



Policies adopted by elected voting delegates of the Member County Farm Bureaus to the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation at the Annual Meeting, December 2024, in Gleneden Beach, Oregon.

2025 OFFICERS Angi Bailey Brian Glaser Shane Otley John Zielinski President First Vice President Second Vice President Third Vice President Jacque Duyck Magwood Fourth VP/Women's Chair

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

REGIONAL DIRECTORS	
Matt Wood, Adams	Region 1
Dennis Myhrum	Region 2
Steve Hammond, Diamond	Region 3
Lyndon Kerns, Klamath Falls	Region 4
Wade Flegel, Prineville	Region 5
Mike McCarthy, Hood River	Region 6
Jon Iverson, Woodburn	Region 7
Carol Marie Leuthold, Tillamook	Region 8
Jerry Mann, McMinnville	Region 9
Tim Miller, Siletz	Region 10
Ron Bjork, Eagle Point	Region 11
Kevin Westfall, Broadbent	Region 12
Dan Andersen, Ontario	Region 13
Andy Duyck, Forest Grove	Region 14
Bruce Chapin, Salem	Region 15
Matthew Brady, Azalea	Region 16
Roy Hofer, Canby	YF&R Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
I. EDUCATION	9
II. TAXATION	13
III. LAND USE	25
IV. TRANSPORTATION	45
V. FORESTRY	55
VI. ENVIRONMENT	59
VII. WATER	63
VIII. CHEMICALS	79
IX. FISH & WILDLIFE	89
X. COMMODITIES	104
XI. LABOR	119
XII. ENERGY	131
XIII. PUBLIC AFFAIRS	135
XIV. NATIONAL AFFAIRS	150
INDEX	450

Purpose of Farm Bureau

0.001

The primary purpose of Farm Bureau is to support the continuation of agricultural and related industries, and prosperity for Oregon farmers and ranchers.

Farm Bureau is an independent, nongovernmental, voluntary organization of farm and ranch families united for the purpose of Analyzing their problems and formulation action to achieve educational improvement, economic opportunity and social advancement and, thereby, to promote the national well-being. Farm Bureau is local, statewide, national and international in its scope and influence and is nonpartisan, nonsectarian and non-secret in character.

Farm Bureau Philosophy

5

0.002

We believe in the American family; in self-government; in limitations upon governmental power; in maintenance of equal opportunity; in the right of all individuals to worship as they choose; in separation of church and state; and in freedom of speech, press and peaceful assembly.

Property rights are among the most basic human rights essential to 6 the preservation of individual freedom. We believe in the private competitive enterprise system, and in privately owned farms and ranches managed and operated for the benefit of farmers and ranchers.

We oppose any legislation that erodes the principle of private property 10 rights or the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Individuals have a moral responsibility to help preserve freedom for 12 future generations by active participation in public affairs.

The U.S. Constitution is the basic law of the land. All elected and 13 14 appointed officials shall be expected not to falter from their oath to uphold 15 and protect it from all its enemies. (04) (11) (20)

I. EDUCATION

General Education Statement

1.001

We recognize that education is of vital importance to the welfare of the 2 individual and society. We believe that every reasonable effort should be made to develop the potential of each person. (04)

Basic Education

We recommend the legislature periodically review the basic education 2

As Farm Bureau members, we favor a basic education program that will:

- 1. Give precedence to thorough training in the fundamentals (reading, writing, arithmetic and self discipline), while providing a balanced curriculum needed for present day living, including vocational opportunities.
- 2. Give greater emphasis to moral and spiritual values being taught at home.
 - 3. Give increased emphasis to the teaching of the fundamentals of American republic and citizens' responsibility involvement.
 - 4. Give increased emphasis to the teaching of the fundamentals of free enterprise in our economic system.
- Give increased emphasis to the fact that agriculture is a major contributor to the economic system.
- Present an accurate and realistic view of the care, feeding and use of domestic farm animals.
- 7. Present an accurate and realistic view of land stewardship and the conservation of agricultural lands.
 - 8. We believe drivers education is an essential part of road safety and support drivers education as part of the school curriculum. (13)

24 25 26

30

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

The annual legislative review process mandated by the Oregon Educational Act should require that student performance data be reported 28 in a manner that allows timely evaluation of each of the specific sets of 29 teaching practices that are being initiated in the state.

We continue to support local control, cost effectiveness, and 31 measurable academic goals throughout all publicly funded schools of 32 learning. We support parental involvement over course content and values 33 instruction. We urge the dedication of school funds, resources and 34 personnel to attain the highest level of academic achievement by people, 35 including vocational training.

The use of a 12-month school should be at the option of the local school district.

We believe local districts should have the option of providing kindergarten, lunch programs, sports or other school activities outside of the basic requirements for education.

Teacher Agricultural Education

1.003

We support the accurate presentation of the agricultural industry in Oregon and beyond. Since a large part of Oregon's economy is agriculture based, teachers should present the factual information on Oregon's agricultural industry and disseminate it to their students.

All K-12 teachers should be required as a part of their continuing 6 education to take a course on the role that agriculture and the natural 7 resource industry plays in the wellbeing of the citizens and economy of 8 Oregon.

Approved courses are those sponsored by agriculture and/or natural resource associations and accredited by the state system of higher education, such as the Summer Agriculture Institute. (01), (04), (06)

Elementary School Agricultural Education 1.104

We support the Oregon Department of Education creating a requirement that all school districts include at least one unit on agriculture as part of their K-5 educational curriculum to promote agriculture literacy. 4 (09)

College Terms

1.100

In order to provide students with the opportunity to earn money for school expenses and provide needed farm labor, we favor the quarterly system in Northwest colleges and universities.

Community Colleges and Higher Education 1.110

We urge continued emphasis of the community college program of vocational, technical academic and/or adult training as the need is determined by the local area. We ask that the community colleges place more emphasis on technical training according to the needs of the local community.

We support election rather than appointment for members of the State Board of Higher Education. Members should be elected on a nonpartisan basis by districts.

9 We recommend that out of state students pay the full cost of their 10 education in Oregon. (05)

Oregon State University

1.120

We strongly support adequate legislative funding for the Oregon State
 University College of Agricultural Sciences, College of Forestry and
 College of Veterinary Medicine.

We strongly support OSUs statewide public service programs of the Agricultural Experiment Stations, the Extension Service and the Forestry Research Lab.

We support the re-establishment of the Department of Entomology at OSU, or one to be established in cooperation with another department at OSU.

To assure that the needs of production agriculture in Oregon are met we urge the OSU College of Agriculture to enact a hiring policy for all professors that provides for continual 12-month salaried appointments. (04), (05), (07), (08)

Policy No. 1.130, Internship Program, was deleted in 2004 ROTC 1.140

We support the continuation of the ROTC programs on university and college campuses.

Teacher Continuing Education 1.200

Emphasis should be placed on teacher training through participation in workshops and programs which enhance a teachers' teaching ability. (06)

Sabbaticals 1.210

The university system should ensure that teaching, research and other services provided by a university professor or extension agent on sabbatical are continued during their absence. (04)

Teacher Tenure 1.220

We support the creation of a more meaningful teacher evaluation system. (04)

Career and Technical Education 1.300

1 We support the concept and continued emphasis of career and 2 technical education in Oregon Public Schools.

We believe instructional assistance from the community is a resource that should be utilized for career and technical education, instruction and program evaluation. We support certification of qualified persons to teach career and technical courses. (18)

Policy No. 1.305, English Language Courses, was deleted in 2008

Student Work Experience 1.310

We strongly support work experience and internship programs on and off campus. We are strongly opposed to any rules or limitations that damage the opportunities of students to safely participate in work experience and internship programs. (04)

Local Involvement

1.400

We urge county Farm Bureaus to initiate programs which will result in increased familiarity and cooperation with our schools through year-round interest, regular attendance at school board and budget meetings, and attendance at all times to the problems of education at state and local levels.

We recommend that schools use lay membership advisory committees to support and promote educational decisions and practices. 8 (04)

School District Reorganization

1.410

We favor continued effort and encouragement towards voluntary reorganization which will result in more effective and efficient education programs.

We are unalterably opposed to any form of compulsory school district reorganization or unification which overrides the wishes of the majority of voters in each district concerned.

We strongly support the right of any existing school district, by majority vote, to nullify a forced consolidation of their district into a unified district.

Charter Schools

1.450

1 We support charter schools and encourage their utilization in all 2 school districts. (07), (09)

Educational Vouchers

1.455

We support education vouchers and encourage their utilization in all school districts. (11)

School District Transportation Fee

1.500

We oppose allowing a school district to charge parents of students for transportation cost for primary and secondary education.

Policy No. 1.510, was moved to Policy No 2.950 in 2004

Education Service Districts

1.600

We oppose any forced consolidation of Education Service Districts by the Oregon Education Department and/or the legislature. (09)

II. TAXATION

General Taxation Statement

2.001

The state tax structure must be built on a sound basis for the general 2 benefit of business and for encouraging individual enterprise.

In general, property taxes should be used to finance property related 4 services and a tax based on a person's ability to pay should be used to finance services that are for the general benefit of society. (00)

We believe that a supermajority should be the standard for all tax 7 increases and structural changes that result in a net increase in revenue 8 generation. (17)

Value Added Tax

1

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2.075

We are opposed to a value added tax.

2.100 Sales Tax

We support the principle of repealing the federal income tax and 2 replacing it with a retail sales and use tax, such as the FairTax (HR25 2006), that is revenue neutral, broad based, holds individuals and families harmless from the tax at 100 percent of the poverty level, and eliminates 5 capital gains tax, estate tax, all business expenses and real and personal property taxes.

We do not support a state sales tax unless it also repeals the state 8 income tax and mirrors the federal sales tax proposed in (HR 25 2006). 9 Any rate increase must require a two-thirds majority of both legislative 10 chambers. Any stand-alone Oregon state sales tax must have the following provisions.

- 1. The rate and agricultural exemptions are established in the constitution.
- 2. Prescription drugs, food purchased for home preparation, livestock, feed, seed, pesticides, processing or cleaning of agricultural products, fees for agricultural business services performed, farm equipment, parts and repairs for farm equipment and any item that is consumed or used in the production of, or becomes a part of, an agricultural product shall be constitutionally exempt from the tax.
- 3. No county, city, district or other municipal corporation or political subdivision may impose a general retail sales-and-use tax.

