

2019 Policies

of the

Arizona Farm Bureau Federation



*Adopted by Delegates of the 97th Annual
Arizona Farm Bureau Convention*

Arizona Farm Bureau

2019 Board of Directors

President, Stefanie Smallhouse
Redington

Vice President, John Boelts
Yuma

Second Vice President, Richie Kennedy
Casa Grande

Benny Aja, Williams

Ava Alcaida, Parker

Rick Evans, Gilbert

Bob Flake, Snowflake

Mark Freeman, Mesa

Sonia Gasho, Pearce

Jim Goldman, Coolidge

John Hart, Willcox

Ashley Jeffers-Sample, Tucson

DeWayne Justice, Waddell

Nich Kenny, Mesa

Lance Knight, Springerville

Jay Larson, Thatcher

Cassie Lyman, Payson

Catherine Mann, Mammoth

Jack Mann, Mammoth

Sharla Mortimer, Dewey

Donald Merrell, Duncan

Mike Norris, Casa Grande

Clay Overson, Kingman

Vickie Parks, Flagstaff

Barbara Predmore, Cottonwood

David Sharp, Yuma

Ex Officio:

Dr. Shane Burgess, University of Arizona

Sherry Saylor, Buckeye

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF FARM BUREAU.....	2
FARM BUREAU BELIEFS.....	2
NATURAL RESOURCES.....	4
WATER.....	44
WATER SUPPLY.....	48
WATER RIGHTS.....	55
WATER CONSERVATION.....	60
WATER QUALITY.....	62
RIPARIAN AREAS.....	65
ENERGY.....	67
ENVIRONMENT.....	71
WEED, INSECT AND DISEASE CONTROL ...	72
TAXES AND SPENDING.....	91
REGULATORY.....	98
LAW AND ORDER.....	126
ELECTIVE OFFICE AND REFERENDUMS...	130
LABOR.....	132
TRANSPORTATION.....	138
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE.....	144
COMMODITIES.....	149
INSURANCE.....	154
PUBLIC RELATIONS.....	155
WITHIN FARM BUREAU.....	157
POLICY DEVELOPMENT.....	160
INDEX.....	162

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 our founding principles rooted in Judeo/Christian values, commandments and the sanctity of life.

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.

We believe the family is the basic building block of our society. We affirm and uphold marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

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.
(2016)

Arizona's Rights:

We ask that our governor and state legislators along with the support of our congressional delegation reclaim Arizona's state rights and our rights as citizens. We call upon our elected leaders to respect the constitution and the balance it created. Powers not delegated to the federal government by the constitution are reserved to the various states. This should be an immutable criterion for judging new federal actions, and our elected officials need to begin rolling back

federal authority where it has usurped the letter and intent of the constitution with respect to state rights. (Amended 2019)

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.

We need to recognize agriculture and promote it as a conservation use for mitigation purposes. We need to promote the conservation values of agriculture to maintain the long-term viability and sustainability of agriculture. We should promote conservation leases over permanent conservation easements. (2015)

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.

There should be a provision in the application section of the real estate code requiring positive disclosure by the real estate sub-developer of the close proximity of agricultural activity and acceptance of agricultural activity by the buyer. (2015)

Real Estate Disclosure Policy:

To promote good neighbor relations and reduce the number of complaints livestock inspectors and the Department of Agriculture must handle, we recommend the disclosure page of real estate contracts for purchases that take place outside of an incorporated area, whether vacant, commercial, or residential land, contain information explaining Arizona fence out law, the responsibility of the owner to fence their property, and the definition of a legal fence. (2018)

Land Use Planning:

We urge farmers, ranchers, agricultural and natural resource representatives to become involved in all phases of land use planning, including zoning and regional comprehensive land use planning meetings and attend local county board of supervisor 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 A.R.S. 11-804 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. (2016)

City Regional Plans:

Regional growth plans that incorporate both municipal and county areas should be ratified by the citizens residing within the boundaries of the planning area and not limited to only those within the municipal jurisdiction. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2015)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2017)

Natural Resource Conservation Districts:

Candidates for Supervisor in a Natural Resource Conservation District shall be of legal voting age and 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.

We support the move of the Arizona Association of Conservation Districts (AACD) from the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) to combine with whichever agency they deem appropriate. We recommend formation of a selection committee that includes members of the NRCDs, to recommend appointees for the commissioner. (Amended 2019)

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. (2016)

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 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 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 who 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 his property, including buffer strips, easements and view sheds, 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 his property has been diminished by government action. 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 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 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 were 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. (2017)

Agricultural Protection Act:

We support 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. (2015)

Improvement Districts:

We oppose municipal improvement districts, which place the burden of improvements on farmland. (2017)

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. Firefighting 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. (2016)

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 private hands. Increased tax revenue should not be used as a 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. (2018)

Mineral Rights:

We recognize that mineral rights are a distinct and separate private property right and when separated from its original land parcel should be subject to the same regulation/taxation/or payment in lieu of taxes (PILT) formulas that other private property rights are subject to. We support legislation that would ultimately encourage the return of separated mineral rights back to its original land parcel. (Amended 2019)

Condemned Property:

The taking of property or easements from property owners should be permitted only for a public purpose when there is a clear-cut 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. (2015)

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, due process, an opportunity to dispute the classification, and payment for the value of private property taken. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2016)

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. (2017)

Airports and Military Air Bases:

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. (2015)

Multiple Use and Sustained Yield of Public Lands:

Urban Americans are pressing all federal land management agencies 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.

All federal land management agencies are urged to explain the benefits of domestic livestock production on all federal lands through their public education programs. Particular emphasis should be placed on the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, especially Sec 5(b) which very clearly states sustained yield:

“...means the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a high level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of the national forests without impairment of the productivity of the land.”

The philosophy of multiple use and sustained yield management (i.e. grazing, mining, forest and recreational use) should be adhered to; therefore, all federal land management agencies 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 or permittees 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. (Amended 2019)

Public Land Improvements:

The lessee or permittee should be compensated at fair market value for improvements, including wells, made on public lands under their control, should the lease or permit be terminated. (2017)

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.

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; and
2. The lost value of our timber resources resulting from the devastating infestation of the European Pine Bark Beetle. (2017)

Wildfire Management:

In recent years huge areas of Arizona's forests have been damaged or destroyed by fires. Policies for managing state and federal land and fighting fires have a direct impact on ranchers who have permits to graze livestock on state and federal land and on the private land that adjoins or is in close proximity to the state or federal land. We believe that USFS and other related federal and state government policies should adhere to the following guidelines:

1. A more proactive approach in managing situations when the potential for fire is high and when fighting fires. Good forest management includes allowing state and federal land to be grazed

and using prescriptive burns during appropriate times. We support a streamlined process to do fire suppression and prevention. A comprehensive plan also needs to include targeted grazing, green stripping, prescribed burning and permanent fire breaks such as roads, waivers from Endangered Species Act (ESA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the purpose of removing fuel loads, and other fire prevention tools to prevent or control future wildfires.

2. The USFS Albuquerque dispatch center and incident commanders need to work closely with local landowners, ranchers, and state forestry departments to better manage fire use, suppression, and resources. In non-federal land fire incidents or when fire moves onto non-federal land, state forestry departments and local landowner priorities should take precedence; the state forester must be consulted during the entire process regardless of complexity or level of incidence; and the county sheriff's department should be the main security force.
3. Recognize that forest fire suppression and control strategies should be developed and implemented on a case by case basis. Current strategies need to be revised to return to the successful fire prevention and suppression tactics that were utilized in the past. Strategies that may work best in some types of forest growth do not work well in other situations. Decision authority for fire management strategies needs to be delegated to responsible personnel familiar with local conditions. In addition, policies calling for the re-introduction of fire into areas where intense fire suppression policies have been implemented in the past should be re-evaluated.

4. Developing cost shares, grants, subsidized loans or other financial assurances for capable logging contractors. To encourage infrastructure investment, contracts will be awarded with agreed upon duration, scope of work, and the possibility of extensions up to 25 years.
5. Agencies responsible for fire control and suppression need to accurately recognize and work to prevent the adverse impacts that are likely to occur following fires and the impact of fire control measures will have on fire recovery efforts.
6. When forest fires do occur, Wilderness Restrictions should be lifted in emergency situations to allow motorized equipment to be used to prevent catastrophic fire. Agencies tasked with fire control and suppression need to take responsibility for fully reimbursing private citizens for damages to private property sustained from actions taken in fighting the fires. For grazing permittees, this would include full compensation for costs related to restoring fences, pipelines, water tanks, livestock and other specified property on leased land. For owners of private property that adjoins or is in close proximity to state or federal land, the lead agency should be held responsible for the full cost of any damages that result from actions taken to fight the fires. These damages may be from suppression fires or flooding that may occur subsequent to the fires.
7. Flood control needs to be a critical part of state and federal land management following fires. All actions that aid in controlling devastating floods and preventing the destruction of private property need to begin immediately when it is safe for personnel to enter burned areas.

8. Restoring access to remote areas of state and federal land after flooding needs to be a high priority. Damaged roads and bridges need to be rebuilt immediately to allow Border Patrol and other law enforcement officials to conduct activities in conjunction with border security and law enforcement efforts.
9. The US federal government needs to recognize that in some cases forest fires result from the passage of illegal aliens through rugged areas near the border with Mexico. Border security is an essential factor in preventing the destruction of our forests and private property.

9.1 The border should be secured at the international boundary so communities and agricultural producers living and working near the international boundary are not left in no-man's land at the mercy of the drug cartel operations which often result in wildfires.

9.2 The cause and the cost of suppressing these fires should be reported by the affected administrative land agency annually to the Department of Homeland Security and tabulated as a cost of the failure of the federal government to secure the border at the international boundary.

10. Salvage of burned timber should always be allowed and encouraged.
11. We support the use of public and private partnerships for replanting fire-ravaged areas with native species where ecologically appropriate.

To assist in implementing these guidelines, we support:

1. A temporary 5-year suspension of NEPA and other pre-decisional requirements for fuel/fiber reduction activities in Arizona's Forests.

2. Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to protect habitat from wildfire.
3. Increasing the scale and extending the terms of saw and pre-commercial timber to allow for private investment in and around forests.
4. Instituting a grant program in Arizona where private residents could apply for funding of fire suppression activities.
5. Designating an office within the department of agriculture to assist farmers and ranchers in addressing any grievances or issues related to forest planning or to resolve other Arizona State agency issues surrounding forest management.
6. Convening a summit at which all interested individuals and advocate, or activist groups will be asked to sign a pledge to refrain from utilizing the courts or administrative processes for a period of five years while we consider and implement adaptive management measures to enhance the health of Arizona's forest lands and the protection of forested communities. (Amended 2019)

Fire Accountability:

Whenever wildfire or controlled, prescribed, or managed fires occur, the managing agency should be responsible to replace all damaged infrastructure within a specific amount of time. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Coconino County)

Formation of Rangeland Fire Protection

Associations:

We support the formation of land owner driven rangeland fire protection association(s) for rural Arizonans and associated training. We further urge the BLM to review and overcome the interagency division between range management and fire staff to further relationships between BLM firefighters, range

staff, and ranchers and improve opportunities for fuel management. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Cochise County)

Grazing Permits and Wildfires:

In many instances' wildfires do not burn an entire forest management unit uniformly. We support permit specific analysis for grazing deferment following wildfires.

