)

Economic Impact:

Farm Bureau needs to quantify agriculture's impact on our economy. Economic impact figures should include agriculture's wise use of water.

Farm Bureau should work with other industries to support and expand on the effort to educate the public on the immigration issues. The general public needs to comprehend the impacts on industry as they relate to the consumer. (2008)

Public Relations:

The Arizona Farm Bureau Federation shall continue its public relations efforts. Funds and resources may be allocated, to support public relations efforts of the Arizona Farm Bureau Board of Directors. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

WITHIN FARM BUREAU

Ag in the Classroom:

Farm Bureau shall continue to support and further expand the Ag in the Classroom program and develop consumer education programs. Further, we encourage Arizona Farm Bureau to continue its support of the Summer Ag Institute. (2008)

Consumer Education:

We direct the Arizona Farm Bureau staff to continue and enhance advertising campaigns to assist counties in getting the message out locally to consumers concerning Arizona's agriculture. (2011)

Farm Income:

Studies and pilot programs show that value added sales of agricultural products, by the producer, multiplies net farm income by a factor 10 percent for each value added step assumed. Since our primary mission is to improve net farm income, we shall explore means of educating and assisting our members in a value added approach to marketing raw agricultural commodities and developing new markets. (2010)

Annual Meeting:

We direct the Arizona Farm Bureau officers and staff to conduct the annual meeting in no more than two consecutive days. Policy development shall be conducted in one day. (2011)

Reward Program:

Arizona Farm Bureau should implement a statewide crime prevention program featuring substantial rewards for anyone who provides information leading to conviction of a person who committed a crime on the property of or against a Farm Bureau member. (2010)

Political Action Committee:

We will continue the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation Political Action Committee. We support Farm Bureau promoting and meeting the criteria for a Super PAC. (2009)

President Expenses:

We will pay for all the expenses of the Arizona Farm Bureau President, including travel, lodging and meals when on assignment for the Arizona Farm Bureau. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Lifetime Membership:

We support the continuation of an endowment fund to benefit the Arizona Educational Farming Company, wherein a one-time donation of \$5,000 would insure to the donor:

1. Annual Farm Bureau membership dues for the life of the donor; and
2. A one-time tax deduction of \$5,000 for income tax purposes.

Any earnings of the endowment fund in excess of membership dues would be used at the discretion of the governing board of the Arizona Educational Farming Company. If annual earnings are less than membership dues, the balance owing will be deducted from the endowment fund. Upon the death of the donor, the total endowment would be used for the benefit of the Educational Farming Company. (2011)

Farm Bureau Membership Dues:

We support the Arizona Farm Bureau's proposed dues structure for a common dues level of \$112 and \$35 when the insurance membership requirement is fully implemented and the system is automated. We support the establishment of a third category in the Arizona Farm Bureau dues structure; "high service county" dues for agriculture members. Any county that deems higher dues revenue necessary to support their programs could set their Ag dues at the "high service county" level. The entire increase above regular agricultural dues will be remitted to the county. The "high service county" dues rate will be set by agreement by the presidents of the counties that choose to adopt this dues level. (2011)

Leadership Training:

We, with other farm organizations, will continue a training program for farmers and agribusiness members. The purpose of this training is to prepare speakers and evaluators to appear at hearings, legislative meetings, TV shows and civic clubs to represent the farm side of the issues involving pesticides, water, taxation and so forth. This would involve public functions. (2006) (2011)

Project CENTRL:

As Project CENTRL is the premiere rural leadership program in Arizona, Arizona Farm Bureau and the various county Farm Bureaus should strive to maintain a high level of involvement and commitment to Project CENTRL. Farm Bureau should encourage members to apply for the program to assist them in improving and expanding their leadership skills, as well as encouraging individual or group financial support. (2010)

FFA 10X15:

We support National FFA's 10x15 initiative and as an Arizona component of that initiative, we support including the agri-science standards that have been established in Arizona. (2008)

Safety Awareness Program:

We urge owners and operators of farm trailers and other farm equipment to stress and practice safe operation on public roadways. As the population of rural areas increases, the chances of farm equipment being involved in an accident on public roadways increase. Accidents of this type could lead to enactment of additional laws restricting the movement of equipment. (2010)

Trucking Regulation:

The Arizona Farm Bureau Federation should inform its members regarding the new state and federal trucking regulations as they pertain to agricultural trucking. (2011)

Water Committee:

The Arizona Farm Bureau officers and staff are directed to reactivate our water committee early in 2010 to address developing issues on water policy, both state and federal. The water committee should review actions and policies affecting agriculture in the state of Arizona. (2010)

Women in Ag Conference:

The Arizona Farm Bureau Federation will support the Women in Ag Conference with advance publicity, financial support and coverage of the event. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

Back to Constitutional Basics

We believe that the Constitutional principles of enumerated federal powers, federalism, property rights and individual liberty have eroded to the point that a strong reaffirmation of these principles is necessary. We believe that the activities and regulatory powers of the federal government should be both limited to and consistent with the enumerated powers outlined for it in the U.S. Constitution.

We believe that the doctrine of “judicial deference” has unacceptably eroded the boundaries that should exist between federal and state powers. We further believe that federal laws and associated administrative regulations have unacceptably trampled the Constitutional principles of personal liberty and property rights.

The fallout from legislation and subsequent court rulings dealing with endangered species, clean air and clean water is example enough of individual, property and state’s rights being eroded. The Supreme Court’s Kelo decision defining “public use” to allow land to be taken by eminent domain from one person to benefit another person in the name of economic development is another glaring example of how far we have strayed from our founding principles.

In order to restore some balance of power between the federal government and the states, better protect individual liberty and property rights from federal nullification and task the courts to police these boundaries, we in concert with like-minded groups, should support the following proposed Constitutional Amendment developed by Randy E. Barnett, Professor of Constitutional Law at Georgetown University. The amendment is reprinted from “The Case for a Federalism Amendment” THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, April 23, 2009 (Barnett proposed repeal of the income tax within this amendment. That portion has been removed since Farm Bureau does not currently support repeal.):

Federalism Amendment

Section 1: Congress shall have power to regulate or prohibit any activity between one state and another, or with foreign nations, provided that no regulation or prohibition shall infringe any enumerated or un-enumerated right, privilege or immunity recognized by this Constitution.

Reason: This section of the Federalism Amendment expands the power of Congress to include any interstate activity not contained in the original meaning of the Commerce Clause. Interstate pollution, for example, is not "commerce . . . among the several states," but is exactly the type of interstate problem that the Framers sought to specify in their list of delegated powers. This section also makes explicit that judicial deference that erodes individual and states' rights is unnecessary if modern issues between the states can be constitutionally adjudicated.