23 A listing of these provisions does not constitute an endorsement of a 24 state sales-and-use tax. (04), (06), (07)

Policy 2.205, Prison Property Tax, was deleted in 2007

Government and Other Ownership Property Taxes 2.209

Profit or non-profit land trusts, federal, state or local government or other sovereign nations owning land for purposes other than farming in an agriculture or a forest use zone should be required to pay, to the county tax collector, the applicable tax penalty and pay annually an amount in lieu of and equal to the property taxes that would have been levied if the property were not in a resource zone.

While the land remains in farming, the owners of such land should be required to pay an amount in lieu of taxes at its farm use value. (00), (07)

Homestead Exemptions

2.210

Homestead exemptions for property tax relief must be constitutionally funded by State General Funds at a level of 100% and only apply to levies assessed by districts providing public education. (00)

Tax Exemption-Personal Property 2.220

All farm personal property should be included in the personal property tax exemption. The definition of farm personal property should include all personal property and equipment used in on-farm processing facilities.

We believe underground irrigation installations should, for assessment purposes, be treated the same as above ground irrigation pipe. (00)

Tax Exemption-Real Property

2.225

There should be a tax incentive to encourage the joining of any two adjoining parcels, such as a reduced tax rate for some period. Such an incentive could be a temporary property tax reduction granted on the smaller of any two adjoining parcels, when one or more of which are smaller than the minimum lot size, which are voluntarily combined by amending the legal description to join both parcels. (10)

Tax Exemption-Condemnation

2.227

When private property is taken under the threat of eminent domain for public benefit, all compensation received from an easement, lease, or sale to any public, private, or government entity should be exempt from state and federal income and capital gains taxes. (06)

Property Tax Administration

2.230

We favor administering the property tax assessment law at the county level. (00)

Appeals on Assessment of Appraisals 2.240

We oppose any fee for appealing an appraisal and/or assessment to the County Board of Property Tax Appeals. (04)

Farm Use Assessment Principles

2.250

Land in EFU zones should be assessed based on its ability to produce farm income from crops and livestock typically grown in the area. All land in EFU zones should be assessed at farm use value except land that is being used for a non-farm use.

We believe the appraisal of timberland for all tax purposes should be 6 based on the ability of the land to produce timber. (00), (01)

Farm Building Assessed Values

1

9

12

17

22

28

The assessed value of farm buildings and farm dwellings should 2 reflect exclusively the value of the building for farm use and not a value based on purchases of structures not located in farm zones.

Farm Use Assessment Criteria Land 2.260

We believe current employment of land for farm use should include 2 any land enrolled in a government related farm program.

3 The appraisal of agricultural and timber land for property tax purposes 4 should be based on the typical income from land used for farm or forest production.

To determine the correct appraisal of farmland, the weighted average use of a class of land for at least five years should be the criteria on which values are based.

Farmland should be appraised for farm use valuation without regard 10 to individual enterprise incomes. No land should be assigned a farm use 11 value higher than the farm use value of the best soil class in the county.

Farm use land in EFU zones left idle on a temporary basis due to 13 economic conditions or the operator's ill health, should continue to be 14 assessed at farm use value.

All lands in EFU zones, except those being used for a use other than 16 farm use should be assessed at farm use value.

Homesites physically situated in conjunction with farm use not located 18 in an EFU zone should be included in the definition of farm use when either 19 gross income

20 from agriculture exceeds \$20,000 per year or half the adjusted gross 21 income is derived from agricultural production.

The maximum value of qualifying homesites in EFU zones should be 23 the average per acre market value of the bare land comprising the parcel 24 or contiguous acres in which the homesite is located, plus a maximum of 25 \$4,000 or the depreciated replacement cost of land improvements 26 necessary to provide the domestic water supply and septic system, 27 whichever is least.

All homesites in an EFU zone containing an owner occupant and any 29 homesite where the owner can show involvement of the occupant in the 30 agricultural operation, should be deemed to be "customarily provided in 31 conjunction with farm use" for property assessment purposes.

Parcels containing more than one homesite that are subsequently disqualified from special assessment should not be subject to an additional tax liability, unless the disqualification is in conjunction with a parcel separation.

No value should be added for an aesthetic view, lawn or shrubs, access to roads, access to a communication system or an energy source. Livestock

The purchase price of livestock should be subtracted from the gross income when computing the formula to determine if land outside of an EFU zone qualifies for farm use assessment, except in the case of livestock which has been held on the farm unit for four months or longer, or the grazing season, whichever is least.

The breeding, boarding and training of horses for profit or the feeding, breeding and management of horses primarily for profit by sale or use should be defined as a farm use for taxation purposes. Horses should be defined as livestock for the purpose of property taxation.

Roads

- 1 We believe private farm and timber roads should be assessed only as
- 2 bare land and not as improvements to the land.

Agricultural Nurseries

- 1 Agricultural nurseries should be specifically included in the statutes
- 2 as a Farm Use.

Recreation

- 1 Land which meets the qualification for farm use assessment which is
- 2 also used for recreational purposes either by voluntary consent or for a fee
- 3 should not be disqualified from farm use assessment.
- 4 Non-EFU Land Income Test
- 5 One hundred percent of the value of farm products produced on a
- 6 parcel and used for personal use should be counted when computing the
- 7 income test for a parcel outside the EFU zone attempting to qualify for
- 8 farm use assessment.

Government Actions

- 1 Valuations for property taxes should reflect practices that were
- 2 implemented because of governmental actions. These practices may
- 3 include environmental restrictions such as mandated environmental
- 4 practices implemented on private property, wetlands, stream/riparian
- 5 habitat, and all endangered species habitat, all of which may decrease
- 6 production capabilities and/or property value for agriculture use. These
- 7 practices should reflect appropriate decreases of assessed values for
- 8 property tax purposes.

Exemptions

1 Lands in farm use should be exempt from assessments and taxes

2 for sewers, domestic water, street improvements and sidewalks.

Disqualification

We support clarifying legislation setting forth a time frame and a better definition for disqualifying land from farm use assessment.

We oppose the use of mail surveys by County Assessors to determine whether the land in EFU zones qualifies for farm use special assessment.

Value Adjustments

- 1 Adjustment of January 1 assessed values should be made when real
- 2 or personal property is damaged or destroyed by acts of God. (00), (02),

3 (05

3

Tax Court 2.270

1 In the event of a disagreement on farm use valuation between the

- 2 assessor and the Board of Review, the matter should go directly to the tax
- 3 court for final determination. When a private citizen prevails in a contested
- 4 property tax case, the county government should be obligated for the
- 5 taxpayer's legal costs through the Department of Revenue hearing level
- and the state should be liable for the legal costs when the taxpayer prevails
- 7 in succeeding higher courts. In matters brought before the Oregon Tax
- 8 Court by an individual property owner, we believe that the burden of proof
- 9 should be on the County Assessor or Department of Revenue.

Double Majority

2.271

We support the "double majority" voting requirement for property tax measures. We believe at least 50 percent of the local voting body should participate in local property tax decisions. We oppose any change to this rule that would eliminate or decrease the "double majority." (07)

Local District Property Taxes

2.275

The Oregon Constitution should be amended to repeal the \$10 tax rate limitation on taxing districts, other than schools, and each district with the authority to levy property taxes should be given a TAX BASE for operating costs equal to the average of the last two years. The allowable tax base increase should be set at 2%. The district should be authorized to ask the voters, one time annually, to increase or decrease the tax base, approve a serial levy for special projects or emergencies, or ask for capital construction levies.

We recommend that all levy elections be held not more than twice a year. If the levy is rejected at the first election, a means should be provided so voters in the district may petition for a special vote on special items in the budget at the same time the levy is resubmitted. If a levy fails twice, the district should revert to the previous year's levy or less.

We recommend that all elections that occur within a three-month period be consolidated into one election time and place.

We support legislation which would require that the calculation of a property tax limit be based on the statutory provisions for determining the assessed value of property. (00), (07) Tax Penalties 2.280

We support ten years as the number of years a tax penalty and interest must be paid when farm lands receiving farm use assessment are changed to a non-farm use.

There should be no tax penalty for temporarily changing a homesite use from one in conjunction with farm use to one not in conjunction with farm use unless the change involves a parcel separation. (05), (07)

Port Bonds 2.290

We oppose Port Districts selling tax free bonds to finance business projects on private property.

User Fees 2.300

Fees imposed or increased by state agencies should only be used as a resource to the agency assessing the fee. Government operations funded by fees should directly benefit those paying the fee. (00)

System Development Charges 2.330

We support the use of system development charges as an important tool for sharing the cost of applicable infrastructure. We strongly oppose the use of system development charges for agricultural and forestry activities in resource zones. (18)

Construction Tax Exemption 2.340

We support an exemption from construction taxes on agriculture buildings when such taxes are authorized by school districts for capital construction projects. (07)

Mass Transit 2.350

We support an agricultural exemption from all mass transit and transportation district taxes. Non-highway fuel uses should be exempt from fuel taxes levied by mass transit districts.

Budgets-Local Government 2.400

We favor retaining the portion of the local budget law that requires publication of municipal corporations' budgets in a newspaper of general circulation, and all features of the local budget that inform and protect the taxpayer.

We support legislation allowing local government to retain control of all salaries subject to the local budget law.

Because of the difficulty of comparing one year's budget to the next, we support line item budgeting. Salaries should be determined before budgets are adopted. (00), (04)

Policy No. 2.410, Budget Expenditure Limitation Local, was deleted in 2004

Budget-State

2.430

The state budget should reflect a responsible fiscal attitude with an emphasis on minimizing unnecessary or nonproductive programs and strengthening those programs which will enhance the economics of the state. (00)

Reserve Fund

2.450

We support the establishment of a constitutional Reserve Fund of not more than 15 percent of the current General Fund budget. The funds should come from any excess funds after providing for the current budget.

The legislature should not use the money from the Reserve Fund unless the actual revenue is more than 10 percent less than the current budget. In no case should the legislature be allowed to use more than 50 percent of the dedicated fund in one biennium. A three-fifths vote of both chambers should be required to access the Reserve Fund. (03)

State Income Tax

2.500

We recommend maintaining uniformity between the state income tax code and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax code.