When the federal government takes land out of production they should be required to keep up the water and fence infrastructure so that in an emergency, such as a fire, the land can be used for grazing.

The Four Forest Restoration initiative does not use sound science in its condemnation of grazing as a cause for forest fires. (2017)

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.

Categorical exclusions should be allowed for ordinary grazing permit renewals.

We support S. 1129, the Grazing Improvement Act of 2011. (2015)

Public Land Leases:

We support the use of current peer reviewed science to help determine the grazing capacity of public land leases. (2017)

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. (2016)

Multiuse Land Permits:

We encourage all-natural resource management agencies to enforce requirements for dispersed camping and recreation permits. Increased enforcement will decrease squatting and associated negative resource impacts. (2018)

Fair Market Value on State Land:

The valuation of State Land improvements should be based on the current replacement cost 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. The compensation should be based on the valuation of improvements “as if new” and by the valuation definition of replacement cost new. (2018)

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 the term of Arizona state agriculture leases/grazing limits up 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. (2017)

State Trust Fund:

Distributions from the State Trust Fund shall not impair the current baseline value of the trust. Enhanced distribution formulas should have limited time periods. (2016)

State Land Agricultural Leases:

If State Land, leased for agriculture other than grazing, is required to go to public auction, there should be no minimum bid requirement. (2018)

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 firefighting 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 addition of legislation that supports a land manager's right to burn, conditional to regulatory requirements.

We support the use of grazing as a fire prevention tool on public lands. (2015)

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 management policies prohibiting dumping of trash on public lands not designated for trash dumping.

We urge the agencies in charge of public or trust lands and local law enforcement agencies to remove any and all illegal inhabitants (“squatters”).

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. (Amended 2019)

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 which is currently managed by Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service subject to preexisting rights. (2016)

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 also oppose the establishment of the “Lower San Pedro National Refuge.” We oppose the proposed Great Bend of the Gila National Monument.

We oppose the expansion of the Walnut Canyon National Monument. The proposal that covers more than 9,000 square miles negatively impacts private land and recreational uses. It also threatens the grazing permits within the proposed boundary. We oppose the establishment of the Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument.

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 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. (2016)

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. (2015)

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. (2015)

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. (2017)

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. (2016)

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 oppose wildlife hunting after dark with the exception of species already designated to be hunted after dark with a handheld spotlight.

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 service's 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 and the Arizona Game and Fish to allow the use of appropriate predator control devices, including dogs, 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. We also support the control of mountain lions, bobcats, and bears with no limitations on method of take.

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, whose private lands and water support much of Arizona's wildlife populations. (2018)

Wildlife Crop Damage:

Wildlife have the ability to create significant crop damage to farmers. when damage occurs on private land, the state of Arizona should be required to provide the landowner with some type of relief, whether it be landowner tags, or assistance in efforts to deter animals. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Cochise County)

Food Safety Depredation Hunts:

The Arizona Game and Fish Department should work with local stakeholders to enact depredation hunts that address food safety concerns for crops and/or livestock grown or raised adjacent to wildlife habitat. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Yuma County)

Hunting Blinds on Stock Ponds:

The laws prohibiting camping within one-fourth mile of a livestock watering location (A.R.S. § 17-308) should be applied to hunting blinds setup on waters, which inhibit both wildlife and livestock from access to available water. We also encourage Arizona Game and Fish to provide warning signs for placement at watering locations to alert hunters as to the applicable rules. We encourage the Arizona Game and Fish to focus on this issue during hunter education and public events. (2018)

Mexican Gray Wolf:

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 gray wolf reintroduction program be abandoned, and all released wolves and all of their pups be captured and removed. Any management program should be administered by the state of Arizona.

In light of budget deficits, livestock depredation and the non-attainment of population objectives, we urge immediate elimination of government funding of the Mexican gray wolf program.

Implementation of the Endangered Species Act has led to a single species management approach for recovery and has been unsuccessful in de-listing species.

This approach has resulted in actions that take little consideration for impacts to multiple un-listed species and complex environments; resulting in such outcomes as catastrophic wildfires, aquatic de-populations, waterway desiccation, and predator overpopulation. These outcomes threaten the human environment, the greater wildlife habitat, economic sustainability of communities and industries and at the end of the day cause further detriment to the listed species.

We advocate that an independent study be undertaken by a recognized non-governmental wolf genetics expert to compare DNA from specimens of conserved pelts of Mexican wolves taken around 1900 with DNA of wolves being introduced in the last two decades in Arizona and New Mexico. Such scientific information, providing reliable confirmation of the genetics of the current population being imposed on Arizona producers, is needed as a basis for informed, scientifically founded public policy initiatives and

any proposed wolf recovery program. We oppose the policy of a single species management approach for the recovery of threatened and endangered species.

We support an ecosystem management approach that considers the overall interrelated effects of management on all species of that system. (2016)

Mexican Gray Wolf Impact Monetary Compensation:

Because wolves have been reintroduced, agricultural production by livestock owners is seriously harmed by the presence of introduced Mexican wolves.

A professional study completed in the Blue Range Mexican wolf release area prior to when wolves were introduced found that the pre-wolf-introduction average annual calf crop was 89%. The professional study determined the average annual calf crop on the same ranches surveyed fell by a minimum of 15% upon wolf introduction.

Wolf presence causes cattle to be nervous, stressed and jumpy with the direct result that:

1. Management of the cattle requires more cowboys to move, work and manage the herd;
2. Wolf-stressed cattle graze less and gain less resulting in lower value at sale. Behavior of stressed cattle results in discounted price by cattle buyers.
3. Affected cows are subject to compromises in their immune systems;
4. Ranch work presents more danger to ranch laborers.

There is a loss of ranch production capacity when a wolf kills a mature breeding cow resulting in the necessity of retaining an additional replacement heifer (one less calf to sell) and a delay of two or three years to produce a calf.

Typical Arizona ranches include many thousands of often-rugged acres resulting in the fact that for every wolf depredation that is actually found, the evidence is that seven to eight head of cattle killed by wolves are not found.

There are currently onerous costs in time and money to report wolf kills, wait for agency response, and spend what may be hours riding to and from wolf kill sites with federal agents detailed to verify the kill.

There are substantial costs and long-term impacts to disruption of carefully designed grazing system patterns resulting from the need to keep moving cattle to unscheduled pastures to try to avoid or minimize wolf attacks.

Large veterinary bills are incurred when livestock and pets are seriously wounded.

Ranch values are adversely impacted from either the actual presence of wolves or the probability of their imminent presence as perceived by potential purchasers of the ranch.

A study has determined that there is a psychological impact to ranchers resulting from seeing husbanded stock ripped and eaten--sometimes while still alive--and from the concern for children's safety and the safety of ranch horses, dogs and other domestic animals important to the ranch operation.

We recommend that Mexican gray wolf impact monetary compensation programs must take into consideration appropriate coverage compensating producers for all impacts resulting from the introduction of Mexican wolves. (2017)

Sonoran Desert Tortoise:

We strongly recommend that if the Sonoran Desert Tortoise is listed as threatened, that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service include a 4(D) rule that provides

exemptions from take, Section 7 & 10 consultation for:

- Normal ranching activities that are implemented with the approved best management practices.
- Conservation practices and other measures that are installed with federal funding that are implemented with the best management practices.
- Private, state, or federally funded studies and monitoring of Sonoran Desert Tortoise populations and habitat that were in place prior to listing. (2016)

Critical Habitat for Jaguars:

We oppose critical habitat for the jaguar (*Panthera Onca*). (Amended 2019)

Critical Habitat Designation:

We oppose the critical habitat designation by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for species including, but not limited to, the Zuni Blueheaded Sucker, the New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse and the Western Yellow Billed Cuckoo.

We believe critical habitat designations should be limited to the historical habitat area of the species based on historical and scientific data.

We believe that critical habitat designations are only appropriate when essential for the survival of the species.

We support collaborative conservation efforts to make critical habitat designation unnecessary.

Government agencies should not change management practices in a way that causes economic harm in response to the threat of litigation.

Areas designated as critical habitat must meet accepted criteria for designation. (2015)

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 groups, State and County Health Services, and Animal Depredation Control Board. (2015)

Ranching for Wildlife:

We direct Arizona Farm Bureau to pursue ranching for wildlife legislation. (2017)

Hunting Within City Limits:

We 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). (2017)

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. (2016)

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.

Categorical exclusions should be allowed for ordinary grazing permit renewals. (2015)

Endangered Species:

We support legislation under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) 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 best available 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 petitioning that a listing classification be determined for any species in this state should be required to conduct DNA analysis on the petitioned species, at their cost, to ensure it is a unique, genetically pure species.

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

We support updating and modernizing the ESA. We urge congress to make the following changes to the act to make it more land owner friendly, more science based, and more reward based instead of punishment based. Voluntary participation of private lands in efforts for species recovery is discouraged by an ESA that punishes first and rewards conditionally. The ESA has a narrow focus that ignores economic realities and multi-species management.

Based on those premises, we urge congress to update the ESA to include the following major points:

1. All agency actions in the listing process must be judicially reviewable;
2. There must be more realistic timelines for determinations;
3. The scientific data used must be reliable, replicable and verifiable;
4. The ESA must not focus on single species management when that approach is counter to natural processes, making recovery of certain species dependent on killing other species (example: spotted and barred owls);
5. Listing petitions must have scientific integrity to pass the initial review by the agencies;
6. More transparency of listing decision subject matter is necessary;
7. We must replace coercive incentive programs with truly incentive based compensatory programs;
8. The cost of the ESA and its implementation should be borne by the general public and fully accountable on an annual basis;
9. The ESA must recognize that the costs of recovery should be borne by society at large, instead of by the unlucky landowner where a species is found;
10. Species which are listed and afforded the protections of the ESA should be limited to those species with a majority range within the borders of the United States. We have no control over management in other countries;
11. Ambiguous and subjective language must be eliminated within the ESA;
12. The term conservation is used throughout the ESA and is overly inclusive. It refers to all actions, programs, and efforts towards the wise use of

natural resources and should not be used in the context of the ESA; and

13. Decision makers must be allowed to adapt and adjust the management of an ecosystem based upon new information.
14. Critical habitat designations should not be required at the time of listing but left to the discretion of the director during the recovery planning process.

Our efforts must be more focused on those species that are most in danger of extinction due to the direct measurable effects of human activity, and only when the modification of those activities will have a significant measurable effect on species survival. (2018)

Southwestern Willow Flycatcher:

We support the removal of the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher from the endangered species list. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Feral Swine:

We support the eradication of feral, abandoned or unauthorized swine throughout the state. We oppose the importation and transportation for purposes of release. (2016)

Feral Horses and Burros:

We are opposed to the protection of feral horse and burro herds within the state of Arizona. Feral horses and burros are abandoned and/or unauthorized livestock.