Section 2: Nothing in this article, or the eighth section of article I, shall be construed to authorize Congress to regulate or prohibit any activity that takes place wholly within a single state, regardless of its effect outside the state or whether it employs instrumentalities there from; but Congress may define and punish offenses constituting acts of war or violent insurrection against the United States.

Reason: This section of the Federalism Amendment then allows state policy experimentation by prohibiting Congress from regulating any activity that takes place wholly within a state. States, of course, retain their police power to regulate or prohibit such activity subject to the constraints imposed on them, for example, by Article I or the 14th Amendment. And a state is free to enter into compacts with other states to coordinate regulation and enforcement, subject to approval by Congress as required by Article I.

Section 3: The power of Congress to appropriate any funds shall be limited to carrying into execution the powers enumerated by this Constitution and vested in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof; or to satisfy any current obligation of the United States to any person living at the time of the ratification of this article.

Reason: This section of the Federalism Amendment adopts James Madison's reading of the taxing and borrowing powers of Article 1 to limit federal spending to that which is incident to an enumerated power. It explicitly allows Congress to honor its outstanding financial commitments to living persons, such as its promise to make Social Security payments.

Section 4: The judicial power of the United States to enforce this article includes but is not limited to the power to nullify any prohibition or unreasonable regulation of a rightful exercise of liberty. The words of this article, and any other provision of this Constitution, shall be interpreted according to their public meaning at the time of their enactment.

Reason: This section of the Federalism Amendment authorizes judges to keep Congress within its limits by examining laws that restrict the rightful exercise of liberty to ensure that they are a necessary and proper means to implement an enumerated power. This section also requires that the Constitution be interpreted according to its original meaning at the time of its enactment. By expanding the powers of Congress to include regulating all interstate activity, the Amendment greatly relieves the political pressure on courts to adopt strained interpretations of Congress's enumerated powers. (2011)

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Five Year Policies:

The policies herein remain in force for a period of five years unless amended or reaffirmed. The date following each policy statement is the year it originated, was amended or was reaffirmed as Arizona Farm Bureau policy. Arizona Farm Bureau policy books are made available to all members upon request.

Policy Development Committee Reports:

We direct the officers and staff of the Arizona Farm Bureau to publish the annual meeting policy committee report and send it to each county not less than seven days prior to the annual meeting.

Procedure for Late Resolutions:

Late resolutions are those resolutions, which address an issue that has surfaced in the time period between the county policy development process ending with the County Annual Meeting and the State Annual Meeting. Late resolutions shall be introduced from the floor by a voting delegate at the Open Reading of the resolutions session of the State Annual Meeting. A written copy of the resolution shall be furnished to the State Resolutions Committee.

After presentation of late resolutions, the State Resolutions Committee shall meet to determine if these resolutions meet the criteria of solving a problem which has surfaced late in the policy development process. Those resolutions that meet this test will be included in the State Resolutions Committee Report offered to the voting delegates. The committee shall return those resolutions, which do not meet the test, to the sponsor.

American Farm Bureau Policy Recommendations

U.S. - Mexico Border Security 180

We need to secure our United States borders and reduce terrorism through the following methods. We further support maximum funding for these programs to assist in securing our border:

- (1) Complete fencing or other barriers where possible on the U.S. Mexico border including an adjacent roadway allowing better access for the border patrol and any other agencies to secure the border;
- (2) Department of Homeland Security enforcing and maintaining the barriers on the border;
- (3) Military presence on the border with rules of engagement defined and expanded;
- (4) An emphasis on deploying technology and personnel based on the unique needs of enforcement agencies on a sector by sector basis, including electronic surveillance technology, fixed wing and helicopter and implementation of unmanned aerial systems for night and day surveillance;
- (5) Increased penalties for drug or human trafficking and other illegal entrance into the United States;
- (6) Full communications coverage for civilians, law enforcement and military, including phone tower construction throughout the border region;
- (7) The use of a virtual fence or other electronic surveillance; technology across agriculture lands where a physical fence is not practical;
- (8) Operation Stone Garden, or similar programs, which would give local law enforcement agencies the technology to work more effectively with border patrol; and
- (9) Operation Streamline, or similar programs, to process and detain illegal persons through the Department of Justice. (REAFFIRM: 2012)

National Dairy Program 238

We support:

- (1) A market-oriented national dairy program that allows U.S. producers to compete in a world market based on fair and open trade policies;
- (2) A risk management program which offers protection based on gross margins (milk price minus feed costs);
- (3) Using all funding previously allocated to the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) and dairy price support programs for a margin insurance program;
- (4) An expanded role for markets and private enterprise in establishing prices for all classes of milk;
- (5) A competitive pay price to include consideration of two classes of milk, fluid and manufacturing;
- (6) Modifications in the Federal Milk Marketing Order structure, formulas and price classes used to compute milk prices in order to better reflect current market conditions and enhance transparency and take into account the regional differences in the cost of milk production;
- (7) State and regional initiatives or compacts which are consistent with our overall goal of a market oriented national dairy program, specifically the expansion and reauthorization of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact and authorization of the Southern States Dairy Compact;

- (8) Legislation that treats imports of milk protein concentrates, ultra-filtered milk and caseine equivalent to and consistent with the importation of similar dairy products;
- (9) Implementation of the California standards for solids-non-fat in fluid milk at the national level;
- (10) A national program for dairy product promotion, research and nutrition education and the U.S. Dairy Export Council;
- (11) The collection of promotion fees on all U.S. and imported dairy products including milk protein concentrates;
- (12) Any changes needed to facilitate the long term market development of value added products;
- (13) Changes in the Federal Milk Marketing Order system to require all those procuring milk from producers to make full payment within ten days of the date of purchase unless other provisions are made in a written contract;
- (14) A national dairy plant security program to enhance a producer's ability to recover losses due to the financial failure of milk handlers or cooperatives. All those procuring milk from producers should be included in the program;
- (15) Research to determine a "no effect" level for any antibiotics and aflatoxins in milk according to Food and Drug Administration (FDA) standards;
- (16) Uniform testing procedures for antibiotics and aflatoxins that detect levels according to FDA standards;
- (17) Regulations which provide for and require the inspection of all imported dairy products at the port of entry;
- (18) All imitation dairy products being labeled imitation;
- (19) Producers having a priority lien on their milk;
- (20) Labeling a product cheese only when it is produced from natural milk products;
- (21) The placing of milk vending machines in public schools;
- (22) Modifying the Federal Milk Marketing Order system to encourage the production of milk protein concentrates in the United States;
- (23) Improving price discovery through mandatory weekly reporting and auditing of prices and inventories. The number of plants being surveyed should be increased as well as the penalties for inaccurate dairy reporting;
- (24) The enrollment of all dairy producers in the Milk and Dairy Beef Quality Assurance Program and their participation in the National Dairy Farmers Assuring Responsible Management program;
- (25) An increased effort by the dairy industry to develop domestic and foreign markets;
- (26) A state or local inspector accompanying all U.S. Department of Health and Human Services inspectors. Producers should receive a full report and explanation upon completion of the inspection, which includes: deficiencies, items inspected, equipment disassembled for inspection and overall score;
- (27) A definition of milk protein concentrate (MPC) and a standard of identity that will define appropriate use of these components as well as a means of enforcement;
- (28) The use of Cooperatives Working Together (CWT) and urge participation by all dairy producers;
- (29) The concept of expanding the Export Assistance Program of CWT;