We believe any changes in the Oregon tax code made by the legislature in response to a change of the IRS code should have a revenue neutral effect. A revenue neutral effect should be accomplished by adjusting the state tax rates on an equal proportional basis. (05)

Fee Increases

2 510

Any increase in state fees should require approval of the state legislature. Increases determined by the Emergency Board should be temporary until voted on at the next legislative session. All state fee increases should require a two thirds majority vote to pass. (00)

Minimum Corporate Tax

2.515

The minimum corporate tax should be abolished. We are opposed to any tax based on gross income. No one should be required to pay an income-related tax when there is no net income. (07)

Capital Gains Tax

2 520

We oppose capital gains taxes. If considered, we support a capital gains rule that would adjust the capital gains for inflation from the date of ownership change for real or personal property and we support the establishment of a capital gain tax rate that is 50 percent of the maximum personal tax rate or 4.5 percent, whichever is the lesser. (3), (4), (11)

We strongly oppose state and federal income taxes on unrealized capital gains. (Refer to AFBF, 21).

Federal Capital Gains Tax

2.521

We support eliminating the federal \$3,000 cap when claiming a loss of capital gains on a federal tax return. (06), (07)

Two Percent Kicker Program

2.530

We support the Oregon Two Percent Kicker Program for corporations and individuals. We support changing the formula for calculating the refund of the 2% kicker money so that it is a refund based on the overpayment of taxes which actually occurred during the qualifying biennium. The kicker should be returned as a refund on the next year's tax return. (06)

Indexing

We favor indexing of the Oregon State Income Tax dollar brackets for inflation. (04)

Estimated Tax 2.550

A taxpayer should not be liable for the estimated tax payment when the taxpayer's income cannot be reasonably predicted.

Tax on Interest Savings

2.560

2.540

The first \$1,000 of all interest and/or dividends received annually should be free of Federal and State Income Taxes. (05)

1099 Reporting

2.570

The minimum amount required to be reported on the 1099 form should be raised to \$2,000 and indexed for inflation. (07)

Inheritance Taxes

6 7

9

10

2.600

We support the phase out and eventual abolishment of all state and federal gift, inheritance, and estate taxes.

Until such time as abolishment occurs, we support indexing exemption levels for inflation. We also support connecting the state inheritance tax law to the federal code if the federal code includes:

- An exemption in 2010 dollars equal to or greater than \$5 million for each spouse;
- 8 2. A permanent rate, that is not set to sunset or on a schedule;
 - 3. A stepped-up basis; and
 - Indexed for inflation.
- The value of all farm land for inheritance tax purposes should be based on its farm use value.
- Timber should be exempt from estate, inheritance and gift taxes, recognizing that timber will not be harvested by each generation.

Valuations for estate taxes should reflect practices that were implemented because of governmental actions. These practices may include environmental restrictions such as mandated environmental practices implemented on private property, wetlands, stream/riparian habitat, and Spotted Owl habitat, all of which may decrease production capabilities and/or property value for agriculture use.

We believe that the continuity of the operation of family farms is desirable and important. The effect of estate taxes should not adversely impact the ability to transfer family farms from generation to generation. (00), (04), (05), (06), (07), (10)

Social Security Taxes

2.700

Self-employed persons should be able to deduct the employer's share of their Social Security taxes as an expense.

We oppose means testing (reducing benefits for high income wage earners) as a way to keep the Social Security system solvent.

The social security tax should be a dedicated fund, and used only for the purpose for which it is collected.

Woodland Assessments

2.800

Lands in forest or small woodlands designations and managed in accordance with the state Forest Practices Act should be assessed in accordance with their productive value. Homesites up to one acre, which are an integral part of these lands, should be assessed on the same principle as is practiced on EFU designated lands.

Timber Taxes 2.810

We support abolishment of the severance tax for those who choose to pay their property tax responsibility through property taxes rather than the severance tax.

The value of small tracts of timber land should not be higher than the farm use value of comparable classes of farm land.

6 Any taxes on timber should be for services related to protection, 7 reforestation, fire protection and management of timber and should only

8 be used for such service. (00)

4

5

6 7

Policy No. 2.820, Small Tracts Option Tax, was deleted in 2004.

Rural Broadband 2.850

- Communication Services should be available at a reasonable cost to all people. We support:
 - Increasing high speed internet access in unserved rural areas through any source, including wireless, by using a combination of tax incentives, grants and/or regulations. Networks should meet or exceed the FCC's definition for broadband.
 - The continuation of the Universal Service Fund (USF) to maintain affordable communication services in rural Oregon. (18)

Pollution Control Tax Credits

2.900

- 1 We support tax credits for agricultural producers for construction,
- 2 remodeling, purchasing, or leasing of facilities or equipment for air or water
- 3 pollution control. An option of credit on income taxes or property taxes
- 4 should be available.
- 5 We recommend that capital investment made in equipment or facilities
- 6 that reduce or eliminate nonpoint source pollution be eligible for Oregon
- 7 Pollution Control Tax Credit Certification by the Oregon Environmental
- 8 Quality Commission.

Energy Tax Credits

2.920

- 1 We support tax credits and similar tax incentives to promote private
- 2 development of new energy sources.

School Finance

2.950

- 1 If additional (replacement) revenue is necessary to fund the state's
- 2 increased role in funding schools, then that additional revenue should
- 3 come from an increase in the income tax rate, and such revenue must be
- 4 used only for financing schools.
- 5 Community colleges should be funded on the same basis as other
- 6 institutions of higher education.

Urban Renewal Districts

2.955

- 1 Urban renewal districts are not to be used on farm/agricultural lands
- 2 that are outside a UGB. Any new urban renewal districts within a city will
- 3 need approval by a vote of the people whose taxes will be affected by
- 4 designation of an urban renewal district. Purposed districts shall have a
- 5 sunset date. (19)

Intent to Make a Profit

2.960

- 1 We support the "hobby loss rule" of 26 CFR Section 1.182-2 to ensure
- 2 that only individuals operating bona fide farms or ranches receive
- 3 deductions on their income taxes from losses incurred in the course of
- 4 business.
- 5 We oppose the Internal Revenue Service and Oregon Department of
- 6 Revenue interpreting the rule in a capricious manner. Therefore, the IRS
- 7 and the Department of Revenue should not use the following criteria to
- 8 make a finding that an individual is not farming for profit:
- 9 1 Choosing crops, livestock, or practices for reasons other than
- 10 2 maximizing profit;
- 11 3 Lack of prior expertise in running a farm or ranch;
- 12 4 Being retired from another career outside of agriculture;
- 13 5 Operating with a good-faith belief that land will appreciate in value;
- 14 6 Having a prior career or additional career unrelated to production
- 15 agriculture:
- 16 7 Losses in 9 or less in the first 10 operating years, and 5 or less
- 17 out of 7 subsequently;

- 18 8 Inability to recover all losses incurred over the course of business;
- 19 9 Outside income of the individual, including but not limited to
- 20 pension, social security, or spousal income;
- 21 10 Deriving pleasure from the process of farming, and the lifestyle
- 22 associated with it. (19)

Corporate Activities Tax

2.965

- 1 We are opposed to the Corporate Activity Tax (CAT) or other gross
- 2 receipt-based taxes being applied in Oregon. (19) We support agricultural
- 3 businesses being exempt from reporting quarterly statements under the
- 4 Corporate Activities Tax. If a farmer or rancher sells commodities to a
- 5 broker, wholesaler, or processor, they should be required to be provided
- a resale certificate to accurately determine their Oregon tax liability. (20)
- 7 We support the repeal of the Corporate Activities Tax. (22)

Mortgage Interest Deduction

2.970

- 1 We oppose removal of the mortgage interest deduction at the
- 2 state and federal level. (Refer to AFBF) (22)

Payroll Taxes

2.980

- 1 We oppose the creation of new payroll taxes to fund new state
- 2 mandates because increased payroll taxes make ag employers less
- 3 competitive in the global market.
- 4 The entirety of any new payroll tax burden should be on the
- 5 employee. (22)

III. LAND USE

Preamble to Land Use Policies

3.000

- It is important to recognize that the protection of land use for
- agriculture requires a series of policies, and that each of these policies is 2
- 3 inter-related.
- 4 The policies included in this section must be interpreted as pieces of
- 5 a whole, not applied independently. (00)
- We recognize the competing pressures on Oregon's land use system,
- 7 and our land use policies in this section are intended to protect Oregon's
- agricultural land, however, OFB remains committed to being a part of any
- conversation related to changes that will affect our land use system.

Land Use Planning

We support the principle of land use planning for the purpose of 2 protecting the resources, and the agricultural environment, and 3 infrastructure needed for farmers and ranchers to produce and/or market

- 4 food and fiber for current and future generations in a profitable
- 5 manner. We are philosophically opposed to efforts to remove
- economically productive farm and forest land from farm or forest zones.
- We are in favor of agricultural utilization of land by individual owners 8 who live on or lease their property.

Definition of Agricultural Land

3.015

Land that should be protected under Goal 3 includes all parcels of 2 predominantly tillable land, whether irrigated or non-irrigated land, grazing 3 land and rangeland necessary to protect the agricultural environment and 4 infrastructure needed for farmers and ranchers to produce food and fiber 5 in an effective manner, and other land necessary to permit farm practices 6 in the area. These lands should be zoned EFU.

OFBF does not support redefining agricultural land and forest lands 8 by counties based on factors other than the statewide criteria identified in 9 Goal 3 and Goal 4. While different regions of the state may have varying 10 levels of non-farm development pressure, a standard definition of 11 agricultural land and forestlands under Goal 3 and Goal 4 is key to 12 maintaining the agricultural land base and to minimizing conflicts from non-13 farm uses.

Local governments should be encouraged to use the Land Evaluation 15 and Site Assessment (LESA) system developed by the Soil Water and 16 Conservation Society, as a tool to determine relative value of parcels of 17 land for agricultural use. (00)

Profitability should not be considered for the purposes of defining 19 'agricultural land' subject to the goal. (09), (11)

14

We support state goals and guidelines combined with county zoning.

We believe it is the responsibility of local governments to formulate and amend their own land use plan within the state goals and guidelines. We favor community effort with landowner participation to develop an orderly plan of the area and its resources and the use of zoning to implement the plan.