Feral horses and burros should not be classified as wild horses and should not fall under the protection of the Wild Horse and Burro Act.

We are opposed to creating any new wild horse sanctuaries on public lands or utilizing public funds; and we recognize the existing sanctuaries.

We oppose the importation and transportation of feral horses and burros for the purposes of release. (2016)

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. Conservation of water should not adversely affect the owner's water rights.

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.

We oppose new ground water metering requirements. It is the right and sole responsibility of the water owner to keep their registrations current at the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR).

This information is private in nature and should be maintained as private. Furthermore, we oppose any attempts by national, state, or local governments as well as private individuals or corporations to meter domestic, irrigation, or rural 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. 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. (Amended 2019)

Water Measuring Devices:

While we do not support mandated water monitoring systems, if legislation or regulation requires such 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. (Amended 2019)

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, e.g.: building water storage facilities, watershed management, desalination plants, conservation and rainfall harvest, 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 the Arizona Department of Water Resources and rural Arizona for hydrological research to augment water. (2016)

Groundwater:

We support the use of groundwater on agricultural lands. We support grandfathered irrigation rights on lands with historic water use, including those within an AMA. 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. (Amended 2019)

Brackish Water:

The taking of brackish water for urban use outside of a groundwater basin that is already using the brackish water for agricultural purposes should be prohibited, except in Yuma county. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Maricopa County)

Groundwater Withdrawal Fees:

Legislation should be supported that allows an AMA to charge up to \$2.50 per acre foot of water withdrawn for water banking. (2018)

Renewable Water Resources:

We oppose efforts by the legislature and the Department of Water Resources to obtain control over the use of surface water by regulation. (Amended 2019)

We support the use of surface 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. (Amended 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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 be credited to the urban community if runoff from the same areas contributes to surface water supplies of the downstream right holders historically.

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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 giving CAP sovereign immunity. (Amended 2019)

Central Arizona Groundwater Replenishment District (CAGRDR):

We support maintaining the current management of CAGRDR. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Maricopa County)

Utilization of Colorado River Allocation:

We recognize the importance of the Central Arizona Project (CAP), in its current priority number 4 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 CAP. 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.

In the event that municipal or other users of CAP water do not utilize their full allocation after the year 2023, any excess CAP water should continue to be made available to agricultural users under the current preferential pricing and contract terms.

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 in place of water released from Lake Mead to alleviate structural deficit losses on the Colorado River. (Amended 2019)

Forbearance:

We support CAP's current forbearance authority within the boundaries of the Central Arizona Project delivery system consistent with existing contracts and court rulings. Agriculture would be willing to support any ADWR/CAWCD joint agreement on the issue of forbearance, provided CAP's water delivery contracts with CAP irrigation districts are honored.

Any forbearance program must include a fair and objective definition of historical water use. Because each individual contractor's historic use is a fact-specific question, historic use should be considered by examining the contractor's normal water use over

a period of several years, taking into account market forces that may account for variations in use. After considering these factors, only an actual reduction in beneficial consumptive use should be considered a reduction that qualifies as intentionally created surplus, or to have the conserved water eligible for compensated system conservation. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Maricopa County)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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, as well as improved distribution to agricultural stakeholders. (Amended 2019)

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. (2017)

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 the US Bureau of Reclamation's Lake Powell/Lake Mead equalization guidelines. We also oppose any surge releases from Lake Powell. (Amended 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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 historic 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. (Amended 2019)

Affirmation of Water Rights:

We oppose use of the Endangered Species Act, Wilderness Act, Clean Water Act (CWA) and/or any other federal laws by federal agencies to usurp, seize, restrict, impede or take state-distributed, granted, assigned or treaty water rights owned by individuals, partnerships, corporations or municipalities.

Any rule defining what constitutes waters of the United States (WOTUS) should adhere to the following principles:

- Focus on water features that are likely to directly affect traditional navigable waters and that are identifiable based on clear, objective, broadly understood and accepted characteristics, to provide clarity and certainty to regulators and the public.
- A water feature that is “relatively permanent” must contain water persistently and frequently. At a minimum, it must continuously and regularly (not exceptionally) carry water on a multi-month seasonal basis (such as throughout the spring season). Features that are usually dry and only carry water when it rains are not “relatively permanent,” but ephemeral and definitely not navigable.
- Regulating wetlands should only be considered if they are adjacent to traditional navigable waters and their tributaries, meaning they directly touch or share a common border with those waters.
- The CWA agricultural exclusions and exemptions should apply to state water regulations and include

additional exclusions for features such as stock ponds, ditches, or irrigation structures.

If the State of Arizona regulates additional waters not already covered by the federal CWA, state regulations must adhere to the same principles outlined above.

When a private or municipal water right is located on federal or state land, that right must be deemed to include the holder's right of access to the source of the water and to any element of the distribution system necessary for delivery including wells, springs, streams, rivers, stock ponds, agricultural ditches, U.S. canals, pipes, and other conveyance mechanisms for maintenance purposes because denial of such access effectively constitutes an illegal, de facto, taking of the water right.

Congressional legislation is needed to guarantee Arizona's premier authority to issue and protect water rights within the state. We oppose any attempt by federal agencies to gain jurisdiction over state waters in a manner inconsistent with established state water law. Additionally, legislation is needed to clarify that the right of access as described above is inherent in state-issued water rights owned by individuals, partnerships, corporations and/or municipalities on federally managed land. (2018)

Water Rights for Protected Agricultural Land:

Pursuant to the expressed public policies and applying only to specified acreage of irrigated agricultural land recognized as being uniquely qualified for protection from development and for preservation as irrigated agriculture, we recommend that when such agricultural 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 agricultural

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. (Amended 2019)

Upper Gila Water Issues:

We support the efforts to settle the Upper Gila River through the use of a resolution task force committee comprised of individuals that belong to the Gila Valley Irrigation District, The Franklin Irrigation District and tribal leaders.

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. (Amended 2019)

Willcox Groundwater Conservation Area:

We support the efforts of the Willcox Groundwater Conservation Area Committee to create an appropriate water conservation program in their unique area. (2016)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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.
(Reaffirmed 2019)

Stock Waters:

We support the lessee's right to water developed by the lessee on public lands. We support a rancher's right to the water they own on their property (base waters) and all water they own the rights to on state and federal lands. (Amended 2019)

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, area, or farm. If, however, an agricultural operation's water entitlement or use is reduced by a mandatory curtailment, then urban water entitlement and use should be subject to the same mandatory curtailment.

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. (2018)

Department of Water Resources:

We believe the cost of operating an Active Management Area (AMA) 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 AMA or an Irrigation Non-Expansion Area(INA) without conclusive evidence of significant decline in the water table and a vote of those within the area to be designated. We request two options for the creation of an INA: (1) by order of the director or (2) by petition and election on an acreage basis.

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. (2016)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Drought Contingency Plan:

We will support a Drought Contingency Plan (DCP) type program so long as it includes meaningful mitigation for the loss of 2004 Ag Water Settlement designated CAP Ag Pool Supplies.

Mitigation should include alternative surface water supplies to be made available to the CAP irrigation districts in amounts equivalent to what they would receive without DCP under the 2007 federal guidelines for operating the Colorado River. Surface water supplies may include existing CAP stored water and higher-priority CAP water allocations of cities and tribes.

When the Secretary of Interior declares a shortage in the lower Colorado River Basin, we believe in most cases it is poor public policy to allow CAP water storage to continue in underground storage facilities when there is availability for storage in groundwater savings facilities which provide water for agricultural use and positive economic activity. (Adopted 2019)
(Originated in: Maricopa County and Pinal County)

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 and water for livestock use, including stock ponds and reclaimed water, should be exempt from state water quality standards designed for other intended uses.

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, the following should be established:

1. How much agriculture contributes to nonpoint pollution;
2. How various management practices influence pollution levels; and

3. How much of the pollutant may be naturally occurring.

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. (2017)

Impaired Water:

If a water source is assessed as impaired by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or the Environmental Protection Agency, the assessing agency should also be required to determine the source of the cause of impairment. (2018)

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. (2017)

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. (2017)

RIPARIAN AREAS

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

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.

We support the use of riparian areas for grazing.

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. (2017)

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.

We oppose limitations and bans on livestock grazing along southwestern rivers, to include the Verde and Gila. Science points to a loss of habitat for native species through these bans, as well as economic loss for individuals and local areas. Also, independent of the studies showing that the “grazing bans” are harmful to the native endangered and threatened species, we stand in opposition to the lack of performance of NEPA analysis for this major federal action on part of the U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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. (2017)

ENERGY

Ag Preference Power:

We believe irrigation and electrical districts should maintain their first priority preference for power from the Arizona Power Authority.

The first priority for allocation of power from the Arizona Power Authority should be limited solely to irrigation, electrical and water delivery districts.

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. We encourage the Arizona Power Authority to observe the preferences stated in

ARS Titles 30 and 45 during the current Hoover 2017 reallocation process.

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 applaud the three-state effort among Arizona, Nevada and California in passing the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011, which ensures the continued availability of Hoover Power for existing power customers and to provide power for new allottees. (2015)

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.

Existing WAPA customers should not be burdened with the cost of integrating variable energy (renewable) resources into the Western grid. We support the concept of "beneficiary pay" regarding the integration of new, non-federal generation. (2015)

Coal Energy:

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 SCR's and bag house equipment on coal generating facilities. Enactment of such regulations could result in the closure of Navajo Generating Station (NGS) and several other electrical generating facilities that are critical to agriculture and rural Arizona.

In particular, 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. 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.

We oppose government regulations that result in the closure of coal mines. (2015)

District Voting Policy:

We support legislation that amends A.R.S. allowing irrigation and electrical districts to adopt an acreage system of voting. (2017)

Energy Sources:

We encourage alternative energy sources that are economically viable, 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. (Reaffirm 2019)

Power Marketing Administrations:

Farm Bureau opposes provisions in the fiscal year (FY) 2018 budget request which call for the divestiture by auction of the department of energy's Power Marketing Administration's (PMAs) assets. The sale of the PMA transmission assets would result in the federal government abandoning a successful and efficient solution for providing affordable power in rural communities.

PMAs are essential not just for states and industry, but for rural communities and the tens of millions of Americans who rely on affordable and sustainable power. Since PMA costs are paid solely by customers, and not the federal government, public ownership generates a nonexistent deficit burden. (2018)

APS Rate Change:

We are opposed to the APS rate structure for irrigation non-use/standby time. Under the new rate structure, costs increased significantly. We encourage the Arizona Corporation Commission to oppose electric rate increases for any utility company if they negatively impact rates for agricultural production, including irrigation wells. (Amended 2019)

Low-Head Hydro Power:

Farm Bureau supports the development and use of low-head hydro-power units without government regulation or permits. (2017)

Grain Ethanol:

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

We oppose any mandates on ethanol blend requirements for fuel. (2018)

Petroleum Refinery:

We encourage the construction and operation of state-of-the-art petroleum transporting and refining facilities within the state. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2016)

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.