(30) The producer/handler exemption being limited in all Federal Milk Marketing Orders to 3 million pounds per month to protect other pool producer members from unfair competition, but do not support its elimination;

(31) USDA to immediately promulgate regulations on the pricing of domestically produced MPC's; and

(32) Exempting milk from EPA Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) requirements.

We oppose:

(1) A mandatory quota system but are willing to consider a temporary supply management system;

(2) Creation of a mandatory fund financed by a checkoff on dairy farmers to guarantee milk checks;

(3) A "no" vote on a referendum changing the order, causing elimination of the entire federal order; and

(4) The FDA changing the definition of milk.

IF THE PROPOSED MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED, IT SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- **IN THE BASE PORTION OF THE PROGRAM, A BUILT IN ALLOWANCE FOR 2% GROWTH.**
- **USDA FARM SERVICE AGENCY SHOULD NOT ADMINISTER THE INSURANCE PORTION OF THE PROGRAM. THIS SHOULD BE PRIVATIZED.**
- **THE PROGRAM SHOULD APPLY TO ALL DAIRIES, REGARDLESS OF SIZE.**
- **THE STABILIZATION PORTION OF THE PROGRAM SHOULD BE BASED ON INTERNATIONAL PRICE TRIGGERS RATHER THAN MARGIN SPREAD.**
- **THERE SHOULD BE NO PAYMENT CONFISCATION IN THE PROGRAM, REGARDLESS OF MILK FLUCTUATIONS.**

WE OPPOSE ANY PROGRAM FOR MANDATORY SUPPLY CONTROL OF MILK.(2012)

Equine 307

We support:

(1) Legislation and rulings that allow the sale, possession and transport of horses intended for processing or rendering, and encourage a national education campaign targeted toward legislators and the media as to the consequences of eliminating equine harvest, resulting in unintended animal abuse and neglect, and the negative impact on the equine industry;

(2) Domestic ownership, control and location of equine processing facilities;

(3) The reopening or development of new equine harvesting facilities;

(4) The classification of horses as livestock;

(5) Maintaining accessibility to federal and state lands for equine activities through the passage of the National "Right to Ride" Act;

(6) Funding for Food Safety and Inspection Service inspectors in facilities that harvest horses;

(7) Including all aspects of the equine industry in the agricultural census;

(8) Encouraging equine owners to follow American Association of Equine Practitioners (AAEP) core vaccination guidelines for equine health and disease related issues;

- (9) Including horses in the definition of livestock as it applies to qualifying for federal disaster programs;
- (10) Individual and non-governmental organization rights to save horses from harvest as long as they take possession of the horses and are responsible for their care and feeding;
- (11) When an equine is in the custody of a government agency and an adoption has not been able to take place within 6 months, that equine should be humanely euthanized and processed;
- (12) The continuation of the three-year depreciation schedule for race horses. We believe the term 'placed in service' means when the horse begins training;
- (13) Legislation that would recognize the inherent risks of equine activities; and
- (14) The development of a national testing and surveillance program for Piroplasmiasis.
- (15) THE PROCESSING OF EQUINE FOR CONSUMPTION BY ZOO ANIMALS.**

We oppose:

- (1) The passage of the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act or similar legislation;
- (2) The classification of horses as companion animals;
- (3) Any regulations that prohibit the harvest of equines; and
- (4) Any legislation that would curtail movement into Mexico and Canada of horses that meet the requirements of existing trade agreements.

(2012)

Packers and Stockyards Act 313

We support continuation of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) as a separate agency of USDA and oppose any attempt to lessen the ability of this agency to adequately enforce the act and its regulations.

The Packers and Stockyards Act should be amended to:

- (1) Extend prompt pay requirements to wholesalers and retailers of livestock products;
- (2) Include a dealer trust provision;
- (3) Provide jurisdiction and enforcement over the marketing of poultry meat and eggs as already exists for livestock;
- (4) Strengthen the ability of GIPSA to stop predatory practices in the meat packing industry;
- (5) Provide producer restitution when a case is successfully prosecuted;
- (6) Provide GIPSA enforcement authority to ensure that all instruments used in quantifying quality factors for value determination for livestock are performing to a set standard; and
- (7) Include breeder hen and pullet operations so they are treated the same as broiler operations.

We support the addition of dairy cattle and milk processors as named in the Packers and Stockyards Act.

We support an amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, that would include the ratite (emu, ostrich and rhea) industry wherever applicable.

We will support legislation on a state and national basis, establishing GIPSA as the overall authority and provider of oversight to ensure livestock contracts are clearly-written, confidentiality concerns are addressed, investments are protected, enhanced price transparency and price discovery are enhanced, and terms of contracts are honored.

We will work with GIPSA for more strict enforcement of regulations requiring poultry to be weighed on the nearest scale within a reasonable time, not to exceed eight hours, after the poultry is picked up at the farm.

We recommend stricter enforcement of laws requiring livestock market owners to water and feed livestock kept overnight in stockyards and markets.

We support more vigorous enforcement of U.S. antitrust laws in keeping with original intent; to include the Sherman Act of 1890, Clayton Act of 1914 and Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. USDA, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, should closely investigate all mergers, ownership changes or other trends in the meat packing industry for actions that limit the availability of a competitive market for livestock producers.