The LCDC Goals and Guidelines and administrative rules must be subject to legislative authority and must ensure that farmers and ranchers can use all accepted farming practices to their best economic advantage on land limited to and protected for farming under Goal 3.

We believe all lands, including state and federal lands, should be subject to all provisions of local land use ordinances. (05)

Rural Community Stability Plans

3.022

We believe that each county should prepare a twenty-year land plan for sustaining its agricultural economy.

The plan should include a statement of resources needed and available to complete the inventories, and a method for reporting on implementation of the plan and enforcement of the plan by the county. (08)

Farmland Oversight Authority

3.024

The Oregon Department of Agriculture should be given the authority to oversee any and all actions of agencies or interactions between state agencies that may impact the use of agricultural land, including decisions by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development and county land use planning. (00), (04), (05)

LUBA Appeals

3.025

1 The county government should be required to defend its local land use 2 decisions that are appealed to LUBA.

Right to Farm

3.030

Right to Farm is an essential part of farm and forest zoning. Laws protecting all agricultural and forestry producers from legal and/or legislative actions challenging agriculture and forestry activities that are a generally accepted, reasonable and prudent method for the operation of the farm to obtain a profit in resource zones are a necessary provision that must be preserved and strengthened. (06), (08), (16)

It is the responsibility of the parcel owner who has the use that requires a buffer from agricultural practices/uses to supply the required buffer from those uses on their parcel.

Guard Dogs Under Right to Farm

3.031

Guard dogs that bark to protect property need to be protected under the Right to Farm laws.

Private Property Rights

3.033

Private ownership of real property is the foundation of our economic

system. As such, it is in the best interest of the people of the State of Oregon to
ensure that statutes and regulations are applied to private property in the least
restrictive manner possible. It is in the best interest of the State of Oregon to
maximize the incentive and cooperative programs in accomplishing statewide
land use policies.

Before any private land can be considered for public use or benefit, the property owner must be notified by registered letter 60 days prior to the beginning of the study.

The property owner should be notified by all parties involved including 11 individuals, private groups, organizations, elected officials and government 12 agencies.

We support legislation for full restitution to land owners for any loss of the 14 use or taking of their lands for public purpose.

No biodiversity or ecosystem shall be altered on private property without the property owner's permission and just compensation as determined by the 17 property owner. (06)

Historic/Cultural Designations

3.034

We oppose designating as historic districts or traditional cultural properties lands in agriculture & forest zones including irrigation supply and drainage infrastructure in all zones. We believe that owners of buildings or land which have been earmarked for historic designation should continue to have the right to "refuse to consent to any form of historic property designation at any point during the designation process. Such refusal to consent shall remove the property from any form of consideration for historic property designation under ORS 358.480."

National and State regulations should, through rulemaking, allow 10 trustees of lands held in "trust" to opt out as owner/owners along with 11 individuals, partnerships, corporations, or public agencies holding fee simple 12 title to property. If an individual wants to designate a specific site on their 13 property as historic, we support their ability to do so as long as it goes 14 through a process ensuring no impacts to neighboring landowners. SHPO 15 should be required to reach out to property owners who are directly affected 16 by any historic designation. We also believe the current 45-day period for 17 recommendation and comment is too short of time frame for outreach and 18 should be expanded to 90 days.

When the National Parks Service receives objections from either the 20 majority of landowners or owners of the majority of the land area of the 21 designated historic district, the historic listing will not proceed.

We support decoupling the historic designation process at the state level 23 with the "Goal 5" resource protection process such that designation of 24 historic properties does not automatically entitle the resource to Goal 5 25 protections under Oregon's land use laws.

Mandated Public Access

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1

2

3

12

3.040

We oppose landowners being forced to allow public access onto their land. However, if a landowner is mandated to allow an agency or the general public the use of his titled and taxed property, he should be fully compensated for that use.

Further, should harm occur the to landowner, friends/family/guests, livestock, structures or appurtenances, crops, vegetation or any other private holdings, the law should require the mandating agency to compensate the landowner in full for such damage, including attorney fees and court costs.

Landowners should bear no liability for harm that might occur to the public as a result of mandated access to, or use of, their land. (00), (03),

Bike/Multi Use Paths in Farm or Forest Zones 3.043

We oppose the condemnation of farm and forest lands for bike/multi use paths. Any paths sited in farm or forest zones need to meet the farm impacts test and should not be sited within the federal or state application exclusion zones for pesticide use. (See also Rails to Trails 4.420) (19)

Liability Exemption for Public Access 3.045

1 We support liability exemptions for landowners who have authorized 2 and/or unauthorized recreation occurring on their land including, but not

3 limited to, hunting, fishing, swimming, boating, camping, picnicking, hiking,

outdoor and agricultural educational activities, waterskiing, winter sports,

viewing or enjoying historical archaeological, scenic or scientific sites,

6 volunteering for any public purpose project, aviation and agritourism. (14)

Condemnation or Acquisition of Land by Public or Private Utilities 3.055

Full public hearings should be held before private lands are taken by 2 public entities in order to assess the effect on the local tax base and on 3 the interest of the landholders of the area.

Land acquisitions should be approved by the local governing body. 5 Public entities should be required to make payments in lieu of taxes equal to the real and personal taxes paid by the previous owner with future payments based on the value or use of the property at the local tax rates.

We are strongly opposed to entities using the eminent domain law to 9 condemn privately owned property for the purpose of transferring 10 ownership for private economic development that will have only minimal 11 incidental benefits to the public. We are not opposed to voluntary sale.

When public entities purchase land that is a part of a sponsoring or 13 servicing district, the public entity should continue to pay a share of the 14 capital retirement and the operation and maintenance charges equivalent 15 to that which the landowner would have paid had it remained in private 16 ownership, or the public entity should pay a lump sum equal to the 17 capitalized amount of obligation based on the terms of the district's charter.

18 We support legislation for full restitution to land owners for any loss of 19 the use or taking of their lands for a public purpose.

Owners of property subject to damage from action by public entities, 21 utilities or individuals, should be compensated.

Upon foreclosure of a farm or ranch, the foreclosed upon party should 23 have the right to repurchase that property in its entirety, without loss of any 24 portion thereof, such as wetland areas or subsurface rights.

25 We believe the power of condemnation by local municipalities, 26 counties, and other government entities, whether it be land or personal 27 property, should not extend beyond their own jurisdictional boundaries. 28 We oppose the purchase of resource lands outside of urban growth 29 boundaries for public ownership.

30 We oppose using the establishment of Urban Renewal Districts as an 31 easier path to eminent domain. The establishment of Urban Renewal 32 Districts should only occur inside the city limits within the Urban Growth 33 Boundary and should be prohibited in all other parts of a city's Urban 34 Growth boundary or urban reserve areas. (05), (06), (07)

DLCD Staffing East of the Cascades

20

22

1

We support the allocation of adequate DLCD staff for Eastern Oregon 2 counties. (03)

LCDC Goals and Guidelines 3.110

Agricultural practices conducted on land regulated under Goal 3 or 2 Goal 4 should be deemed to not be a conflict with any other land use goal. 3 Specifically, Goal 5 must not be used to restrict the production activities 4 on land regulated under Goal 3 or 4. We believe that since aggregate is a 5 Goal 5 resource that is consumed as a result of its "protection" under Goal 6 5, aggregate should be removed from the designation as a Goal 5 7 resource.

Until the time it is removed from Goal 5, aggregate removal should 9 remain a conditional use. (07)

LCDC Commission 3.120

Oregon statute should provide that at least one LCDC commissioner 2 position will be a farmer or retired farmer currently involved in agriculture 3 in some capacity.

Because of the complexity of land use planning laws, we recommend 5 that all persons appointed to the Land Conservation & Development Commission receive a thorough annual training in agricultural land use planning issues and the state's land use planning history and the laws and 8 rules as they exist. (08)

Restructure of LCDC 3.180

We support restructuring of LCDC so that it better represents all areas 2 of the state and the agriculture industry. Such restructuring may include 3 regionalization. (05)

High Value Farmland

3.200

The definition of High-value farmland in the ORS should be used in conjunction with the provisions for farm dwellings, aggregate removal and Lot of Record.

It is our position that there is no need for a definition of high-value farmland for the purpose of general land use planning when the term "agricultural land" is correctly defined (Policy No. 3.015). All land in an EFU zone is equally important to the preservation of the agricultural community which makes up the zone. (00)

Minimum Lot Sizes

3.410

- 1 Each county comprehensive plan should be required to establish
- 2 minimum lot sizes appropriate for various areas of that county that would
- 3 protect the agricultural environment and infrastructure needed for farmers
- 4 and ranchers. A .95 factor should be applied to minimum lot sizes for historic inaccuracies.
- 6 For counties with or considering lower minimum lot sizes in an
- 7 exclusive farm use or mixed farm-forest zone, analysis for designating
- lands for non-agricultural use should first consider the impact to existing
- 9 agricultural operations in the area. (00) (09)

Farm Dwellings

3.500

We support a menu approach using three options to determine when an initial dwelling is provided in conjunction with farm use. Such dwellings should be allowed on any tract or tracts of land under the same ownership and deed restrictions should be imposed on the tract or tracts that were used to qualify the initial farm dwelling. The dwelling applicant must be the owner of the tract or tracts of land. The first option is an acreage test of 320 acres or more of zoned rangeland or 160 acres of other land. A second option is a two-year gross annual income history test by the operator of \$80,000 on high value farmland or \$40,000 on any other land. A third option for non-high-value farmland only is a "potential gross sales test" that evaluates the farm size and income of all farm operations that are capable of grossing more than \$10,000 annually, which have parcels located wholly or partially within one mile of the tract of the dwelling applicant.

We support a change in the dwelling criteria that would allow, at the time of application, an initial farm dwelling if both the applicant and the parcel can show a farm income history that meets or exceeds the applicable farm dwelling income test.

We believe that before a non-farm dwelling can be sited in an EFU zone with a Goal 3 exception zone change, the county must make sure the applicant and county have tried to get the dwelling in conjunction with the farm. (00), (01), (09)

Additional Farm Dwellings

3.510

Additional dwellings on the same parcel as the initial dwelling, for

2 persons with significant involvement in the farm or ranch operation, should 3 be allowed as needed.