Environmental best management practices (BMPs) are to be a set of guidelines developed for farmers and ranchers with significant input from producers. The BMP Compliance Program shall emphasize education rather than penalties. We support state and federal funded programs to assist producers with education and implementation of bmp programs. (2017)

Green Infrastructure:

Trees and plants in managed urban landscapes contribute significant environmental and economic benefits, in addition to their aesthetic value. As such, we should advocate for policies that would ensure the “green” movement includes native landscape plants and trees. (2016)

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.

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.

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. (Amended 2019)

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.

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 practical. We suggest that chemical manufacturers and dealers use reusable or dissolvable containers for all chemicals as soon as practical. 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. (2017)

Worker Protection Standard Testing:

We adamantly oppose mandatory written competency testing for handlers of agricultural chemicals. (2015)

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. (2016)

Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA):

Balanced and science-based considerations of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) is of the utmost concern to farmers and ranchers. Failure to conduct 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—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, we support the use of options such as litigation and legislation.

We will work aggressively to persuade EPA to reasonably manage 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 decisionmaking 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 goals 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.
- (2015)

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. (2017)

Retail Agriculture:

Arizona Farm Bureau recognizes the growing trend toward retail agriculture, i.e. farm stands/stores, U-pick operations, community supported agriculture and farmers’ markets. In order to protect themselves as well as their customers, 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.

We also recognize and support the Arizona Department of Agriculture’s “Arizona Grown” program and encourage growers to participate in this program to further the promotion of Arizona Grown products.

We also support the Arizona Farm Bureau’s “Fill Your Plate” campaign/website in its efforts to champion the rich and diverse agriculture industry in Arizona and encourage its expansion.

The Arizona Department of Agriculture’s Ag Consultation and Training Program offers free training for certification in GAP and GHP and a cost share program that helps with the cost of the USDA audit for certification. (2018)

Imported Agricultural Products:

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

State of Origin Labeling:

We believe that it should be mandatory for all fresh market vegetables, fruits, 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. (2017)

Country of Origin Labeling:

We support voluntary Country of Origin Labeling. Country of Origin Labeling should be considered a separate and distinct issue from Animal ID. (2016)

Protection of Non-Traditional Crops:

We oppose traditional program crop producers from receiving Conservation Reserve Program payments and then using that acreage to produce non-traditional crops, giving an economic advantage over the non-traditional producers not receiving CRP payments. (2018)

Special Use Labels for Agricultural Chemicals:

We strongly support renewal of special use labeling for agricultural chemicals. We also support a more equitable pricing formula for these chemicals. (2017)

Organic Standards:

To maintain the integrity of organic agriculture, we support 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 organic crops should not affect the status of the organic certification. (2017)

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. (2017)

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. (2016)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Crop Protection:

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. (2016)

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. (2016)

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 Farm Bureau, agriculturalists, and the Arizona Department of Agriculture to advertise all forms of integrated pest management and pesticide application on radio, television and the Internet to explain the safety and benefits of agricultural chemicals. (2018)

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. (2016)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Prepass:

We oppose qualification for the Prepass Program of commercial carriers entering the state of Arizona carrying agricultural and horticultural commodities. 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. (2018)

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. (2016)

Screwworm:

We urge continuation of the screwworm eradication program as needed. (2016)

Blister Beetle:

We request that the University of Arizona continue to monitor any changes in possible infestations of the blister beetle in Arizona and continue research efforts to combat the pest. (2018)

Agricultural Pests:

We support research and other activities to help control any agricultural pest that causes economic harm.

(Amended 2019)

Mosquito Abatement:

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

(2017)

Bees in Agriculture:

Bees are essential to production agriculture. Domestic, feral, and native bees provide an important pollination service to farmers and ranchers. Bees are an essential 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.

Education on colony collapse should not automatically blame pesticide use. It should include the stressors for bees including the varroa mite and other pests and parasites, disease, loss of forage diversity, bee nutrition, adverse weather conditions, and reduced genetic pool.

(Amended 2019)

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.

(2015)

Sweet Orange Scab:

The USDA / APHIS requirement for disinfecting citrus fruit under the Sweet Orange Scab quarantine should be removed for fruit being shipped to non-citrus producing states. (2017)

Citrus Disease Research:

Farm Bureau supports USDA APHIS research on pests, diseases, and detection methods in citrus fruit, including Asian Citrus Psyllid and the resulting citrus greening disease, specifically including metabolomics and specially trained dogs. (2018)

Salt Cedar Biocontrol Research:

We support use of mechanical or biological control of salt cedar (tamarisk) on our properties adjacent to rivers and riverbeds through private, state or federal programs.

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. (2018)

Public Rights of Way:

Public property should first be considered for rights of way for utility transmission lines as well as roadways and rail lines. The restrictive regulatory barriers of using federal and state lands for utility lines should be removed to facilitate routings on public land.

Utility transmission lines should be routed in ways to minimize the impact on private property. (2018)

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.

(2016)

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 weeds, in order to protect adjacent farms and irrigation canals from wind-blown debris and seed contamination. (2017)

Noxious Weeds:

The laws prohibiting the planting of noxious weeds, especially for wildlife or riparian management should be vigorously enforced. (2017)

Weed Resistance:

We support the use of multiple modes of action for herbicide application in order to prevent weed resistance. We support the good management practices recommended by the University of Arizona. (2015)

Native Species Introduction:

Federal, state, and local agencies should work closely with permit holders and private landowners whose land management expertise is a critical component for any native species introduction plan and management.

We believe permit holders and land owners should receive notice prior to any reintroduction or introduction of species to Arizona land or waters.

Furthermore, Arizona native species should not be introduced to areas of Arizona where that species has no prior history. (2015)

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. (2017)

Puncture Vine (Bullhead):

We support use of biological and chemical control of Puncture Vine (Bullhead/Goathead) on properties through state programs. (2018)

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 idella*). We support the continued stocking of the White Amur in all of Arizona at no charge to the land owner. (2017)

Animal Disease Lab:

Be it resolved that we strongly urge the continuation of the University of Arizona Animal Disease Diagnostic and Toxicology Laboratory. (2015)

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. (2015)

Bovine Trichomoniasis:

We recommend the Arizona Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the cattle industry develop regulations for mandatory testing of non-dairy 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 trichomoniasis must be consigned to slaughter. Owners of bulls testing positive and their cattle producing neighbors must be notified.

In the event of a trespassing or stray bull, the rancher who locates the stray bull, may request and pay for an official trichomoniasis test of that bull. The owner of the trespass bull must be notified prior to the test. In the event of a positive trichomoniasis test the bull must be identified with an “S” brand and consigned for slaughter.

We support the efforts of all neighboring states in eliminating the disease. We recommend considering neighboring states’ programs to establish our own.

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

In support of this policy, we recommend it be a priority to establish an ad-hoc committee to address bovine trichomoniasis.-

The ad-hoc committee shall consist of a representative from each beef producing county, a representative from the livestock auction community, a local veterinarian, the Arizona state veterinarian, Arizona Cattle Growers Association, and Arizona Farm Bureau. (2018)

Hoof and Mouth Disease:

We recommend that Arizona Farm Bureau work closely with the state veterinarian to develop an emergency management plan to deal with any outbreak of hoof and mouth disease in Arizona or neighboring states. (2018)

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. (2016)

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 and/or direct marketing 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. (2016)

Agricultural Valuation for Small Farms:

Viable agricultural production can be conducted on parcels of less than 5 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 5 acres that include commercial farms and commercial equine operations as agricultural properties. (2017)

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. (2016)

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.

Fiscal restraint, prevention of waste, increased efficiency and reducing government regulations continue to be needed in reducing government spending. (2018)

State Property Tax on Real Property:

We oppose a state property tax levy on real property. (2016)

Agricultural Status for Property Tax Assessment:

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. Tax assessors should not be authorized to change or interpret policy.

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 and specialty crop operations

including but not limited to production nurseries, viticulture, concentrated feeding operations, ratite operations, cotton gins, agri-tourism and agri-tainment. Further, we believe agricultural packing sheds, pressing rooms, wineries, storage facilities and elevators are also agriculture and should be reclassified as such.

All specialty crops and agri-tourism should be classified as agriculture production and qualify for the agriculture property tax classification.

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.

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.

Counties should not impose laws, rules, regulations or more restrictive interpretations of state or federal laws with respect to classifying agricultural property for property tax purposes.

During drought conditions or when water availability is limited, the classification process of agricultural land for tax purposes should be extended from three out of five years to three out of eight years of qualified agricultural uses.

Classification of real property for property tax purposes should be consistent with federal law in recognizing vineyard and winery products as agricultural products until they are taken “out of bond”. Only the land and improvements dedicated to the sale or distribution of agricultural products after they are taken out of bond should be classified as commercial.

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. Agricultural facilities should be considered agricultural use if it is used for sales of farm products. (2017)

Property Tax Classification and Water reductions: Agricultural land shall be considered “in production” as long as it is maintained for agriculture, even with reduced availability of water. This policy does not apply to Maricopa County. (2017)

Agricultural Grazing Land Property Tax: For the purpose of establishing the value of grazing lands for property taxes, they shall include all leases including deeded lands, federal grazing leases and state grazing leases. Additionally, deeded acreage should be part of an economically viable ranch or meet the minimum standard of 40 animal units carrying capacity to be used for the valuation of property taxes. We recommend that statute and the Arizona Department of Revenue policy and procedure reflect these principles. (2015)

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. (2016)

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 annually. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Sales and Use Tax:

We believe that all inputs necessary to conduct normal farming or ranching activities should be exempt from sales and use tax:

1. New and used agricultural machinery and equipment, supplies and unlicensed farm vehicles;
2. Fertilizer, chemicals, and fuel 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. 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. (2015)

Severance Taxes:

We support amending current severance tax funding formulas to ensure equitable distribution of severance tax revenues to the counties and communities where the taxable materials originated. (2018)

Possessory Interest Tax:

We oppose the implementation of a possessory interest tax on any agricultural lease. (2015)

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. (2017)

Arizona Racetrack Gaming Policy:

To maintain horse racing as a part of agriculture in Arizona, Farm Bureau supports legalization of casino-style gambling at race tracks in the state, on the conditions that 45% of every gaming dollar be paid into the state general fund and that 75% of the money paid to the state be used to support county fairs, Arizona State Fair and the Arizona National Livestock Show. (2017)

Estate and Capital Gains Tax:

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

Until permanent repeal is achieved, a fair and reliable way to transfer a business from one family generation to another should be developed. Such policy would exempt taxation on the first \$10 million dollars per individual and shall not exceed a tax rate of 20% after the \$10 million has been surpassed. (2017)

Arizona Income Tax Returns:

We oppose Arizona income tax returns being processed outside the state of Arizona. (2015)

Tax Credit Classification:

We support the recognition of an agricultural business owned by stockholders, partners or LLC

as a commercial operation. As such, we believe that the business should be eligible for tax credits applicable to commercial operations, including credits for improvements placed on housing owned by the operation. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Tax credits:

Agriculture is a major contributor to rural and economic development in Arizona. State tax credits will support agriculture and preserve working farmland, increase tourism and overall economic growth. State income tax credits should be available to individuals, partnerships or corporations for purchasing of new equipment in Arizona. (2017)

Heritage Fund:

We recommend that Heritage Fund monies be removed from the Arizona Game and Fish Department budget and returned to the General Fund. (2016)

REGULATORY

Ag Certainty:

All regulations which impact agricultural operations should be clear, concise, reasonable, affordable, and implementable for the operation. Agricultural operations should be regulated on what they physically have in-place, not what could potentially be constructed in the future (such as regulating a lagoon as a digester because it could potentially be covered to capture gas). Regulations should be written in such a way that a layman can discern what is required. Air and water quality regulations should not contradict each other. Regulations which are not complete, under litigious proceedings which could affect the regulation's requirements, or have parts which have not been finalized, should not be put into effect. All regulatory development, policies, and interpretation should go through a transparent stakeholder process; internal regulatory agency memos and guidance documents

are not acceptable ways to develop regulations, set regulatory policy, or determine how to interpret the regulations.