Any proposed GIPSA rules or legislation should address the following:

- ~~(1) Separate and different rules should be allowed for different species of livestock;~~
- ~~(1)~~ (1) SEPARATE, APPROPRIATE, CLEAR AND LEGALLY SUPPORTABLE RULES, CONSISTENT WITH CONGRESSIONAL GRANTS OF AUTHORITY, FOR EACH OF THE POULTRY, CATTLE AND HOG INDUSTRIES, RECOGNIZING THAT EACH SEGMENT OF THE MEAT INDUSTRY IS UNIQUE.
- ~~(2) An economic impact study must be conducted by USDA;~~
- ~~(2)~~ (2) A THOROUGH AND COMPREHENSIVE PRACTICAL, LEGAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PROPOSED RULES
- (3) Opportunities for marketing arrangements between packers and producers must be allowed and preserved;
- (4) Confidentiality of contract information must be maintained; and
- (5) Establish legal thresholds for proof of injury.

WE REQUEST THE GRAIN INSPECTION PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION (GIPSA) REFRAIN FROM PROPOSING ANY RULES THAT WILL HAVE MARKET DISTORTING IMPACTS ON THE BEEF INDUSTRY.

Action should be taken to oppose further concentration of the meat packers. The Departments of Agriculture and Justice should more aggressively enforce current antitrust laws pertaining to packer concentration.

Beef packers who process more than 1,000 head per day should be monitored so they cannot manipulate the market through forward contracting.

We believe that from a regulatory standpoint, captive supplies should be defined as all cattle owned, or controlled or contracted by, a packer seven or more days prior to delivery. We support legislation that would prohibit packers from manipulating the number of captive supply cattle slaughtered from week to week in order to manipulate the cash market.

The bonding requirement for livestock dealers and packers should be reviewed on an annual basis and be adjusted to reflect the volume of the maximum financial exposure to producers and/or their brokers and then be made available to the public.

~~We oppose prohibiting a packer or livestock buyer from purchasing, acquiring or receiving livestock from another packer, livestock buyer, or another packer's or livestock buyer's "affiliate" companies or farms.~~

WE OPPOSE ANY RULE THAT LIMITS SALES, OR PROHIBITS PACKER TO PACKER SALES OR SALES TO AFFILIATED COMPANIES.

We oppose the government making livestock buyers, packers, contractors or livestock owners justify in writing why and how they are buying or selling livestock on the spot market.

We oppose any ban on contract livestock buyers purchasing livestock for more than one packer.

Food Quality and Safety 339

The American food supply is the safest, most abundant and affordable in the world. Agricultural chemicals and other technological advances play a major role in maintaining both the quality and quantity of our food supply.

We will monitor initiatives to improve and streamline food safety to ensure that policies and procedures are in place that build trust and reliability in U.S. agriculture.

We support:

(1) INDUSTRY-LED AND COMMODITY SPECIFIC FOOD SAFETY INITIATIVES THAT ARE THOROUGH, ECONOMICAL AND REALISTIC.

- (1) The consideration of both the risks and the benefits of pesticides in the evaluation of chemical products;
- (2) The establishment and promotion of sound scientific research criteria which ensure the safety of food additives;
- (3) Legislative and regulatory decisions concerning food irradiation (cold pasteurization) based on valid research;
- (4) Utilization of USDA approved technologies, such as cold pasteurization and high pressure processing to eliminate e-coli and other pathogens from our food supply;
- (5) The use of modern technology in the processing and the handling of food to assure food safety and to promote consumer confidence in the food supply. More research should be conducted by agricultural colleges into inspection methods to eliminate the risk of pathogens in food;
- (6) Immediate actions by USDA and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to raise the priority of, and resources devoted to, federal safety and inspection services, including: Food Safety Inspection Service and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service;
- (7) Protection of our food supply by requiring that imported food products be subjected to the same high safety standards and testing as food products produced in the United States;
- (8) Funding appropriate inspection services at a level permitting effective inspection of imported and domestic food products;
- (9) Legislation to require the FDA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to prepare, in advance of final rule-making, agricultural cost/benefit statements on proposed regulations having a significant impact on agricultural producers;
- (10) Cooperative efforts with food processors, chemical companies, government agencies, scientists and others who are responsible for the food supply of our nation to provide factual information on the safety of our food supply;
- (11) Open communication with willing consumer groups;
- (12) Measures to improve and streamline food inspection by having USDA serve as the sole federal agency responsible for food inspection and safety;
- (13) Provisions to allow the transport and storage of fresh eggs based on current USDA standards of 45 degrees Fahrenheit or less, but oppose the mandatory pasteurization of fresh eggs;
- (14) State efforts to ensure the quality and integrity of unpasteurized fruit juices. We oppose FDA regulation of these products;
- (15) Promoting science-based, voluntary commodity quality assurance products;
- (16) Additional research on food safety technology advances;
- (17) USDA and FDA removing E.coli as an adulterant; and

(18) The FDA to allow the extra-label use of cephalosporin antimicrobial drugs in animals when warranted.

We believe food safety issues at the producer level should be handled through "quality assurance programs."

We believe that equivalent and consistent standards should be set for beef, pork and poultry for school lunch programs.

We encourage the education of all food handlers on the proper preparation, cooking and serving of all food products and on sanitary practices as part of state licensing procedures.

Ensuring a safe, secure food supply is a critical concern when establishing domestic and international policy. We should continue to communicate accurate, timely information on food safety issues to the mainstream media and the general public. Our goal is to improve awareness and understanding of agriculture's commitment to providing a safe, high quality food supply at a reasonable price to the public.

We support efforts to develop food safety guidelines to help prevent microbial contamination of fresh produce. The guidelines must:

- (1) Be based on sound science and risk;
- (2) Provide flexibility to accommodate the great diversity of the fresh produce industry including those in geographically challenged areas;
- (3) Be practical to implement;
- (4) Take the form of good agricultural practices rather than federal or state mandates;
- (5) Be consistent with existing state and federal regulations and guidelines;
- (6) Ensure that Good Agricultural Practices and Good Handling Practices standards are crop specific;
- (7) Be implemented in a manner that will not impair our ability to export produce items;
- (8) Provide adequate resources to carry out an education program for the industry and consumers; and
- (9) Be tailored to the size, type, and capacity of the farm.

In the event Congress grants FDA food safety authority, FDA should coordinate with USDA in the development and administration of any food safety guidelines related to fresh produce or other agricultural production. FDA should not have on-farm authorities unless a food safety-related cause is indicated by sound science. Any recordkeeping requirements must be accompanied by assurance that information accessed by Federal or state government authorities in regards to food safety protocols will remain confidential. The guidelines must exempt farms engaged in direct sales to consumers from FDA oversight for sale of fruits and vegetables.