Additional dwellings in the same farm ownership, when located on a 5 noncontiquous parcel that is smaller than the minimum lot size and provided in conjunction with farm use, should be manufactured dwellings. These should be subject to annual review and removal when no longer provided in conjunction with farm use. (00)

Additional dwellings located on farm parcels in an EFU zone should 10 contain a deed restriction that the dwelling is not allowed to be partitioned 11 from the parent parcel. (17)

Farm Labor Housing

3.515

Seasonal, temporary or migrant farm labor housing should be a 2 permitted use in an EFU zone. All farm labor housing shall be operated by 3 a person or business directly engaged in production agriculture/timber. We 4 oppose operation or use of seasonal, temporary, or migrant farm worker 5 housing in an EFU zone by any other type of business or organization. 6 (07) (22)

Replacement Dwellings

2

7

3.545

When an existing dwelling in an EFU zone is removed, destroyed, or damaged, the owner of the parcel should be eligible for a replacement dwelling permit without an expiration date.

The holder of this permit should be allowed to replace the dwelling at their discretion without meeting additional land use criteria. The dwelling should be eligible for replacement if the owner can provide evidence that a building permit was issued for the dwelling, or the dwelling has been taxed as a dwelling by the County.

Non Farm Dwellings

3.550

We oppose the establishment of more non farm dwellings in EFU 2 zones on agricultural land as defined by OFBF policy. It is our position that 3 because land has been zoned as EFU for the exclusive purpose of 4 agricultural production, all dwellings established in that zone should be 5 farm dwellings. Statutes referring to or providing for non farm dwellings 6 should be repealed. Existing dwellings in EFU zones not provided in conjunction with farm use should be identified as a non-conforming use.

Non-farm dwellings and associated development such as roads and 9 accessory buildings should be sited on a lot or parcel where it will have 10 the least impact on farming practices. (08),

Lot-of-Record 3.575

A sunset date to the lot-of-record provision should not be added. We 2 remain opposed to changing the lot-of-record date of January 1, 1985. We 3 support changes to the law that would clarify that the Lot-of-Record 4 provisions only apply to the person(s), or the legally authorized heirs of 5 such persons, who continuously owned the parcel since January 1, 1985. 6 We support a study of the impacts of applying lot-of-record provisions to

7 high value farmland.

We believe that "lot-of-record" dwellings that are really non-farm dwellings should lose the farm use assessment if the dwelling is not approved using a farm dwelling standard. The applicable tax penalty for change of use should also be applied. (08)

Farm Related Uses in EFU Zones

We are opposed to state or local government regulation of farm structures or accepted farming practices that occur in farm, forest or farmforest zones.

Game ranching and fee hunting or fishing should be recognized as farm activities which supplement regular farm income. Such activities should not disqualify a farm from farm use assessment. Bed & Breakfast and Dude Ranches should be a permitted use only when provided in conjunction with farm use. We support the following additions to the list of statutory permitted uses in all farm use zones:

- 1. Propagation or harvesting of a forest product; and
- Water impoundments.

10

11

12 3. Farm use should include the breeding, management, and sale of 13 breeds of dogs commonly utilized in livestock management and 14 husbandry. (01), (08)

Farm Use 3.620

"Farm Use" should be considered a use of right in any zone used for farming. (08)

Farm use should include any accepted farm practice or activity deemed by a farmer or rancher to be necessary for the cultivation, preparation, or sale of their farm crops or livestock. We believe individual farmers are the best judge of what a farm use is.

We support the farmer's right to produce, harvest, process, distribute, market, promote and sell their commodity in the manner most economically advantageous to their particular operation. We support policies that protect farm uses in the farm zone and that protect the economic success and viability of farm and ranch businesses in the farm zone. We oppose legislation regulation that limits farm uses in areas designated for exclusive farm use that are unrelated to public health and safety.

Land Use Action Notification

3.625

Public notice of all land use applications outside the urban growth boundary should be sent to all land owners within one-half mile of the property on which any land use application is made. (07)

Commercial Activities in EFU Zones 3.630

We support the right of an agricultural producer to vertically integrate 2 the farm operation and to provide other producers with such services as 3 long as the owner's product is a significant portion of the product being

We support clearly defining the differences between "processing" a 6 crop and "preparing" a crop for market. We agree that preparation should 7 remain a farm use under state standards. We also support allowing small-8 scale processing of agricultural products grown primarily onsite as an 9 outright permitted use in a farm zone. (17)

Non-production based commercial activities or promotional activities 11 should be accessory and auxiliary to the farm use on the subject farm and 12 not the primary use. We do not support limits on the amount of 13 income a farmer can earn from promoting their business. 14 We believe on-farm experiences encourage the public to support 15 beneficial policy. We support farmers engaging with the public on

16 farm in order to promote agriculture as a valuable part of our communities. 17 (03), (09), (17)

18 We support maintaining agritourism in farm zones, such as farm cafes. 19 Farm cafes in EFU zones should be owner managed, seasonal in nature 20 and/or should be tied directly to the crops grown on the farm. We believe 21 that agritourism uses may include products and activities that enhance the 22 sale of products grown on the farm. We believe that the county is best 23 suited to evaluate compliance with existing law and determine the 24 appropriate conditions for an agritourism activity.

On-Farm Education

3.650

3.670

We believe that educating the public on agriculture and accepted farm 2 practices is an important tool to protect agriculture for now and into 3 the future. Activities like farm education tours, and other activities intended to 4 promote and explain agricultural practice should be allowed on farmland. We 5 oppose any legislation or regulation that would make it more difficult for 6 farmers to educate the public about agriculture.

Any activities adjacent to exclusive farm use ground must supply land for any buffer requirements. Refer to Right to Farm 3.030

Application of Byproducts to Agricultural and Forestry Land 3.660

Biosolids: We support the use of treated or untreated biosolids and reclaimed water for agricultural purposes that will not lower or degrade the quality of farm land on which it was applied.

Food and agricultural byproducts: We support the application of food waste, processing water, and other agricultural byproduct to agricultural land at agronomic rates.

Non-Farm Activities

1

2

3

4

5

1

Because the limitation of non-farm activities is crucial to the integrity 2 of the exclusive farm use zone, we will vigorously oppose the inclusion of any new non-farm uses on lands properly zoned for exclusive farm use.

Furthermore, we will actively seek reduction of the growing list of permitted and conditional non-farm uses that have been added to the zone since its inception.

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

18 19

Except for necessary utility transmission lines and facilities that serve the rural land owners, public facilities should only be allowed in EFU zones if there is no property outside the EFU zone on which the facility could be 10 physically located.

Activities in private parks should be passive and consistent with a rural 12 setting, including consistent with rural farm and forest operations. Parks 13 may not be on high-value farmland without an exception unless they are 14 within the urban growth boundary.

Weddings and other events on EFU land must be ancillary and 16 accessory to existing farm use as defined in ORS 215.203 and not a 17 commercial business separate from the farm activity. (00), (01), (06), (08),

We support the state adopting conditions for siting and permitting 20 short term vacation rentals in exclusive farm use zones that ensure such 21 rentals are economically ancillary to the existing farm and that the farm

- 22 owner is the farm operator and a full-time resident of said county. (17)
- 23 We oppose wildlife overlay zones in land use planning. When wildlife
- 24 overlay zones are designated, a management plan that involves and is
- 25 supported by the landowners, neighboring landowners and producers that
- 26 are impacted by the overlay zone will be developed with the wildlife
- 27 management agencies whether state or federal or both to manage the
- 28 wildlife in that zone. (17)

Landfills in EFU Zones

3.671

We oppose the siting of new or the expansion of existing landfills on 2 high-value EFU land. (09)

Non-Resource Lands Zoning

3.674

We believe that a county should authorize new non-resource land 2 zoning by having the determination approved by the county 3 commissioners. A property owner should be allowed to apply to the county 4 for a determination of whether land is non-resource land that does not fall 5 within the definition of "agricultural land" under LCDC Goal 3, subject to 6 approval or denial by the county commissioners. The county commissioners should deny the application if the property is "agricultural 8 land" under LCDC Goal 3.

When a county rezones EFU lands that do not fall within the 10 definition of "agricultural land" under LCDC Goal 3, counties shall 11 establish non-resource zones for these areas, and allow other rural uses 12 to occur. The process to use would include the county obtaining the 13 expertise of a certified professional soil classifier registered and in good 14 standing with the DLCD. That expert's testimony and report to the DLCD 15 becomes public record. (03), (09), (10)

Utility Siting

7

3.675

We favor locating thermonuclear power plants and other industrial 2 developments in areas that will enhance irrigation developments and not take prime farm and forest land out of production.

Power transmission lines should be located to avoid losses of present 5 or potential agricultural and timber production activities need to avoid 6 valuable farm land. We support the principle of establishing utility corridors to minimize avoid the loss of agricultural and timber lands.

Underground utility facilities crossing or utilizing farmlands should be 9 buried at a depth and in a manner that will not interfere with normally 10 accepted agricultural practices in the area. All new buried pipelines and 11 utilities in agricultural zones and on private land shall be placed no less 12 than six feet below the surface of the ground. Such facilities include cables 13 for communication and power transmission and pipelines for transmission 14 of water, petroleum products, natural or manufactured gas, or other 15 materials. All utility pipeline installations must be installed as negotiated 16 with the land owner. (14)

17 Farmers should not be held responsible for damage or disruption of

- service. Utility operators shall be held responsible for repair, maintenance, restoration of any damages or disruption of service the farm operation. The operator shall fairly compensate the land owners, or lease holders for

21 any repair, maintenance or restoration of their property. At the time of 22 significant change of operation, the utility owner shall renegotiate a right-23 of-way agreement and easement and compensate the land owner or lease 24 holder accordingly.

25

27

28

30

37

41

44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

All agricultural tillage of less than 24 inches in depth should be exempt 26 from the requirement to notify any buried pipeline or utility before work begins. (14)

All overhead utilities must be maintained at a height so as not to 29 interfere with agricultural activities. (07)

We support changing the law to provide that if a land owner does not 31 wish to have a utility on their property, then every effort would be made to 32 avoid the property and/or put the utility line in an existing road right-of-way. 33 No landowner should be required to accept an easement for a utility unless 34 no road right-of-way exists within a five-mile corridor. The area receiving 35 the majority of the service should be the area that supplies the utility 36 corridor. If the majority of the service will be used in the urban growth boundary then the utility corridor should be in the urban growth boundary. 38 The Oregon Department of Agriculture should be the agency that oversees 39 the mitigation on agricultural land. The Oregon Department of Forestry 40 should be the agency that oversees the mitigation on forest land.