Agricultural operations should be given emission reduction credits for the installation, implementation and use of emissions reduction technology; these types of credits should be extended to both air and water quality improvement technologies and practices.

We are strong believers of environmental protection and support the voluntary use of reasonable, implementable, and cost-effective control technologies. Where regulatory changes mandate specific types of control technologies be installed, a reasonable timeframe to implement and pay for the required new technologies should be provided. In addition, for those operations who have an existing control technology (voluntary or mandated), the timeframe should allow for the full depreciation of the existing control technology prior to a new technology being mandated. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. The Department should educate and promote accurate statements regarding GMO's, organics, and gluten. 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. (2015)

Support for The Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management:

Arizona Farm Bureau supports the continued autonomy of the Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Pinal County)

Department of Interior Reorganization:

We support the reorganization of the DOI and the move of headquarter positions for the BLM and FWS westward and the national office of BLM to the Rocky Mountain region. We urge the DOI to continue consulting with western states to ensure regional development considers state political boundaries and concerns. Each state and its government represent local needs and can capitalize on resources to address common objectives, including wildlife, land use planning, environmental quality, and water resources management. Continuing this approach, while also moving agency decision-makers closer to the lands they manage, would increase efficiency and decentralize decision-making, while also respecting state authority and improving the department's ability to consult and cooperate with state and local governments. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Cochise County)

Wildlife Pest and Predator Control:

We oppose the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearm and Explosives regulating explosive pest control devices (EPCDs) under federal explosive laws that require individual permitting and qualified storage facilities for the use of such devices. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2015)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

County Fair and Department of Agriculture Funding:

We support the allocation of funds from pari-mutual racing in Arizona, to support county fairs and the Arizona National Livestock Show. County Fairs Livestock and Agriculture Promotion Fund should be used exclusively for the purpose of promoting the livestock and agricultural resources, and not to be used at the will of county parks and recreation, or county fair departments, for other purposes and expenses when funding a county fair. (2018)

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 related administrative costs and should not be remitted to the state general fund. (2016)

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. (2015)

Equine Rescue Registry:

We support the Equine Rescue Registry established in the Arizona Department of Agriculture and development of programs in relation to this registry. We urge improvements to the Department website to make this registry easily accessible and to add links to the individual registered horse rescues.

We encourage all equine rescues to meet the requirements and register with the Arizona Department of Agriculture 501(c)(3) equine rescue registry. (2015)

Equine Massage and Dentistry:

We encourage a change in Arizona state law to allow non-veterinarians who are trained as massage therapists or equine dentists to legally practice as certified massage therapists or certified equine dentists. (2016)

Livestock Warranties:

We favor legislation exempting the sale of Arizona livestock from implied warranties of merchantability and fitness. (2017)

Agricultural Warranties:

We favor state legislation exempting raw agricultural products from implied warranty laws. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2018)

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 Plower Program initiated in 1991.

We support the ongoing boll weevil and pink bollworm maintenance programs.

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. (2015)

Grower Information Program:

With numerous herbicide-resistant crops on the market and resistance to different herbicides being created, we support a grower information program (GIP), facilitated by the Arizona Farm Bureau website, to enable producers and crop consultants to post and share information with their neighbors in an effort to prevent unintended crop injury from herbicide applications. (2015)

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 as

‘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 so broad as to grant one developer the right to a whole class of future developments. (2015)

Labeling Of Genetically Modified Foods:

Farm Bureau opposes the mandatory labeling of foods derived from genetically modified (GM) plants and/or animals. The use of biotechnology in agriculture has greatly increased yields, decreased the amounts of pesticides used by farmers, and been proven safe by years of scientific study. Mandatory labeling of GM foods is not supported on any scientific basis, as no significant differences between conventional and GM food varieties have ever been recognized. Labeling of GM ingredients will give consumers a false impression that these foods are different and may lead to decreased demand for GM goods. This in turn may lead to crucial crop shortages, increased food insecurity and a decrease in advances within the field of agricultural biotechnology. For the same reasons, we also oppose any attempt by a city, county, state, or other local government to ban the production, marketing, or sale of GM foods. (2018)

Synthetic/Imitation Meat Products:

We oppose the labeling of products from alternative sources, including but not limited to lab-grown animal cells, synthetic creations from insects, plants, and non-animal components, as “meat”, “beef”, “chicken”, or “pork.”

We oppose the use of misleading marketing labels that lead consumers to believe that lab-grown products are better nutritionally and/or environmentally than traditional, naturally grown meat.

Imitation products should not be labeled as meat harvested in the traditional manner.

We support legislation that defines “meat” as coming from a live animal.

We support USDA, not FDA, oversight of synthetic lab-grown meat-like products. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Cochise County and Coconino County)

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. (2015)

Animal Reproduction (Pet and Livestock):

We oppose any legislation that would seek to impose limits on the number of litters or newborn animals, including pets and/or livestock, that a breeder may produce in a given period of time. We further oppose the use of vague or unspecified terms such as “humane housing” or “adequate shelter” in any animal rights bills which result in penalties to animal owners who do not meet these standards in the opinion of non-industry enforcers. (2018)

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 wellbeing 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 oppose unauthorized imaging on private agricultural property. We encourage the aggressive prosecution of violators.

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 are so vital to the livestock industry. (2015)

Equine Training for Peace Officers:

We encourage all peace officers, especially those in rural parts of Arizona, to attend the Arizona Horse Council's Peace Officers' Standards and Training (POST) certified law enforcement training program as part of their continuing education. (2017)

Animal Welfare:

We support a mandated requirement that any employee within an operation who witnesses animal abuse report the incident to the operation's management within 48 hours or less. (Amended 2019)

Livestock Health:

The proper use of antibiotics is essential to efficient, economic production of abundant, reasonably priced, high quality animal products. Usage of such medications 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 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.

(Amended 2019)

Feed Additives and Hormones:

The proper use of feed additives and growth hormones is beneficial 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. (Adopted 2019)

(Originated in: Cochise County)

Controlled Substances for Veterinary Use:

Farm Bureau supports allowing licensed veterinarians to carry with them, in their vehicles, such controlled substances that are legally registered to their premises.

(Amended 2019)

Veterinarian Procedures:

We are opposed to any new laws, regulations or rules which mandate that a veterinarian or their staff be present to administer and/or perform veterinary procedures that have historically been done by ranchers, farmers or their employees. (2017)

Livestock Traceability:

We will work with the Arizona Department of Agriculture urging I) compliance with ARS 3-1214; and II) the Department's adoption of the hot brand or freeze as its official animal id, working with other Western brand states to accept Arizona cattle with a brand inspection and health certificate as have historically

been required for interstate movement of cattle.

Should the Department insist on mandatory compliance with traceability, we will work with the legislature to defund the Department's implementation of mandatory livestock traceability. (2015)

Carcass Beef Grading Standards:

We support the continued use of current methods, including dentition, for classifying maturity of carcasses presented to USDA for official quality grading.

Due to the varied environments and management inherent in ranching, we oppose requiring actual age documentation.

(2018)

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.

We request the Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) provide 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. (2017)

Brand Inspection (Non-Dairy):

We support the livestock brand inspection programs, which promote self-inspection. We do not support the non-range self-inspection book.

However, if such books continue to be issued, the Department of Agriculture shall require 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, and provided within 24 hours, 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 encourage the use of part-time inspectors.

We recommend the placement of livestock inspectors throughout the state of Arizona (not just rural areas) with at least one inspector per county. Furthermore, 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. (2016)

Brand Recording Policy:

The record keeping system of cattle brands currently in use is cumbersome and needs revision.

We recommend brand recording be a standardized procedure with a hierarchical process and separation of duties integrated with current technology for management and record keeping. We propose moving from a brand book to a magnetic card system to provide traceability, accuracy, and cost effectiveness. The ADA Animal Services Advisory Board will oversee this system.

We reference the Arizona Supreme Court ruling dated August 5, 2017, that discontinues all duplicate brands.

Junior owners of duplicate brands will be given a reasonable time to transition to the use of another brand.

We strongly advocate for the expansion of the brand review board to include local sale barn operators and livestock operators with active cattle brands.

We recommend that brand recording responsibilities be moved from the Environmental Services Division of the Arizona Department of Agriculture to the Animal Services Division. (Amended 2019)

Livestock Inspection for Show Animals:

We should work with the Arizona Department of Agriculture to develop a streamlined inspection program for animals that are primarily used for livestock shows. (2016)

Certified Nurseries:

We support voluntary certification of nurseries. (2017)

Seed Mediation:

We support seed mediation or arbitration procedures that will be beneficial to the seed industry and users. (2018)

Corn Borer:

We should discontinue testing when a county is proven to be free from corn borer. (2018)

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. Requiring new regulations on all hay sold would be an unnecessary and expensive tax on producers and buyers. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Karnal Bunt:

Karnal bunt should be immediately deregulated and handled as a quality issue. (2016)

Scale Certification:

Arizona Department of Agriculture Division of Weights and Measures should certify private scales at a reasonable charge. (2017)

Mountain Standard Time:

We recommend that the State Legislature keep Arizona on Mountain Standard Time. (2015)

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 solid, industrial or hazardous waste. (2016)

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. (2018)

Illegal Dumping:

We oppose any attempts by the state land department to put agricultural leases at risk as a result of third-party illegal dumping. (2015)

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.

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

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. (2015)

Feed Liens:

We encourage the Arizona Department of Agriculture to clarify feed lien procedures. Equine feed lien procedures under A.R.S. § 3-1295 should be updated to better protect boarding managers from prolonged damages due to non-payment of boarding fees.