USDA should be designated as the lead agency in the development and administration of food safety guidelines.

We encourage food regulatory agencies to research and develop expedient and efficient processes to trace food contamination outbreaks, which result in economic losses and a lack of consumer trust.

Producers of legal agricultural products should not be held responsible or liable for long-term health problems claimed to occur from the product's consumption or use.

We support the right of private industry or farmers to meet quality demands exceeding U.S. Government standards for products they produce.

Those making public health decisions that result in product recalls, product seizures or destruction of perishable goods must be held accountable when such decisions prove erroneous.

Such entities must be required to compensate or indemnify individuals and companies for the monetary losses that occur.

We recommend funding to assist in the implementation of food safety regulations should come from the state and federal governments mandating the regulations.

Any food safety legislation or regulatory actions should adhere to the following principle:

(1) Increases in federal or state funding should not come in the form of fees or fines to farmers unless these fees are in the form of industry assessments under a marketing agreement order; and

(2) Any additional mandated regulatory requirements should not financially impact producers. An indemnification program should be instituted to properly compensate farmers when the government issues an inaccurate food safety warning or recall, that causes losses.

Good Agriculture Practices

Good Agriculture Practices (GAP), are a set of recommendations that can help improve the quality and safety of the produce grown.

We support:

(1) All government agencies following food safety and security protocol on farm operations;

(2) All GAP auditors complying with the same rules;

(3) Training for all auditors being consistent and uniform for both private and USDA auditors;

(4) GAP certification should have requirements reviewed by industry and science groups;

(5) GAP being coordinated with already established and related certifications to minimize conflicts, overlap and paperwork; and

(6) Limiting food origin traceability to no further than the farm of origin. Traceability should not extend to the field level or input level. Any system should be non intrusive and economically feasible.

We oppose expanding GAP audits beyond fruits and vegetables.

(2012)

Grain Standards, Grading, Inspection and Pricing 356

We support adjusting U.S. grains and oilseeds premiums and discount schedules to encourage the storage, delivery and export of high-quality, clean grain; and to offer incentives to minimize the percentage of moisture, foreign material, dockage, and shrunken and damaged kernels.

We support strengthening and enforcing federal standards that would reflect the quality of grain sold in world trade.

We propose that USDA:

(1) Accelerate research to develop more objective tests and promote the use of those tests to accurately differentiate between types of classes of grains based on hardness, protein content and physical and biological characteristics;

(2) Conduct a comprehensive study to identify the changes in grading procedures and standards including sampling and testing methods needed to ensure that class and grade will accurately indicate the appropriate end use for each lot of grain; and

(3) Allow all information available, such as identification by variety, to be used in the classification procedures, pending the adoption of acceptable objective tests.

We support continued development of new grain standards to improve the present U.S. Grain Standards Act. Revised grain standards should indicate clearly and give assurance that we will provide clean, identity-preserved grains for our customers at home and abroad.

The objective of improving grain standards must be to enhance sales and improve returns to producers. New standards should be developed immediately and be strictly enforced. Foreign material, including dockage, should be defined in new grain standards as material other than the grain being marketed.

We believe Farm Bureau, USDA and the grain trade should continue to work cooperatively to improve grain standards which accurately reflect the importance of test weight, protein content, insect infestation levels, moisture, dry matter basis, and foreign material in determining quality, grading, and pricing factors for soybeans, wheat and feed grains. We support grading in increments of tenths. Premium and discount schedules should be consistent and stated at the time of contracting and not be subject to change at delivery.

We support amending the United States Grain Standards Act for soft white wheat to include the level of alpha-amylase enzyme based on the falling number test.

USDA needs to ensure that grain imported into the country complies with domestic grain quality standards.

If grading procedures or standards are changed, proper and timely notification should be given so farmers and grain dealers have the opportunity to adjust with the current crops.

We support working for the development and funding of a voluntary certification process for identity preserved grain.

We encourage and will work to develop contract language on grain that will not extend producer liability for grain quality or type past the point of delivery.

We support imposing a late cash payment penalty on grain brokers and mills who fail to pay by the agreed upon contractual date. This penalty should include the contractual payment price plus compensation for delay in payment.

The practice of adding foreign material, other grains, screenings to a shipment of grains to meet a certain grade should be prohibited. Criminal penalties for violations should be swiftly and surely administered.

The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) should inspect and check cargo weights of all export shipments. GIPSA should also verify the cleanliness, quality and test weight of every export grain shipment.

We support producer representation on the GIPSA advisory council.

The current grain marketing system discounts producer returns for high moisture grain, but does not pay a premium for low moisture grain. Therefore, we support the adoption of the equivalent bushel concept for grain marketing which rewards producers for delivery of a quality product. A change to the equivalent bushel concept would eliminate the economic incentive of manipulating moisture levels and more accurately reflect the commodity's true value.

Unless sound science demonstrates a real need, we oppose the establishment of defect action levels in grain by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and encourage the continual use of guidelines so that blending of like products can be continued.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD COMPLY UNDER PROTEST WITH THE EUROPEAN UNION'S NEW RESTRICTIONS ON CADMIUM LEVELS TO ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES CAN COMPETE IN FOREIGN MARKETS. THIS WILL FORCE THE UNITED STATES TO DEVELOP NEW VARIETIES OF GRAIN THAT UPTAKE LESS CADMIUM THAN WHAT IS GROWN TODAY.

We urge further research of new and advanced technology in testing grains for quality, such as protein and oil content, to determine the profitability of adopting these testing procedures to enhance income of grain producers.

We oppose federal grain warehouses being exempted from state grain indemnity laws and applicable coverage.

We support standards for the quality and safety of feed co-products coming out of ethanol plants.

(2012)

Plant and Animal Infections and Infestations 378

(Annotated)

Karnal Bunt

The tolerance on karnal bunt must be based on sound science and appropriate to each segment of the industry, for karnal bunt in wheat, wheat products and other commodities. USDA should work towards that goal by:

(1) Sponsoring an international meeting of scientists to evaluate the status and strategies for management of the smut and bunt diseases of cereals worldwide, with particular attention to karnal bunt;

(2) Taking a leading role in re-evaluation of international policies on the use of quarantines to prevent the movement of cereal smut and bunt fungi; and

(3) Maintaining an aggressive research effort on smut and bunt diseases of cereals, including karnal bunt.

(4) SETTING A TOLERANCE LEVEL FOR MARKETING OF WHEAT AND WHEAT PRODUCTS.