Every quarter mile section should be evaluated for location and 42 availability to any existing road right-of-way. In addition, the utility should 43 be required to:

- 1. Post a sufficient bond with the State of Oregon.
- 2. Locate its companion facilities in the road right-of-way.
- 3. Purchase a lease from a willing landowner for the property of a utility not located in the road right-of-way. The utility and/or companion facilities must be along the edge of the agricultural or forest land next to the road right-of-way and the fee/rate should be established based on commercial/industrial property rental rates within the urban area receiving the majority of the service.
- 4. Have an annual fee with the landowner(s) that is adjusted at least once every five years for inflation. The mitigation agreement should be reviewed by the Oregon Department of Agriculture upon request of the landowner at the time of the Renewal of the lease.
- 5. Pay the mitigation costs including the lease, the costs to the landowner for the life of the use, the cost of changing management practices and the actual loss in value of the crop, timber and/or livestock. Mitigation should include the entire area of production affected by the utility facility or pipeline and not just the footprint. (08)
- To establish the route for a utility facility that is a linear utility facility, the utility provider shall establish, in a land use application seeking approval of the linear utility facility, that each segment of the linear utility facility must be sited in an exclusive farm use zone

to provide the service. If the criteria in subsections (3) and (4) of this section are met for a utility facility that is a linear utility facility, the utility provider shall locate the segments of the linear utility facility, to the extent possible, along tract boundaries and maximize the stability of the remainder of the tract for farm use. "Segment" means the portion of a linear utility facility sited in an exclusive farm use zone that is on lands that share a similar site and situation geographically. (09), (10), (Referred to AFBF, 2010)

Providers of utility services should be required to work with 75 landowners to provide advanced notice of entry onto the property, make a 76 plan to avoid the spread of noxious weeds, pest and other disease, and 77 avoid negative impacts to ongoing farming and forestry operations, such 78 as planning for livestock control and management, avoiding disruption to 79 harvest and ongoing farming activities, and avoiding negative impacts to 80 agriculture.

Utility Access

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

18

19

We believe that access to public utilities for the agriculture industry for 2 all agricultural purposes should be no less than equal to the services provided to other users. (09)

3.676

Solar Siting in EFU 3.678

We oppose siting of non-agricultural solar panel facilities on 2 productive agricultural lands when alternative sites are available. We 3 define productive agricultural lands as lands that are locally significant for 4 the agricultural economy, have high productive value for that region, or 5 have other qualities that make them valuable for that region. This analysis 6 may be done on a county or regional basis, and can account for factors such as presence of irrigation or drainage infrastructure, soil class, large tracts of intact farmland, or other regionally relevant factors. Counties 9 should be allowed to exclude non-agricultural solar panel facilities in the 10 EFU zone on productive agricultural lands. Counties should not authorize 11 projects that could result in forfeiture of irrigation rights or loss of 12 agricultural wetland exemptions. (18) We support bonding and a legal 13 requirement to ensure that future solar sites when decommissioned are 14 reclaimed back to farmland with comparable characteristics to the original 15 farmland. Solar facilities must be maintained free of noxious and wind 16 blown weeds and fire prone vegetation. (See Green Power at 12.305), (16) 17 (19)

We oppose referring to solar facilitates as "solar farms." (19)

Agriculture Working Lands Conservation Easements 3.680

We support agriculture working lands conservation easements for 20 the primary purpose of protecting farmland for continued agriculture use, 21 while providing wildlife habitat and environmental benefits. Conservation 22 easements shall not impact neighboring agriculture operations. If a

- 23 conservation easement negatively impacts a neighboring agriculture
- 24 operation, the neighboring agriculture operation should have an
- 25 appropriate available remedy. (14)

Management of Public Lands

3.685

All public agencies that own, manage, or otherwise control real 2 property must continuously actively manage its land to best achieve the 3 purpose of the public land and to prevent negative impacts to

- 4 surrounding private lands and landowners. Negative impacts include but
- 5 are not limited to the spread of noxious weeds and annual grasses,
- 6 trespasses onto private property, increased wildlife burden, and other
- land use and resource conflicts. (14) All public agencies need to be
- 8 accountable for invasive plants and insects originating on public lands.
- 9 Agencies must control invasive plants and insects promptly. If the issue
- 10 is not managed, the agency involved must cover any crop damage from
- 11 invasive plants and insects originating from public land.

Policy 3.680, Agricultural Conservation Easements, was deleted in 2007

Removal of Acreage from Production

3.687

As producers of the highest quality agriculture products in the world, we oppose the permanent removal of acreage from agriculture production 3 through any government or private program. (02)

Loss of Private Property

2

1

5

7

3.688

We support adoption of a governmental policy of no net loss of private ownership of agricultural and forest lands in Oregon.

Any consideration for land ownership transfer from private to 3 4 government ownerships shall require a public hearing process including 5 hearings in the local area. After such public hearing process, the agency 6 or entity must get approval from the local governing body of the county. Only then can the federal or state agency seek funding for such land 8 ownership transfer. (13)

Government Ownership of Farm or Forest Land 3.689

State and local government should be required to prove and 2 guarantee that the purchase of land by a state or local government will not violate Goal 3 as expressed in ORS 215.243 (1) and (2), namely the preservation and maintenance of farmland for farm use. (00)

We support State management of federal lands in their jurisdiction. 6 (13)

We oppose allowing foreign governments to own land within our state." Rights of land ownership by foreign nations should be equal to the right of ownership by US citizens in foreign nations to create a reciprocal 10 effect. (13)

Road Development

3.690

During the design phase on road development, consideration should be given to impacts on existing agriculture practices. Road development should encourage the continuance of farm use.

When establishing expressways in EFU zones, the Oregon 5 Department of Transportation should be required to provide access to 6 farms and ranches and construct overpasses at county roads. (00)

Wetlands in EFU

3.691

1 Permanent wetlands, vernal pools, or mitigated wetlands should not 2 be located in an EFU zone if the land has been used for agriculture purposes or government money is used to develop a wetland project. We 4 would not oppose a wetland project providing the project is funded by the 5 landowner and meets the state's conditional use requirements. (11) 6 (See also Wetlands 7.850)

Road Rights of Way

7

12

14

3.692

Before a government entity can get approval for a road improvement 8 project that would result in the right-of-way increasing in size, all property 9 owners with land bordering the project should be informed by the 10 government entity as to where all the existing property boundaries are and 11 how much more land would be acquired.

All disputes should be settled and a compensation rate agreed upon 13 for the taking of the property before the widening project can be approved.

If the road improvement project is for the benefit of the urban 15 population, the extra land acquired should be valued as if inside the Urban 16 Growth Boundary.

17 In the event of road abandonment, the state or county will notify 18 property owners in writing. And, will consider the economic impact of the 19 road abandonment in addition, public meetings should be held on the 20 issue. (02), (12)

Traffic Impacts Due to EFU Land Conversions 3.693

We support retaining LCDC Administrative Rules requiring the long-2 term assessment of the transportation impacts resulting from the 3 establishment or enlargement of non-agricultural commercial businesses 4 at the state and county level. The burden of any cost of infrastructure 5 improvements should be paid for by the developer and not the general 6 public. (11)

Surveyor's Access

3.695

We support requiring all surveyors, their employees, or agents, to obtain permission before entering upon private land for the purpose of surveying and/or setting monuments without permission of the landowner. 4 Further, surveyors should compensate the landowner for any and all 5 damages and time lost caused by their entry on private property. (08)

Deed Recording

1

7

13

19

21

23

We support requiring county planning departments and county 2 recorders or city recorders to verify that a newly created parcel is legal and 3 in compliance with the county comprehensive plan before the deed is 4 recorded. (03), (07), (08)

Aggregate

We support requiring an "alternatives analysis and a needs analysis" 2 as part of the aggregate permitting process when applying to mine highvalue farmland soils in EFU zones. We support requiring the use of a permitting process with public hearings before allowing new or expanded commercial aggregate mining operations in the EFU zone.

We support state and local governments using a higher percentage of quarry rock and a lower percentage of alluvial gravel mined from under high-value farmland soils in the Willamette Valley.

We support prohibiting the mining of rock when it is under high-value 10 farmland soils or if the mining activities meet or exceed the depth of surrounding irrigation or domestic water wells within the boundaries of an 11 12 aquifer.

Before an application can be approved for a proposed aggregate 14 removal operation that is located on high-value farmland, the Department 15 of Agriculture and the Department of Water Resources should be required 16 to examine the application and both sign off that the proposed 17 mining/removal operation will not negatively impact agricultural operations 18 and water rights on surrounding farms.

We believe facilities and structures including batch plants should be 20 prohibited when surrounded by EFU land.

We support the removal of river rock from dry gravel bars. (01), (04), 22 (07), (08)

At a minimum, counties should have the authority to require that there 24 be a demonstration that there are no reasonable alternatives to siting an 25 aggregate facility on Class I, Class II, prime or unique soils in Oregon.

We support the requirement that future aggregate mining sited on Class I, Class II, prime, or unique soils in the Willamette Valley to be 28 reclaimed back to farmland with comparable characteristics to the original 29 farmland. (09)

30 We support long-range planning to identify appropriate places for 31 developing aggregate resources. (18)

Mitigation for Aggregate Projects

3.720

- When an application is submitted to site an aggregate operation, we
- support requiring counties to impose and enforce mandatory conditions

designed to reduce the impacts of the operation on neighboring farms and 4 ranches.

Supersiting

We oppose the supersiting of any non-farm activity that would subtract 2 from, or adversely affect, the surrounding agricultural industry and 3 resource base. We oppose any jurisdiction, governing body, or the Governor using supersiting authority to circumvent Oregon's land use 5 system.