Boarding managers should be allowed to forgo the lien process upon prior written agreement with the boarders allowing ownership of a boarded horse(s) if the boarding fees are not paid within 14 days. (Amended 2019)

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 sixty (60) 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. (2016)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2016)

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 federal, state and local regulatory agency inspectors or auditors to give advance notice of inspections or audits with details of the items to be inspected or audited;
2. All such inspections shall be conducted by inspectors or auditors in person. No satellite or aerial imaging shall be used for regulatory monitoring or enforcement unless governed by a federal consent decree.
3. No regulatory enforcement action should be taken against agricultural production or processing facilities based upon satellite or aerial imagery;
4. Require that regulatory agencies and inspectors or auditors shall follow due process when taking action against a citizen or business;
5. 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
6. Require regulatory agency inspectors or auditors to apply regulations in an equitable and consistent manner. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Arizona Corporation Commission:

The Arizona Corporation Commission staff should include representation from the agricultural community. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. This statement should clearly identify the commodity.

FDA should not release business names to the public during or after an investigation, until a thorough investigation of the producer, harvester, shipper or marketer has been conducted, and the entity to be named publicly has been informed such a publication is to be made. Entities who cannot sell goods into the public marketplace should never be named publicly unless it can be proven that they adulterated the food or product through negligence.

In the interest of improving cooperation during investigations and in an effort to obtain better information for consumers and industry alike, FDA should revise their practices during investigations greatly to improve the speed and accuracy with which they conduct their efforts. Additionally, FDA's authority to name individuals, businesses or brands should be greatly reduced, and Congress should enact legislation that grants legal recourse to anyone conversely affected by FDA's action, instead of on a case by case basis requiring congressional actions for every situation. (Amended 2019)

Federal Funding:

We oppose the withholding of federal monies, grants or matching funds to force local or state compliance with

federal rules or regulations. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund:

We oppose the renewal of the land and water conservation fund. Until the fund is discontinued, we urge congress to appropriate all funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which receives its monies from off-shore oil royalties, and to divert those funds to individual state foresters for their use in fire suppression, fire management, and conservation efforts instead of using those funds for buying private property. (2018)

United States' Sovereignty:

We do not recognize the United Nations as legal authority. We oppose giving up United States' Sovereignty to the United Nations on any cause including Agenda 21. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Weather Information:

We support the accurate, timely and localized reporting of weather information and the maintenance and adequate funding of current weather analysis and information dissemination systems that are useful to producers in their particular area.

Federal, state and private agencies should work together to improve these systems and the coordination of user support and federal funds to assure continuity and improvement. (2018)

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. (2016)

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 intrastate 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. (2015)

Pollution Prevention Program:

We oppose the inclusion of livestock operations, including confined animal feeding operations, in the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality’s Pollution Prevention Program (P2) or the Environmental Protection Agency’s Clean Air Act regulations. (2018)

Methane Emissions:

We oppose any attempt to regulate methane emissions from ruminant animals under the Clean Air Act or any other legislative vehicle. (2017)

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. (2016)

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. We oppose air quality monitoring by both manned and unmanned aerial crafts. (2015)

Air Inspector Education:

We support agriculture air inspector training administered by a partnership of the Arizona Department of Agriculture and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for air inspectors (city, county, and state) for standardization of inspection and interpretation of regulations as it relates to AG BMP rules.

Regulation guidance should include photo examples to ensure inspectors are consistent in their enforcement process. Additionally, there should be continuity in jurisdictional rules (city, county and state). (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Maricopa County)

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. (2015)

Mobile Communication:

We oppose a ban on the use of mobile communication devices while driving. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2017)

Cell Phone Towers:

We support the erection of cell phone towers in rural areas to improve telephone and data reception. Cell towers should be sited in non-farm corridors or adjacent to power lines so as not to cause additional obstructions for aerial applicators and other farm and ranch equipment. (2015)

Satellite and Aerial Images:

We oppose the use of satellite or aerial imaging of agricultural land for the purposes of harassment, litigation of an agricultural operation or individual, or regulatory monitoring and enforcement, except for a federal consent decree. We oppose the use of aerial imaging as the sole source of natural resource information in land management policy decision making. (Amended 2019)

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. (2017)

Mail Delivery:

We endorse and support the Uniform Rural Addressing program in all fifteen Arizona counties. (2017)

Cultural/Archaeological Clearances:

We support efforts to streamline cultural clearance processes for rangeland and conservation improvements. We support the Cultural Resources Programmatic Agreement among the AZ State Land Department, AZ State Forestry, BLM, NRCS, AACD, and SHPO. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Cochise County)

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. (2016)

Native Plant Removal on State Trust Land:

We encourage the Arizona State Land Department to review and adjust its application of the native plant fee structure and its survey requirements for the removal of plants on state trust land. The Arizona State Land Department applies the fees arbitrarily and unfairly to agricultural, mineral exploration and removal, and rights-of-way activities. (Adopted 2019) (Originated in: Cochise County)

Argentine Citrus:

We oppose the import of Argentine citrus into the United States, until that citrus is certified free of all harmful phytosanitary problems and pests. (2017)

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

To obtain a criminal 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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Enforcement of Federal Officer Ethics:

Agricultural producers victimized by damaging and unethical abuse of federal authority, assert that federal officers should recuse themselves from decision making in all circumstances where they may allow their personal views to unethically affect their work as public employees. We support appropriate provisions, within the power of the state, be established to provide for consequences for federal officers if they misrepresent

facts or sources or lie about matters that impact Arizona citizens and businesses. (2017)

Terrorism:

Agri-terrorism should be considered a felony offense. (2016)

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. (2016)

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. (2015)

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 for those engaged in the illegal distribution or sale of narcotics and drugs.

We oppose legalization of marijuana for recreational use. (2015)

Court Compensation:

We support legislation requiring the courts to recover costs of court appointed attorneys whenever possible. (2017)

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. (2017)

Farm and Ranch Liability Protection Policy:

We support liability protection for farmers and ranchers from frivolous lawsuits. Individuals must recognize there are inherent risks including, without limitation, the risk of animals, land and water conditions, structures or equipment used in farming or ranching operations, that may contribute to injury or death. (2017)

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. (2015)

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.” (2018)

Equine Processing:

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

We support a policy that allows equine processing facilities to be built in the United States. (2018)

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. (2018)

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. (2017)

Pornography/Prostitution:

We support the elimination of prostitution and pornography. As an organization, we believe in the freedom and personal dignity of all individuals which are directly oppressed by the sex trade. (2015)

Domesticated Animals:

Domesticated animals running loose are a serious problem in some areas of the state. We request an expanded effort in the control of domesticated animals that roam off the owner’s property. We urge the government entities to enforce their leash laws and

public awareness campaigns addressing food safety in vegetable producing communities. Pet owners should also demonstrate the same control over their animals near livestock operations. (2018)

Prairie Dogs:

Prairie dogs are 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. (2018)

ELECTIVE OFFICE AND REFERENDUMS

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. (2015)

County Board of Supervisors:

All counties should be allowed to set salaries of county supervisors and other elected county officials. (2018)

Pro-Tem Judges:

We support the use of non-attorney pro-tem judges in the justice court system. (2015)

Election Activities:

We believe that limitation on the amount of contributions on political campaigns is an unrealistic and unjust restriction of constitutional rights. (2018)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Public Funding of Campaigns:

We oppose the use of public funds to finance a candidate's campaign. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Arizona Initiative Process:

We believe 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, we generally support 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. (2015)

Legislative Districts:

We oppose the arbitrary division by legislative boundaries of rural towns, communities and areas where common economic and social bonds exist. (2017)

NonTaxpayer 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. (2017)

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

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.

Government agencies should be required to pay contractors, so they can pay subcontractors for services rendered within thirty days of the completion of work. (2017)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Right-to-Work:

We will continue to insist on rigid enforcement of Arizona’s Right-to-Work Law. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Labor Availability:

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

We support 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. (2017)

Worker Program:

We highly support the implementation of a worker program that will allow foreign workers with legal identification to work in the United States. 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 "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. (2017)

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).
- 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. (2016)

Labor Needs for Arizona Agriculture:

Farm Bureau supports increasing border security and 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 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. (2017)

Employer Rights:

The focus of employers is to employ people and not enforce immigration laws. We oppose the role of employers as immigration enforcers. (Amended 2019)

State Immigration Reform:

We believe that the Arizona legislature should do whatever it can to encourage federal 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. (2017)

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.

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

We advocate that the current border patrol strategy, effectively allowing high percentages of drug smugglers and undocumented crossers to enter through rural lands and travel in the U.S. for five to 100 miles, must be changed to a specific objective of securing the international border at the border. We also support congressional action to exempt the border patrol from the multi-year delays caused by federal planning and environmental laws that impede construction of infrastructure deemed necessary by the border patrol within a one-mile strip immediately north of and adjacent to the southwestern international boundary in order to secure the border at the border.

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 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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Harmful Union Activities:

We vigorously oppose the tactics used by the leaders of the United Farm Workers (U.F.W.) and other labor unions. 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 Right to Work Laws. (2017)

Union Elections:

United States citizenship and state residency should be prerequisites for voting in union elections. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

TRANSPORTATION

Implements of Husbandry:

All portable tanks used by agriculture, including but not limited to fuel storage vehicles, farm chemical tank trailers and weed burners, should be classified as implements of husbandry and therefore be exempt from licensing requirements when moved on public roads. (2015)

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 backhauls.

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. (2018)

Transportation of Equine:

Transport of equine should not be regulated by federal law but rather as a states' rights issue. We support 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. (2015)

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. (2018)

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. (2016)

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, also eliminating the monies solely allocated for beautification of new construction contracts. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Grade Separation Structures:

We urge the Arizona Department of Transportation 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. (2018)

Fencing Highways or Roadways:

All existing and future state or county paved roads and highways running through grazing areas shall have a legal fence as defined by ARS 3-1426 constructed and maintained on both sides of these roads and highways by the legal entity having maintenance responsibility of these roads and highways. We support enforcement and penalties for vandalism of fencing on public highways and any public access roads. (Amended 2019)

Slow Moving Vehicles:

We recommend all farms be encouraged to place SMV signs on equipment and all blinkers and lights be in working order. (2017)

Littering:

We support penalties for littering, including restitution for loss of livestock and production or revenue. (2016)

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. (2017)

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. (2017)

Driver's License Issuance:

We oppose any law that prohibits possession of a valid driver license until the age of 18 years. (2017)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

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. (2016)

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. (2016)

Prorated Commercial Vehicle Fee:

We support pro-rating commercial license fees for vehicles used for only a portion of the year. (2016)

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. (2017)

Truck Weight Limits:

We support increasing truck weight limits to 96,000 pounds. (2016)

Fuel-Use Permit Charge:

We support legislation that would repeal the fuel-use permit charged Arizona registered heavy trucks as they enter the state. (2017)

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. (2017)

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. (2017)

Rail Lines Through Yuma County:

Any freight coming from ports 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, Arizona Farm Bureau is adamantly opposed to any new rail lines crossing through or in close proximity to agricultural areas of Yuma County. Double tracking of the rail way should not impact the Yuma Territorial Prison or other historical sites. (Amended 2019)

Yuma ASH Highway:

A controlled access route through the farm land of the Gila Valley would potentially destroy its productivity. Therefore, we encourage 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. (2015)

ADOT Wilderness Corridor Program:

We oppose ADOT's wilderness corridor program. (2017)

HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Health Insurance:

We oppose mandated health insurance. (2016)

School Financing:

We are in favor of local control of school systems.