In order to protect and expand U.S. wheat exports, USDA, U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) and the wheat industry should actively promote and gain acceptance of karnal bunt as a quality issue at the earliest possible date. Karnal bunt should be deregulated and handled as a quality issue in a manner that facilitates the marketing of grain and prevents market disruptions.

We encourage continuation of compensation discussions and should keep the minimum compensation level the same as 1996. Compensation should be established for harvesters and transporters and consistent regulations need to be established for sanitizing equipment. (2012)

Renewable Fuels 404 (*Amend and renumber to conform*)

We support:

(1) A mandate for renewable energy/electricity to be purchased at a minimum of the wholesale price;

(2) Private and public efforts to develop and promote new uses for agricultural products;

(3) Research into the viability and economic potential of agricultural products and commodities;

(4) Production and use of agricultural based fuels;

(5) Research and demonstration programs that use renewable fuel as a fuel for fuel cell engine development;

(6) Continued research and education into ruminant and non-ruminant feed utilization of renewable fuel co-products;

(7) The definition of biomass to include timber and other renewable resources;

(8) An increase in the establishment, production and utilization of eligible biomass energy crops through the Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP);

(9) Retention and development of policies which support the biomass fuels industry;

(10) Renewable fuel producers be encouraged and offered incentives to use recycled effluent water produced by local municipal wastewater treatment facilities in the production process;

- (11) Harvesting of lowland and riparian areas for biomass use except lands enrolled in retirement programs;
- (12) Full research and development for the increased production of all forms of renewable energy from agricultural resources including effects and solutions to help producers effectively manage soil and water conservation issues related to energy crop production;
- (13) The continued use of Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) funds as incentive payment to producers of renewable fuels for new gallons of production;
- (14) The establishment and enforcement of national quality standards for biodiesel, renewable fuel and related co-products. Biodiesel shall be defined by meeting the specifications of the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) 6751 or its properly designated successor;
- (15) The reporting and publishing of renewable fuel production and renewable fuel plant construction on a timely basis by an entity such as the United States Department of Energy (USDOE);
- (16) Encouraging research for better performing engines that run on renewable fuels;
- (17) Adding price reporting for corn and its co-products, including DDGs, to the Bureau of Census Current Industrial Reports as well as to the Bureau's domestic and international market reports;
- (18) Diesel to be a biodiesel blend and gasoline be an renewable fuel blend;
- (19) State and federal tax credits that provide incentives for the use of alternative ag-based energy;
- (20) Grants, cost-share programs and renewable fuel production tax credits for farmers to produce their own fuel for farm use.
- (21) Legislation to require that all new gasoline-powered vehicles must be flex-fuel;
- ~~(22) Regulation or legislation that increases the ethanol blending standard to a level higher than 10 percent, without requiring engine modifications to existing standard gas engines;~~
- ~~(23) Efforts to educate consumers and industry on the benefits of biofuel blends higher than ten percent;~~
- (24) The timely certification by Underwriters Laboratory (UL) of dispensing equipment for all renewable fuel products, including all storage tanks and pumping equipment;
- (25) Requiring new renewable fuels or renewable energy production facilities that utilize public funding, tax deferments or grants to offer a percentage of investment opportunity to local producers to keep gains realized in rural America;
- (26) The promotion, use and expansion of renewable fuel as an octane or cetane enhancer, fuel source, or lubricity agent to improve air quality. Our goal is expanding the use of renewable fuels to the maximum amount possible;
- ~~(27) Continuation of the tariff on imported renewable fuels and~~ Discontinuing use of the blender credit. Current blender credit funds should be used to invest in the installation of a blender pump network for ethanol and biodiesel;
- (28) The transition of the volumetric renewable fuels excise tax credits from the blending point to a program that builds bio fuel infrastructure including blender pumps and bio fuel pipelines; and
- (28) All diesel engine manufacturers adopting biodiesel as an alternative for complying with EPA emission control standards.

We support an oxygenate standard unless there are enhancements of laws and regulations (anti-backsliding) that preserve the improvements in air quality that renewable fuel provides as a fuel. We support legislation requiring the production of clear gasoline that would accommodate year-

round blending with ethanol in all fuels. We support research for the development of alternative denaturing options, in an attempt to make the denaturing of renewable fuel more economical. We are opposed to states being exempt from the oxygenate requirements of the Clean Air Act. We support amending the Clean Air Act to hold states harmless for emission levels resulting from emergency waivers granted by EPA.

We support biodiesel being included in all the Department of Energy's policies and materials regarding alternative and renewable fuels.

We support the use of biodiesel to meet up to 100 percent of an affected utility or government fleet emission reduction requirements under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

We support streamlining and expediting the process for issuing permits for the construction and operation of refineries for the production of renewable fuels and coal gasification. We encourage the distribution of renewable fuels via pipelines or other cost effective means.

The tax benefits for renewable fuels should be maintained.

~~We support the small Ethanol Producer Credit (a federal income tax credit provided under section 40(B)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code) being allowed to pass through to cooperative members or being sold as a tax credit.~~

We oppose the use of federal renewable fuels tax incentives for imported renewable fuels.

We support designating the cost of purchasing biodiesel as an allowable expense in the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality program.

We will seek an industry standard that would require all vehicles capable of burning E85 fuel to be equipped with a yellow gas cap to distinguish this capability.

We support color coding fuel pumps to indicate blends of liquid energy.

We support the biodiesel producers' excise tax credit at the current rate.

We urge the use of renewable fuels in all federal vehicles where available.

WE OPPOSE ANY MANDATES ON ETHANOL BLEND REQUIREMENTS FOR FUEL

WE SUPPORT RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD (RFS) BLENDING REQUIREMENT BE ADJUSTED TO REFLECT AN UNDERSTANDING OF CORN SHORTAGES AND THE NEED FOR AT LEAST A 10% TARGET FOR CORN CARRYOUT VIA THE FOLLOWING FORMULA: FOR EACH PERCENTAGE OF CORN CARRYOUT BELOW 10%- THE RFS IS TO BE REDUCED BY 2 BILLION GALLONS. ** THIS MEANS IF THIS YEAR'S CARRYOUT IS 5% THE RFS MANDATE WOULD BE REDUCED TO 5 BILLION GALLONS FROM THE CURRENT 15 BILLION GALLON MANDATE (10%-5%=5%; 5 X 2 BILLION=10 BILLION GALLONS)
(2012)

AFBF Taxation Policy # 439 (Annotated)

Income Taxes

Tax policy should be designed to encourage private initiative, economic growth, equity and simplicity. We support:

- (1) Income tax indexing;
- (2) Reductions in all tax rates;
- (3) Confidentiality of federal income tax returns;
- (4) The option of using cash accounting;

- (5) Creating pretax savings accounts as a risk management tool for farmers and ranchers including deferment of self-employment taxes;
- (6) Allowing farmers and ranchers to average income over **AT LEAST** a **five SEVEN** year period and allowing share-based rental income to be eligible for income averaging;
- (7) Elimination of the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). Until repealed, the threshold and deductions allowed should be increased;
- (8) The same depreciation for income and the alternative minimum tax;
- (9) Elimination of the imputed interest rate;
- (10) Reinstatement of investment tax credit;
- (11) Acceptance of canceled checks as sufficient documentation of any deductible expense or contribution;
- (12) Seized real property being returned to the tax roles as soon as possible;
- (13) Taxing for profit businesses operated by tax-exempt organizations;
- (14) Tax credits for small business;
- (15) Treatment of replacement hedges (i.e. exchanging cash positions with a futures contract) as ordinary income or loss;
- (16) Eliminating income tax on reduced quota payments and state master settlement payments;
- (17) Allowing corporations to deduct earnings distributed to stockholders as dividends;
- (18) A tax deduction for produce and agriculture products donated to charity; and
- (19) Federal income tax exemptions for loan forgiveness programs, incentives or other monies given to rural medical or large animal veterinary practitioners because they practice in rural areas.

We oppose:

- (1) A freeze or cap on scheduled tax cuts;
- (2) Taxing interest income as it accrues;
- (3) The use of agricultural land as a long-term, tax sheltered investment by pension and profit-sharing funds;
- (4) Taxing the cash value buildup in life insurance;
- (5) A value-added tax;
- (6) Allowing earned income credits for dependents who are not citizens and who do not live in the United States;
- (7) IRS's taxpayer compliance measurement program;
- (8) Taxing health insurance premiums to fund health coverage for those who do not have insurance;
- (9) Retroactive taxation as unconstitutional; and
- (10) Taxation by tribal governments of nonenrolled people within reservation boundaries without representation. **(2012)**

Aboveground Fuel Storage Tanks 501

We support revisions to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) rules regarding aboveground fuel storage tanks to include the following:

- (1) No limit on the number of aboveground fuel storage tanks should be allowed per farm;
- (2) Double wall tanks may be permitted in place of diking around tanks;
- (3) Exempt farm fuel (diesel and gasoline) tanks up to 12,000 gallons from EPA mandates; and
- (4) All farmers regardless of their on-farm fuel storage capacity should be allowed to complete and self certify a spill control plan.

We oppose any mandatory regulations or fees with the registration or monitoring of aboveground fuel storage tanks for farm use.

WE OPPOSE THE EXPANSION OF REGULATIONS OR ANY ADDITIONAL MATERIAL INCLUSIONS INTO THE SPCC REGULATIONS. WE OPPOSE DRIED DISTILLERS GRAINS AND ANY OTHER HIGH OIL/FAT PRODUCTS BEING INCLUDED INTO THOSE REGULATIONS.

We believe state rules for aboveground fuel storage tanks should not be more restrictive than federal rules.

We support clearly defined requirements for on-farm, aboveground fueling facilities. Farmers should be assured of regulatory certainty before investing in corrective measures.

(2012)

National Farm Policy 239 *(See also conforming changes on associated documents)***

Agriculture is strategically important to the survival of the United States. Our nation's economy, energy, environment and national security are dependent upon the viability of the agricultural industry. Agriculture must be treated as a strategic resource by our nation and reflected as such in local, state and national government policies. ~~We believe agriculture should not suffer disproportionate cuts in federal spending.~~

We support a consistent, long-term market-oriented farm policy that will:

- (1) Rely less on government and increasingly more on the market ~~as well as providing more options for insurance and revenue assurance products that are more equitable for all commodities in all production regions of the country against adverse market fluctuations and weather-related hazards;~~
- (2) Allow farmers to take maximum advantage of market opportunities at home and abroad without government interference; **AND**
- (3) Encourage production decisions based on market demand.; **and**
- (4) ~~Develop risk management tools to deal with the inherent fluctuations in revenue and income associated with farming.~~

U.S. policies affecting agriculture should be designed to:

- (1) ~~Provide sharp focus on and enhance funding for agricultural research and education;~~
- (2) Reduce regulatory burdens on farmers and ranchers;
- (3) Provide a tax structure that is fair and equitable to present and future generations of farmers;
- (4) Ensure that U.S. consumers have access to a stable, ample, safe and nutritious food supply;
- (5) ~~Continue to improve the environment through expanded incentives to encourage voluntary soil conservation, water and air quality programs, and advanced technological and biotechnological procedures that are based on sound science and are economically feasible;~~
- (6) Minimize world hunger and nutrition deficiencies;
- (7) Create and sustain a long term, competitive and profitable agricultural industry;
- (8) Enhance U.S. agriculture's access and competitiveness in the world market;
- (9) Improve the quality of rural life and increase rural economic development;
- (10) ~~Compensate farmers for their positive impact on habitat, wildlife and the environment;~~
- (11) Recognize the regional and commodity based differences that exist in U.S. production agriculture ~~and provide programs that meet these needs,~~ while recognizing the need to be internationally competitive.; **and**

(12) Be implemented in a way that minimizes the negative effects on nonprogram crops and livestock production. Statements of support for individual commodity programs and provisions shall adhere to these general principles of farm programs, regulatory, international trade, and tax provisions.

Improving net farm income, Enhancing the economic opportunity for farmers, preserving property rights and conserving the environment are our most important goals.

Implementation of the Farm Bill

We should undertake a comprehensive effort to assure U.S. producer competitiveness. Competitiveness issues should include biotech seed cost, agricultural research, U.S. transportation infrastructure, U.S. farm bill structure and funding, exchange rates and other factors relevant to agricultural global competitiveness.

We support:

- (1) Maintaining the current definition of "actively engaged" farming; and
- (2) Allowing farms with fewer than 10 base acres to be eligible to receive farm program payments.