We oppose the 2005 FERC law relating to the supersiting of pipelines 7 and support the reintroduction of state and local oversight. (Referred to 8 AFBF, 2008), (08), (16)

Urban Growth Boundaries

1

7

10

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

31

32

We support the use of Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) as a means 2 of dividing agriculture land from urban land. We oppose reduction in 3 requirements for UGB expansion. The purpose of designating land within 4 UGBs under land use planning should be to provide space for all urban 5 needs, including, but not limited to: housing, commercial and industrial, 6 utilities, parks & recreation, schools and to manage the growth of a city in such a way that these needs and services can be efficiently provided within the UGB. We oppose any effort to remove farm use assessment 9 from actively farmed land inside a UGB, without land owner consent.

We believe that UGB expansion is not an automatic right and that 11 there are some situations where expansion has reached its limit because 12 of the surrounding resource land. As such, we believe the 20-year 13 buildable inventory requirement is inappropriate and should be repealed. 14 Any boundary expansion on land protected under Goal 3 must not impair 15 the agricultural environment and infrastructure needed to produce food 16 and fiber for current and future generations. The expansion of a UGB should not occur on land(s):

- 1. That is predominantly irrigated or non irrigated soil classes I, II and irrigated class III and IV soils in western Oregon;
 - 2. Parcels of land that are predominantly irrigated or non irrigated soil classes I, II and irrigated class III through V soils in eastern
- 3. Parcels that are predominantly soils that, if irrigated, are capable of producing the average of other irrigated land in the area;
- 4. Any parcels that are predominantly soils capable of producing the average non irrigated wheat yield for the county; and
- 5. Any soils that the county determines to be necessary to support the agricultural community.

29 Exceptions should include parcels that are smaller than the applicable 30 minimum lot size and at least 75% of its perimeter is contiguous to:

- 1. An Urban Growth Boundary, or
- Land designated as urban reserve, or

- 3. An exception area, or
- 34 4. Soils not listed in ORS 215.710 (definition of high-value farmland). 35

System Development Charges

3.801

36 See tax section 2.330. (18)

Periodic Review

3.805

In order to provide a reasonable level of land ownership certainty for 2 agriculture producers near urban growth boundaries, no jurisdiction should 3 be required to evaluate their need to conduct a periodic review of their comprehensive land use plan more frequently than every 10 years. (04)

Population Allocation

The population growth allocations among cities within a county should 2 be under the county's jurisdiction and not the individual cities. (03)

Urban Rural Reserves

8

In the Rural/Urban Reserves process, (Beginning after the 20-year 2 UGB planning horizon), local governments should use the 20-year land 3 supply criteria as the maximum determining application tool and should 4 not use vague factors when designating reserves. Class I, II, Prime, 5 Unique, or other regionally significant agricultural lands should be 6 excluded from the urban reserves inventory and preserved for agricultural 7 use.

We only recognize two classifications of lands: (1) urban lands and (2) rural lands. We do not recognize or support the term "undesignated lands" 10 as a classification in the Rural/urban reserve process.

The urban rural reserves process allowed by the legislature for the 11 12 Metro regional government, and Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington 13 Counties needs to have hearings by the legislature prior to being finalized 14 by Metro to make sure that the agricultural and forestry lands have 15 maximum protection.

These lands are agriculture's and forestry's industrial lands and need 16 17 to be available for production with a 100 year supply.

These lands are nature's natural filters for the greenhouse gases that 19 the urban areas expel and need to be recognized for this purpose as well 20 as the economic benefits that they bring to Oregon's economy.

21 Cities that elect to have Urban Reserves shall be contained within the 22 reserve until substantially depleted. (08), (09), (11)

Destination Resorts

Destination Resorts should not be sited on high value cropland or near intensive crop producing areas unless it can be demonstrated that:

1. The resort will not result in the loss of land being intensively farmed;

- 2. The improvements and activities at the resort will be located and designed to avoid adverse effects of the resort on farm uses on surrounding farmlands; and
- 3. The property deed contains a provision that prohibits the owner, employees or customers from taking legal action to restrict or change the farming practices of agricultural producers in these surrounding areas.

Destination resorts should not be allowed to incorporate as a city or as a municipality if doing so would adversely impact the surrounding agricultural industry.

Destination resorts should not be sited on irrigated land or within an irrigation district and such irrigated land should not be included as land eligible for a destination resort in a county's destination resort map. However, irrigation districts should be allowed to opt out. (09)

Measure 37 and Measure 49 Right to Farm 3.

Counties should be required as a condition of approval for any singlefamily dwelling or non-farm use approved pursuant to a Measure 37 or Measure 49 claim to sign and record for the deed records a document binding the new land owner and the land owner's successors in interest. The deed should also prohibit them from pursuing a claim or cause of action alleging injury from a farming or forest practice protected under Oregon's Right to Farm Laws. (06), (08)

2 Crypto Mining and Server Farms

6

7

8

9

10

11

3.925

We oppose siting crypto mining and server farms on productive farmlands or EFU zones. The conversion of arable land into technology-centric facilities may diminish the available space for essential food production and potentially lead to increased competition for land, water and other resources needed to sustain farms producing living organisms that help sustain food security, agricultural stability, and the potential disruption of local economies that rely on farming and ranching.

Policy No. 3.940, Measure 37 Counter Claims, was deleted in 2008

IV. TRANSPORTATION

4.005

4.010

General Transportation Statement

The state transportation laws and rules must be built on a sound basis 2 for the general benefit to agriculture and for encouraging individual 3 enterprise. (07)

Financing Highways

4

5 6

12

17

19

26

27

Highway use fund expenditures should be limited to the building and 2 maintenance of highways and bridges, and should not be used for any other purpose.

State Highway funds should not be spent on construction and maintenance of multi-use paths, bicycle lanes, or other bicycle accommodations.

We support having adult bicycle users pay for improvements and 8 maintenance of bicycle lanes through the implementation of some form of fee or registration system.

10 Local jurisdictions should be prohibited from imposing bicycle lane 11 improvement requirements on private enterprise without compensation.

If increased financing is required for the maintenance and repair of 13 highways and bridges, we favor an increase in the highway use funds.

14 We recommend continual effort by county, state, and federal agencies 15 for more efficient use of funds concerning maintenance and repair 16 projects.

Road funding priorities must consider the infrastructure needed to 18 support a viable commercial farm economy.

For the purpose of maintaining primary and secondary rural roads, we 20 support allowing more flexibility in the use of Federal Highway 21 Construction Funds at the state level when a state has completed 90% of 22 its interstate highway system responsibility.

We support continual review of the Statewide Transportation 24 Improvement Plan which would include the following:

- 25 1. A review and analysis of the current gas tax allocation plan;
 - 1. The identification of need by conducting a road equity study as well as the unfunded needs of county market roads;
- 28 The analysis of the economic impact of market roads;
- 29 The identification of and analysis of how much gas tax is exported 30 from, and returned to, rural communities; and
- 31 4. A determination if any new revenue is required. (06), (09), (10)

Highway Funding Decisions 4.011

Regional highway funding decisions should be done at public 2 hearings, which occur in the evening when the public can attend. (03)

Fuel Tax 4.030

Any fuel tax increase should be accompanied by an increase in commercial vehicle fees to maintain parity with auto related taxes. We

- 3 support a tax on alternative fuel highway vehicles including electric
- 4 vehicles to equal the taxes normally paid through conventional motor
- 5 vehicle fuel taxes. (22) All off-road fuels and fuel alternatives should be
- 6 exempt from fuel taxes. (22) All fuel/energy taxes should be collected at
- 7 the final point of distribution.

Vehicle Location Monitoring 4.03

- 1 We oppose state or federal government use of location
- 2 tracking devices and systems being required for private vehicles in
- 3 Oregon. (22)

Vehicle Insurance Tax

4.040

We oppose a vehicle insurance tax. (06)

Weight Mile Tax

4.060

We favor the concept of farm-plated trucks paying their highway cost responsibility through the payment of motor fuel taxes rather than a weight mile tax.

We oppose any change in vehicle taxation that is detrimental to agriculture.

Local Government Gas Tax

4.075

1 We favor a constitutional amendment prohibiting a municipal 2 corporation from imposing a petroleum use tax without approval of the 3 voters within the municipality.

Three Axle Trucks

4.100

We oppose subjecting three axle trucks with farm plates to the weight mile tax and CDL requirements when hauling agricultural products for hire. (01)

Farm Contract Carrier Provisions

4.120

We support changing from a farm contract carrier to a general carrier which would still allow a person to haul their own products without being

3 subject to a weight mile tax.

Vehicle Registration

4.140

We support a method of issuing farm plates that is designed so that these licenses can only be issued to qualifying farmers.

Farmers should be allowed to haul their own agriculture and timber products on a truck with a farm plate to the point of first sale.

5 The state shall allow government surplus vehicles and trucks to be

6 eligible for farm plates.

We support the concept of registering farm trucks on a declared loaded weight for the power unit as long as the total dollars collected do not exceed the amount that would be collected under a light weight fee schedule

We support legislation providing for the pre-purchase of an unlimited number of overweight trip permits.

We support the adoption of a reciprocal registration and licensing program between adjoining states, including apportioned farm plates. (05), 15 (06)

Titling Fees

Titling fees should not exceed the cost of issuance and should not be used as a method of financing transportation facilities.

4.160

4.185

Driver's License Classification 4.175

Operators of farm plated trucks should not be required to have a commercial driver's license or a health certificate. (04)

Driver's License 4.180

The Oregon Driver's License is proof that an Oregon Drivers' License holder has demonstrated a working knowledge of the rules of the road, and can safely operate a motor vehicle. (07)

Minor Aged Vehicle Drivers

We support legislation allowing drivers under 18 years of age to operate a vehicle with passengers under 20 years of age when operating a vehicle is necessary for agricultural employment. (00)

Hand Held Communication Devices 4.190

We support the use of hand held voice communication devices in motor vehicles as needed for use in production agriculture activities. (07), (11), (17)

Public Utility Commission (PUC) Truck Permits 4.200

We support the hauling of farm supplies, such as fertilizer, lime, feed, etc., and farm products on non-regulated carriers operating with trip permits in intrastate and interstate transportation. (14)

Vehicle Trip Permits

Vehicle trip permits should be made available from the county clerk in those counties that do not have a permanent DMV agency office.

We support issuing unlimited trip permits for abnormal truck loads at local Department of Motor Vehicle offices.

The permit fee should reflect an amount not more than the proportional wear caused by the vehicle and should provide an economic incentive to purchase more than one permit at a time.