We strongly urge Farm Bureau members to run for local boards of education. (2015)

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. (2016)

Evolution Theory:

We strongly urge that evolution be taught in public schools as a theory rather than as a fact and include scientific evidence that is contrary to the theory. If one theory on how the earth was formed is taught in schools, then other theories and related scientific evidence must be presented. (2017)

Vocational Agriculture Programs:

We strongly support vocational agriculture programs and the FFA. Full time executive and support staff should be funded by the state. We 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. (2015)

Career and Technical Education and Joint Technical Education District Funding:

We continue to support the funding of Joint Technical Education Districts(JTED) programs and other Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs. We are opposed to using those funds for anything other than the intended purpose. (2016)

Teaching:

We advocate a return to teaching the basic educational skills of reading, writing and arithmetic at the elementary level. (2015)

Agriculture Teacher Shortage:

We recognize that there is an extreme 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. (2018)

Agriculture Education:

We support efforts to promote accurate scientific information on the positive effects of agriculture to be incorporated into all education curriculums. (2016)

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. (2018)

School Lunches:

We support the use of balanced, nutritious, and affordable school lunches and support the utilization of Arizona agriculture products where available. (Reaffirmed 2019)

Veterinary Training:

We support veterinary training and certification program in the state of Arizona to help alleviate the shortage of large animal veterinarians in the state. (2017)

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. (2018)

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. (2018)

Research:

Research is essential for agriculture to keep up in the technological frontier. As the nature of farming and ranching 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, and rotational grazing methods on rangelands. Additionally, we should work with the universities and community colleges of Arizona in identifying and conducting other needed agricultural research in areas such as:

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.
6. Invasive woody species encroaching on rangelands. (2018)

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. (2016)

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. (2017)

COMMODITIES

Farm Programs:

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 Commodity Credit Corporation and crop insurance programs could be eliminated entirely in exchange for calculation of income tax on a 7-year rolling average. (2017)

Specialty Crop Insurance:

Farm Bureau supports specialty crop insurance that is formally requested by commodity-specific producers and supported by market data. The following prerequisites must be met prior to the creation of any specialty crop insurance product:

- a. Before anyone can develop a new crop insurance product, they must conduct a survey of the relevant industry to determine whether producers want the product.
- b. As crop insurance products are being developed, those potential products have to be accompanied by economic modeling to determine whether and how the product would impact regional and national markets. (2018)

Milk Pricing:

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

We oppose any program for mandatory supply control of milk. (2017)

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 directed by the producers of these products; and
 7. That only those persons who contribute monies to the respective programs shall be eligible to serve on the boards which administer such programs.
- (2015)

Beef Checkoff Fee:

Before the amount for the Beef Checkoff fee is increased, a proposed budget needs to be presented to participants of the program indicating how the funds will be used (2015)

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. (2018)

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 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. (2016)

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 and encourage more agricultural credits to help beginning farmers and ranchers. (2017)

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 throughout the world in major crops, results in wide swings in market prices, which are very costly to the American farmer. (2017)

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. (2015)

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. (2017)

Vineyards and Wineries:

Wine grape growing and wineries where grapes are processed into wine is value-added agriculture known as specialty crops. 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, agri-business use, and/or farming.

We support the wine industry's efforts to educate the public of the role of the wine grape industry in supporting a healthy statewide economy.

We support efforts by the USDA, Arizona Commerce Authority or other entity to measure the economic impact of the grape-growing and wine industry. (2017)

Sustainable Agriculture:

Sustainable agriculture refers to an integrated system of plant and animal production that will, over the long term, satisfy human food and fiber needs, enhance environmental quality and the natural resource base upon which the agricultural economy depends, makes the most efficient use of both renewable and nonrenewable resources, sustains the economic viability of agricultural operations and enhances the quality of life for both agricultural producers and society as a whole.

The term "sustainable agriculture" should include all agricultural practices that meet the above definition. (2015)

Arizona Grain Council:

Wheat and barley produced in Arizona should be subject to a voluntary refundable check-off by the Arizona Grain Council. No remuneration should be given to first purchaser for collection fees. (2017)

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. (2018)

Industrial Hemp:

We support the development, production and distribution of industrial hemp and will work with state and federal agencies to remove the federal schedule 1 registration from cannabis varieties that are primarily grown as an agricultural crop and contain less than 0.03% of THC (delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol). (2015)

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. (2016)

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. (2017)

Prorated Insurance:

We support insurance companies pro-rating for occasional use vehicles. (2016)

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Farm Bill:

We should work cohesively with other agricultural organizations addressing the needs of Arizona agriculture, while working on the next Farm Bill. (2017)

Specialty Crops and the Farm Bill:

The Farm Bill should expand the market access program to include specialty crops; 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. (2017)

Tell Ag Story:

Arizona Farm Bureau will regularly build a strategy around public outreach and engagement to help the general public understand modern agriculture.

We shall partner with related organizations (including other agriculture and commodity-specific groups) and agencies to establish outreach programs and specific legislation in the best interest of Arizona agriculture. The public should be more thoroughly informed of agriculture's role in the economy and welfare of our community and nation. As a result, we support any form of agriculture, including agri-tourism and agribusiness,

in Arizona that helps educate the public through on-site experiences about agriculture.

We support ongoing studies that adequately quantify agriculture's economic benefit to the state. And once such studies have completed data, a concerted and robust effort shall be made to inform the public through various channels of outreach including social media and any other form of public engagement.

Where appropriate, government relations and outreach will strategically align efforts, especially on behalf of "priority issues" established by farm bureau's delegate body. When a public issue surfaces that would be harmful to the agriculture industry's wellbeing we will develop a multimedia outreach campaign to promote the activities and positions of the agriculture community. Such a campaign will be executed through the formation of a committee comprised of all agricultural commodity groups in order to obtain grants and other funding to educate and promote the agriculture community's position regarding the issue. (Amended 2019)

Education for Water Conservation:

Farm Bureau and other agricultural organizations should join to educate the citizens of our communities on the efficient use of water in today's production of food, fiber and horticulture products. (2018)

Economic Impact:

Farm Bureau needs to regularly 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 labor issues. The general public needs to comprehend the impacts on industry as they relate to the consumer. (2018)

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. (2017)

WITHIN FARM BUREAU

Ag in the Classroom:

Farm Bureau shall continue to support and further expand the Ag in the Classroom program. Further, we encourage Arizona Farm Bureau to continue its support of the Summer Ag Institute. (2018)

Consumer Education:

We encourage 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. (2016)

Consumer Education on Pesticides:

We encourage active education of consumers on the use and importance of agricultural chemicals. (2015)

Consumer Education on Genetically Modified Crops:

We encourage active education of consumers on the use and importance of genetically modified crops through Ag in the Classroom and related educational material. (2015)

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. (2015)

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. (2016)

Statewide Office Holder Vacancy:

If there is a vacancy in our statewide office holders, the current officer may move up to fill respective positions, and the board will have the authority to fill the unexpired term. (2016)

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. (2015)

Litigation Fund:

Farm Bureau supports teaming up with other agricultural organizations in Arizona and any other state (i.e. New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, etc.) That would like to participate in creating a litigation fund that would enable these organizations to litigate against agencies like the EPA and USDA when faced with unreasonable sanctions and/or regulations. (2018)

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. (Reaffirmed 2019)

President Expenses:

We will pay all the expenses of the Arizona Farm Bureau President, including travel, lodging and meals when on assignment for the Arizona Farm Bureau. (2017)

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. 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. (2016)

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. (2016)

Project Central:

As Project Central 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 Central. We 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. (2015)

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. (2015)

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. (2016)

Water Committee:

The Arizona Farm Bureau officers and staff are directed to maintain our water committee 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. (2015)

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. (2017)

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 resolution's 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.

INDEX

A

Active Management Areas	44, 45, 61
Adjudication	58, 59
ADOT Wilderness Corridor Program	144
Aerial Images	125
Affirmation of Water Rights	56
Aflatoxin	91
Ag Certainty	98
Ag Economic Development	152
Ag in the Classroom.....	157
Ag Preference Power	67
Agricultural Chemicals	71
Agricultural Grazing Land Property Tax	95
Agricultural Inspection Stations	84
Agricultural Products	152
Agricultural Protection Act	13
Agricultural tax classification	93
Agricultural Valuation for Small Farms	91
Agricultural Warranties.....	104
Agriculture Conservation Programs	49
Agriculture Education	146
Agriculture preservation districts	17
Agriculture Teacher Shortage.....	146
Air and Water Quality Regulations	124
Air Inspector Education	124
Air Pollution Controls.....	122
Air Quality.....	124
Airports and Military Air Bases.....	17
AMA.....	44, 49, 61
Animal Care	108
Animal Disease Lab	89
Animal Reproduction (Pet and Livestock).....	108
Animal Rights.....	108
Animal Welfare.....	111
Annexation	16
Annual Meeting	158, 161
Antibiotics.....	111
APS Rate Change	70
Argentine Citrus.....	126
Arizona Corporation Commission	70, 121, 140
Arizona Department of Agriculture . . .	13, 75, 76, 77, 84, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 152
Arizona Department of Motor Vehicles	142

Arizona Game and Fish Department	25, 98, 130
Arizona Grain Council	154
Arizona Groundwater Protection List.	76
Arizona Income Tax Returns	97
Arizona Initiative Process	131
Arizona Power Authority	67
Arizona's Rights	3
Augmenting Arizona Water Supplies	46
Automobile Insurance	154
AZMET Program	122

B

Bark Beetle	20
Beef Checkoff Fee.	151
Bees In Agriculture	86
Best Management Practices	39, 123
Biotechnology Regulation.	105
Blister Beetle	85
Border Security.	23, 134, 136
Brackish Water	47
Brand Inspection	113
Brand Recording Policy.	115
Buffer Zones	83

C

Carcass Beef Grading Standards	113
Career and Technical Education	145
CDL	142
Cell Phone Towers	125
Central Arizona Groundwater Replenishment District (CAGRDR).	50
Central Arizona Project.	50, 51
Certified Nurseries.	115
Citrus Canker	93
Citrus Disease Research	93
City Regional Plans	7
Clean Up Public Lands	29
Coal Energy.	68
Code of the West	5
Commodity Promotion.	150
Compensation for Victims	128
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.	64
Condemned Property	14
Consumer Education.	157
Consumer Education on Genetically Modified Crops	157