Farm Policy Design

We support development of the 2012 Farm Bill focused on the following principles:

- (1) Baseline funds should not be diverted outside the farm bill;
- (2) Extend the concepts of the 2008 Farm Bill;
- (3) Provide a strong and effective safety net that does not necessarily guarantee a profit, but protects crop and livestock producers from catastrophic occurrences;
- (4) Provide strong and effective risk management programs;
- (5) Provide funding for conservation programs that will continue to protect natural resources;
- (6) Maintain a strong and effective safety net that consists of direct payments, crop insurance, and a simplified Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program;
- (7) Farm program payments should be classified as personal financial information, the same as social security payments;
- (8) Reduced complexity while allowing producers increased flexibility to plant in response to market demand;
- (9) Maintenance of a farm income safety net while encouraging efficiency, including consideration of an energy escalator clause because of the high prices of fuel and fertilizer;
- (10) Driven by the needs of production agriculture;
- (11) Be compliant with WTO agreements;
- (#) ELIMINATE ALL COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND CROP INSURANCE programs IN EXCHANGE FOR INCOME AND ESTATE TAX REFORM INCLUDING:
 - (A) INCOME TAX CALCULATIONS BASED ON A 7-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE.
 - (B) ESTATE TAXES SHOULD INCLUDE A \$5 MILLION EXEMPTION AND 20% TOP RATE.
- (12) The specialty crop industry be given consideration in the farm bill with emphasis focused on fundamental research, food safety, nutrition, marketing and promotions, and investment in the competitiveness and sustainability of the U.S. specialty crop industry;
- (13) Trade distorting domestic support (amber box) may be reduced in exchange for an economically proportionate increase in agricultural market access and elimination of export

subsidies. Such reduction in U.S. "amber box" supports should be offset by a transfer to fully funded "green and blue box" eligible programs. This could be accomplished through working lands conservation programs, risk management, the Market Access Program, enhanced crop insurance, the concept of a revenue based safety net program, or government programs that increase producer profitability that may include direct payments and/or tax credits; and (14) Inclusion of a commodity loan program and counter-cyclical program.

We oppose:

- (1) New mandatory government supply management programs and acreage reduction programs, excluding Conservation Reserve Program and conservation easements, for marketing loan commodities under the current farm program;
- (2) A farmer owned reserve or any federally controlled grain reserve with the exception of the existing, capped emergency commodity reserve;
- (3) Income means testing;
- (4) Payment limitations; and
- (5) Targeting of benefits being applied to farm program payment eligibility.

General Issues

We support:

- (1) Requiring compliance by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) with all federal rule-making notification procedures;
- (2) Providing timely notification to producers of all program requirements;
- (3) Implementation in such a manner as to minimize the disruptions to landlord-tenant relationships. We support efforts to provide the state Farm Service Agency (FSA) Committee authority to determine eligibility requirements for farm program benefits;
- (4) The elimination of any USDA requirement to report the specific cash rental amounts between a landlord and a tenant in an effort to protect a farmer's right to privacy. We do, however, support the requirement to report the type of lease agreement;
- (5) Requiring FSA to constantly review and make public the formula used to set posted county prices (PCPs) to ensure they accurately reflect market conditions at the county level and that the differential between the cash price and PCP does not penalize producers or county elevators. The formula for calculating the terminal price, differential, and the PCP should be public information to allow producers the opportunity to maximize program benefits;
- (6) Providing the secretary of agriculture discretionary authority to provide assistance to producers during times of economic disaster;
- (7) Extending final loan deficiency payment (LDP) dates to coincide with the USDA crop marketing year;
- (8) Allowing a producer to lock in a published LDP rate at any time after a crop is planted with payment being made only after harvest and yield determination;
- (9) Allowing producers the option of an interest free deferment on LDPs into the next calendar year;
- (10) Allowing farmers to choose the date that they lock in LDP rates while grain is in storage at feed mills;
- (11) Allowing for verification of actual physical measurement if computer measuring of farm acres results in different acreage measurements than has been the historical case. The cost incurred for such measurement should be borne by the party in error;
- (12) Allowing a single sign up that covers all programs for a crop year;

- (13) Changing FSA regulations to not require farms that are owned and operated by the same individual, but not contiguous, be reconstituted into one farm;
- (14) Individuals directly involved in family farming operations not having payment eligibility adversely affected by farm business loans secured by cross collateralization, (same assets pledged for multiple producer loans);
- (15) The establishment of a reasonable time limitation on USDA's ability to alter or reverse an FSA compliance determination so that no producer enrolled in a farm program may be penalized in a subsequent crop year;
- (16) Allowing either a conservation compliance plan or a confined animal feeding operation permit to meet eligibility requirements for farms which require a conservation compliance plan for eligibility for certain USDA farm programs;
- (17) Increased funding sources be developed to assist farmers in complying with livestock regulations;
- (18) The FSA facility loan program to include all commodity storage;
- (19) Allowing tenants with multiple landlords to treat each farm as a separate entity for compliance with the farm bill;
- (20) Action by a landlord not placing any tenant farm program payments in jeopardy. The tenant should be able to maintain eligibility for all farms;
- (21) Consolidation of the power of attorney form to enable the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), the FSA and the Risk Management Agency to honor one power of attorney form;
- (22) Producers being able to use Federal Crop Insurance records for proving yield for base and yield updates;
- (23) Defining "specialty crops" as any fruit, vegetable, nut or non program crop grown for consumption and sales;
- (24) Additional policy options that support the specialty crop industry should be handled separately from the debate over compensation for the loss of the prohibition. We support enhanced spending to support the specialty crop industry through the following prioritized funding options:
 - (a) Per state competitive grant program to enhance grower directed research and extension programs;
 - (b) Expanded crop insurance;
 - (c) Dedicated funding for specialty crop growers in working lands programs; and
 - (d) USDA commodity purchases.
- (25) The recognition of horticulture, Christmas trees, sod and equine as agriculture enterprises eligible for government assistance through disaster programs, crop insurance and conservation programs;
- (26) USDA requiring mandatory monthly reporting of rice stocks and rice production; and
- (27) Removal of matching fund requirements for public grants and loans intended to help small farmers. In the interim, in kind contributions like labor should be allowed to be applied to matching fund considerations.

We oppose:

- (1) Producers becoming ineligible for participation in any USDA program due to their participation in federal or state water projects;
- (2) Compliance status of one farm affecting the ability to receive benefits on another farm;
- (3) The extension of the CCC commodity loans beyond the current term;

- (4) The system of anonymous reporting of operator violations to the FSA and NRCS; and
- (5) The use of conservation programs by entities unrelated to agriculture.

AFBF NEW POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

GPS BAND:

THE MOBILE SATELLITE SERVICE BAND SHOULD BE RESERVED TO MILITARY AND AGRICULTURAL GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEMS (GPS). GPS HAS IMPROVED PRODUCTION AND EFFICIENCY IN AGRICULTURE AND SHOULD BE PRESERVED FOR AGRICULTURE'S FUTURE USE. (2012)