Consumer Education on Pesticides	157
Control of Rights-of-Way	87
Controlled Substances for Veterinary Use	112
Cooperative Extension	147
Corn Borer	116
Cost Plus Contracting	132
Cotton Remnant Destruction and Pest Management	105
Country of Origin Labeling	82
County Authority	130
County Board of Supervisors	71, 130
County Departments of Environmental Quality	71
Court Compensation	128
Critical Habitat Designation	39
Critical Habitat for Jaguars	39
Crop Protection	83
Cultural/Archaeological Clearances	125

D

Definition of a Farm	91
Department of	
Agriculture	34, 75, 76, 84, 99, 102, 103, 104, 112, 152
Department of Interior Reorganization	102
Department of Water Resources	15, 44, 46, 47, 58, 61
Discarded Road Signs	141
District Voting Policy	69
Documentation of Injury	83
Dogs	130
Driver's License Issuance	141
Drought	53, 62, 94
Drought Contingency Plan	62
Drug Education and Enforcement	127

E

Economic Impact	156
Education of Water Conservation	156
Elected Officials	132
Election Activities	130
Elections	130
electrical districts	67, 68, 69
Eminent Domain Condemnations	14
Employer Rights	135
endangered species	13, 37, 43, 87, 108
Endangered Species	41
Energy Sources	69
Environmental Law	126

Environmental Regulation	72
Equestrian Property Use and Regulations	129
Equine Facilities	128
Equine Massage and Dentistry	104
Equine Processing	129
Equine Rescue Registry	104
Equine Training for Peace Officers	111
Estate and Capital Gains Tax	97
Evolution Theory	145

F

Fallowing Land During Drought	53
Farm Bill	155
Farm Bureau Beliefs	2
Farm Income	157
Farm Programs	149
Farm/Ranch Truck License	142
FDA Advisories	121
Federal Funding	121
Federal Land	30
Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund	122
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations	142
Feed Additives and Hormones	112
fence out laws	32
Fencing Highways or Roadways	141
Fencing Notices	32
Feral Horses and Burros	43
Feral Swine	43
Fire Accountability	24
Fire Control	29
Firearms	127
Fiscal Responsibility	132
Five Year Policies	160
Flood Control and Dam Safety	52
Flood Plain Condemnation	15
Flood Plain Designation	15
Food Quality Protection Act	73, 78
Food Quality Standards for Raw and Fresh-Cut Fruits and Vegetables	80
Food Safety Depredation Hunts	34
Forbearance	51
Forest Management	19
Form 1080	76
Four Forest Restoration	25
Frivolous Lawsuits	128
Fruit And Vegetable Standardization	151

Fuel-Use Permit Charge	143
Fund Sweeps	103

G

General Adjudication.....	58
Genetically Modified	105, 157
Goats and Goat Products	152
Good Agricultural Practices.....	81
Government Taxes and Spending	92
GPS Band.....	124
Grade Separation Structures.....	140
Grain Ethanol	71
Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Administration. . .	113
Grandfathered Rights	45, 48
Grazing Permits	25
Grazing Permits and Wildfires.....	25
Green Infrastructure	72
Groundwater.....	45, 46, 61, 63
Grower Information Program	105
Guest Worker Program	133

H

Harmful Union Activities	138
Hay Standards.....	116
Hazardous Waste Disposal	116
Health Insurance	144
Healthy Forest Initiative	19
Hemp	154
Heritage Fund.....	98
Highway Beautification	140
Highway User Taxes.....	139
Hoof And Mouth Disease.....	91
Hunting	33, 40
Hunting Blinds on Stock Ponds	35
Hunting Within City Limits	40

I

Illegal Dumping	110
Impaired Water.....	64
Implements of Husbandry	138
Imported Agricultural Products.....	81
Improvement Districts.....	13, 125, 140
Indirect Recharge.....	48
Industrial Hemp.....	154
Industrial Water Permits for Agriculture	49

Interregional Research Project #4 (IR-4)	80
Invasive Plants	89
Irrigation	45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 57, 61, 67, 68, 69, 88, 89, 129
Irrigation Districts	47, 50, 55, 129
Irrigation Non-Expansion Area	61

J

Joint Technical Education Districts	145
---	-----

K

Karnal Bunt	116
-------------------	-----

L

Labeling	82, 107
Labeling Of Genetically Modified Foods	106
Labor	132, 134
Labor Availability	132
Labor Needs For Arizona Agriculture	134
Lake Powell	58
Land Use Planning	4
Leadership Training	159
Legal Access	32
Legalized Gambling	97
Legislative Districts	132
Lending Institutions	154
Liaison with Agriculture Commodity Organizations	151
License	141
Lifetime Membership	159
Limited Liability of Irrigation Districts	129
Litigation Fund	158
Littering	141
Livestock Grazing	33, 67, 147
Livestock Health	111
Livestock Inspection for Show Animals	115
Livestock Traceability	112
Livestock Warranties	104
Low-Head Hydro Power	71

M

Mail Delivery	125
Man-Made Lakes and Reservoirs	54
Medfly Trapping	85
Methane Emissions	123
Mexican Gray Wolf	36

Mexico Entry Inspection	143
Milk Pricing	149
Mineral Rights	14
Mobile Communication	124
Mosquito Abatement	86
Mountain Standard Time	116
Multi Species Conservation Plan	41
Multiple Use of Public Lands	17
Multiuse Land Permits	26
Multi-Year Work Permits	133
Municipal Water Transfers	60

N

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	40
National Monument	30, 137
Native American Water	59
Native Plant Removal on State Trust Land	126
Native Plants	126
Native Species Introduction	88
Natural Disasters	127
Natural Resource Conservation Districts	8
NEPA	21, 23, 40, 67
Non-Taxpayer Office Holders	132
Notification of Adjacent Agricultural Use	4
Noxious Weeds	88
NRCS	9, 64

O

Off-Road Vehicles	31
-----------------------------	----

P

Particulate Air Pollution	123
Permits	8, 11, 20, 25, 30, 31, 40, 48, 49, 61, 71, 102, 129, 133, 134, 135, 143
Personal Property Tax	95
Pesticide	73, 83
Pesticide Complaints	83
Pesticides	74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 83, 84, 88, 107, 117, 157, 159
Pesticides	74
Petroleum Refinery	71
Phytosanitary Inspections	85
Plant and Animal Sanitation and Residue Testing	89
Policy Development Committee Reports	161
Political Action Committee	158
Pollution Prevention Program	123

Pornography/Prostitution	129
Possessory Interest Tax	97
Power Marketing Administrations.	70
Prairie Dogs.	130
Prepass.	85
Preservation of Farmland	4
President Expenses.	158
Priority Lien	91
Procedure for Late Resolutions	161
Project CENTRAL	159
Proof of Citizenship.	103
Property Lien Release	118
Property Rights.	10
Pro-rated Commercial Vehicle Fee	143
Pro-rated Insurance	155
Protection of Non-Traditional Crops	82
Pro-Tem Judges.	130
Public Employee Bargaining.	138
Public Funding Of Campaigns.	131
Public Land Access.	31
Public Relations	155, 157
Public Rights of Way	87
Puncture Vine (Bullhead)	89
Punto Colonel Rail Line Through Yuma County	143
Purpose of Farm Bureau	1

R

Ranching for Wildlife	40
Range Management Education.	147
Real Estate Disclosure Policy	5
Recharge	48
Reclaimed Water.	44, 48
Reclaimed Water.	48
Recognition of Equine Industry.	104
Regulatory Compliance Inspections	120
Regulatory Reform.	119
Regulatory Rules and Enforcement	119
Renewable Energy	69
Renewable Water Resources	47
Requirements for Medical License.	146
Research.	147
Reservation Expansion	8
Retail Agriculture.	81
Reward Program.	158
Right to Farm	9
Rights-of-Way.	87

Rights-of-Way	95
Right-to-Work	132

S

Safe Use of Pesticides	84
Safety Awareness Program	160
Sales and Use Tax	96
Salt Cedar Biocontrol Research	87
Sanitary Landfills	117
Satellite and Aerial Images	125
Scale Certification	116
School Districts	145
School Financing	144
School Lunches	147
Screwworm	85
Section 8 Memorandum of Understanding	17
Seed Mediation	116
Severance Taxes	96
Slow Moving Vehicles	141
Small Ag Systems	64
Soil Chemical Tolerance Levels and Clean-Up	84
Sonoran Desert Tortoise	38, 39
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	42
Special Local Needs	78
Specialty Crop Insurance	149
Specialty Crops	155
State Farm Land Leases	27
State Immigration Reform	135
State Income Taxes	97
State Land Leases	27
State of Origin Labeling	82
State Power Line Siting Committee	71
State Property Tax on Real Property	92
State Sovereignty Over Public Lands	30
State Trust Fund	29
State Trust Lands	26, 27
Statewide Office Holder Vacancy	158
Stock Waters	60
Stub Cotton	104
Support for The Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management	102
Surface Water Entitlement	55
Survey Markers	141
Sustainable Agriculture	153
Sweet Orange Scab	87
Synthetic/Imitation Meat Products	107

T

Tax Base Protection	95
Tax Credit Classification	97
Teaching.	146
Tell Ag Story	155
Terrorism.	127
Tort and Insurance Reform.	155
Transportation	138
Transportation of Equine	139
Trespass Laws	13
Trichomoniasis	90
Truck Safety.	143
Truck Weight Limits	143
Trucking Regulation	160
Type I Right.	59

U

U.S. / Mexico Border Security	136
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	19, 24, 36, 39, 67, 130
Unemployment and Welfare Benefits	148
Unemployment Tax	149
Union	138, 143, 144
Union Elections	138
Union Pacific.	144
United States' Sovereignty.	122
Upper Gila Water Issues	58
Urban Conservation	117
USDA.	34, 80, 95, 106
Utilization of Colorado River Allocation	50

V

Veterinary Training	147
Vineyards and Wineries	153
Vocational Agriculture Programs	145

W

Water Committee.	160
Water Conservation During Drought	62
Water Measuring Devices	46
Water Retention Structures.	53
Water Rights	14, 44, 45, 46, 50, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 66
Water Rights for Protected Farm Land	57
water testing	64
Water Transfers.	60
Weather Information.	122

Weather Management	53
Weed and Pest Abatement.	88
Weed Control in Waterways.	89
Weed Resistance.	88
Western Area Power Administration	68
Wide Load Permits.	143
Wild and Scenic Rivers	66
wilderness area	52
Wilderness Corridor	144
Wildfire Management	20
Wildlife Crop Damage.	35
Wildlife Grazing Fee	40
Wildlife Management	32
Wildlife Pest and Predator Control	102
Wildlife Ranching	40
Willcox Groundwater Conservation Area	58
Women in Ag Conference.	160
Work Permits	134, 135
Worker Protection Standard Testing.	78
World Crop Reporting.	152

Y

Yuma ASH Highway	144
----------------------------	-----

Z

Zoning	4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 16
Zoning and Subdivisions Permits	8
Zoning Use By Right	8

Arizona Farm Bureau Federation
“The Voice of Agriculture”

325 South Higley Rd. Suite 210
Gilbert, AZ 85296

(480) 635-3600
Fax (480) 635-3781

www.azfb.org