We support the issuance of a functional wide load permit for the purpose of hauling large bales.

The Oregon Department of Transportation and the Public Utility
Commission should provide a 30-day renewable harvest-time permit for
farm plated vehicles. State statutes and/or rules should allow field-loaded,
farm licensed vehicles to have up to a 10% over gross vehicle weight,
without violation. (05), (06)

Truck Transponders

4.225

We support use of green light transponders at weigh stations for agriculture vehicles on the freeway without fees being charged. (07)

Uniform Truck Loads

4.230

We recognize the imperative need for greater uniformity among states to minimize barriers to the free flow of commerce; this should be done with federal regulation of truck size and weight. (06)

Deregulation

4.240

In an effort to be consistent with the states of Idaho, Nevada and California, we support deregulation of the commercial hauling of livestock in Oregon.

Hours of Service Exemption

4.280

We support an agricultural exemption from the maximum driving and on-duty time requirements of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) as defined in 49 CFR 395.3 and 395.5, for farmers and retail farm suppliers transporting crops or farm supplies for agricultural purposes within Oregon and/or a 150-air mile radius of their distribution point or farm. (05), (06)

Hours of Service (HOS)

4.285

We support exemptions from HOS rules for equipment dealers, livestock hauling, and hauling of agricultural products to port or market. (17)

Interstate Commerce

4.290

We support a farm to market exemption from interstate commerce regulatory enforcement to allow the movement of farm gate products from the farm to its points of delivery within the state of origin until title is transferred. (Referred to AFBF, 10), (10) 11 Bridges 4.295

12 Any replacement of bridges should include increased capacity to 13 handle current and future motor vehicle transportation needs.

Public Roads Safety

11

18

20

23

25

27

4.300

We express our approval of reasonable laws related to highway safety for movement of implements of husbandry.

We encourage safe and adequate turnouts which are well posted. provided by the state highway and the county road departments for movement of agricultural equipment, rural mail delivery and other service vehicles.

If a roundabout is shown to be necessary, we support the increase in 8 the size of roundabouts along with road design and engineering to support the safe movement by truck traffic and agricultural vehicles/equipment.

10 We support highly visible dividing lines on rural roads.

We support adequate guard rails on state highways.

12 The Department of Motor Vehicles and Driver Education classes and 13 tests should increase emphasis of mandatory questions and facts regarding slow moving vehicles and other farm related hazards to include, but not be limited to, road etiquette as it pertains to rural roads.

The Department of Transportation needs to adopt signage in major 16 17 farming areas to notify the public of the need for caution.

Non motorized bicyclist should be fined for riding on roadways when 19 bicycle paths are available.

We encourage the establishment of a standard setback of 21 obstructions (mailboxes, signage, poles, etc.) to allow for adequate clearance of over-width vehicles on all public roads. 22

We support limiting the duration of highway closures to two hours for 24 the investigation of an accident.

We believe that accident should be reported by mile markers and 26 forwarded to ODOT.

We support a bumper height limitation on all non-commercial licensed 28 vehicles that is no greater than the one for farm and commercial vehicles. 29 (06), (07), (08), (09)

30 We express our approval of reasonable laws related to highway safety 31 and support the establishment of best practices for movement of all types 32 of farming equipment. We also support the use of all highway and rural 33 roads for the movement of all types of farming equipment regardless of 34 posted speed limits. (15), (17)

Rural Road Maintenance

We support the improvement of maintenance of rural roads so local 2 food can get to market. (15)

4.302

Slow-Moving Vehicle Signs 4.305

We support the proper use of the slow-moving vehicle (SMV) signs.

2 We expect appropriate administrating agencies to enforce the laws

3 including assessment of fines regarding misuse of SMV signs. We support

4 enforcement blitzes by law enforcement for the improper use of SMV 5 signs.

Any use of SMV signs other than what the statute or rule provides, is a class C violation and enforced with fines. (14)

Any implement that is required to have a SMV sign is not in violation of the law if the implement is traveling at a speed in excess of 25 mph or is being transported on a truck or trailer or towed. (07), (09)

Maximum Speed

4.310

We support using the Basic Rule as the governing speed on Oregon highways and oppose proposals for fixed limits on maximum speed except during emergencies.

We support enactment of a state law that allows vehicles registered under 26,000 lbs. (gross vehicle weight) to travel up to the maximum-posted speed. (03)

Roadside Signs

4.314

Whenever the Oregon Department of Transportation and/or the Tourism Information Council places roadside signs, an actual determination should be made that those signs will not block the view of highway conditions for the drivers of trucks and farm equipment. (03)

Highway Signs

4.315

1 There should be only one type of sign indicating the proper use of 2 passing lanes.

Prior to the end of the passing lane, a sign should indicate a mutual responsibility to merge. (01)

School Zone Lights

4.316

All school zones should be controlled at each end a consistent color of signing and lighting (that no other entity is allowed to use) for school zone warnings. A warning sign should be attached to the light indicating that the speed is 20 M.P.H. when the light is blinking.

Highway Signage for Roadside Stands 4.317

We support changing state laws so that farmers may place signs for roadside stands on highway rights of way through a permit process. (02)

Caution Signs

4.318

We encourage state and county road departments to place caution signs along rural state and county roads in EFU zones, warning motorists

3 to drive with caution, because farm machinery and livestock may be on 4 the road. (02)

Stop Lights 4.319

We support ODOT implementing standard amber light times that are generously longer than ITE minimums and implement all red periods on highways used for hauling agricultural goods. (17)

Studded Tires 4.320

We believe the use of studded tires should be legal when weather and road conditions warrant their use. (00)

Drug Testing 4.330

Any driver who is involved in a motor vehicle accident in which another person(s) is injured or killed should have a blood test within 3 hours to determine if the driver was under the influence of drugs.

Safety Restraints 4.340

School buses carrying children to and from day care, migrant school programs and/or field trips, should be exempt from the law (only until such time a law is passed that mandates all school busses have seat restraints) requiring seat restraints for children under the age of three.

Leaky or Sifting Loads 4.350

We support legislation that provides for obtaining a permit to haul a leaky load from the farm to a processing plant or another farm. Trucks of silage and manure should be exempt from sifting load laws.

Road Access 4.360

We support legislative action that will require the Oregon Department of Transportation to take immediate action to ensure that Oregon's roads and intersections are improved and constructed in a manner that will allow farmers and ranchers to move their equipment from field to field in a manner that is safe for the producers and the traveling public. "No thru truck zones" do not apply to vehicles hauling ag products or farm equipment. (17)

We support access to cross the road(s) that exist now or have existed since the area was designated as an EFU zone are grandfathered in and ODOT and/or the Federal Highway Authority that have major throughways or express ways running through the EFU zone or proposed to run through the EFU zone must design a system that allows for agriculture to have access to cross the road where existing access has existed and still exists and no road closures are allowed.

We oppose road impediments such as islands in the turning lanes. Roundabouts need to be sized for commercial and agricultural traffic. (07), (09), (11), (17)

Agricultural Produce Signs

4.390

We support expanding state roadway regulations to permit agricultural producers, to display seasonal signs advising the public that agricultural 3 commodities are available. This signage should be allowed on private 4 property with permission, regardless of ownership.

Railroad Abandonment

7

20

4.400

We seek and support alternatives to railroad branch line abandonment 2 through the use of short line railroads, customer operated branch lines, tax 3 incentives or other creative solutions. In the event of railroad abandonment, the ownership of the land should revert to the landowner if the land under the railroad is an easement, or if the right-of-way is owned 6 by the railroad the land should be sold to an adjacent landowner.

Rails to Trails 4.420

We oppose the creation or development of Rails to Trails. For existing 2 Rails to Trails or those created despite our opposition, we support 3 management of trails under the Oregon Recreation Trails System Act. 4 Such management should be approved by county government with public 5 input, and should also be in compliance with statewide land use goals and compatible with acknowledged county comprehensive plans.

We support legislation indemnifying adjacent farm owners for 8 damages caused by trail users to their land, and making trail users liable 9 for their torts. We support amendments to Oregon's recreational use 10 statute to make sure farm owners are immune from suits for injuries that occur on recreational trails adjacent to their land.

We support requiring the state to show an ability to meet the financial 13 requirements associated with developing and maintaining a recreation 14 trail.

15 We support an amendment to the Oregon Recreational Trails System 16 Act to specifically mandate the state comply with ORS 608.310 through 608.400 (Fences and Crossings on Railroad Right of Ways) and comply 18 with the terms of any deed or other instrument attached to land used to 19 develop the recreation trail.

We support legislation that will give adjoining landowners first right of 21 refusal to purchase, at agricultural land prices, any railroad right-of-way 22 adjacent to their property, if that railway is abandoned. We support an 23 amendment to the Oregon Recreational Trails System Act to guarantee adjacent landowners unlimited access to and from their own property 25 along and across the trail property was previously used by the land owner. 26 (See also Bike/Multi Use Paths in Farm or Forest Zones 3.043) (19)

Abandonment of Railroad Right of Way 4.450

The abandoned rights of way will be returned to the current owners of 2 the underlying parcels. (14)

We seek legislation requiring the administrator of any right of way abandonment procedure to:

- 1. Search title to all adjoining properties for reversion clauses, and to honor such documents; and
- 2. If none exists, we support the necessary legislation to provide that in the case of abandonment or nonuse, adjacent landowners shall be given the right to buy such land, including mineral rights, on the basis of the fair market value of comparable property.

11 We oppose provisions of the National Trails Act which permits 12 abandoned rail property to be donated and/or used for nature trails or other 13 recreational purposes.

All Terrain Vehicles

5

6

7

8

9

10

1

4.525

All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) are an important piece of production 2 equipment on America's farms and ranches. The sale and use of ATVs for 3 use as farm equipment and on private property should be retained.

ATVs, when owned by a person conducting farm operations on land 5 receiving farm use assessment and when operated in conjunction with the farm or ranch, should be defined as an implement of husbandry for the purposes of motor vehicle laws.

We support exemptions for agriculture use from ATV safety 9 regulations. (06)

Transportation Emergency Powers 4.575

We recommend that, when the need exists, the governor be given the 2 power to declare an emergency so that immediate steps can be taken to 3 increase the supply of railroad cars, truck trailers, and other equipment, 4 used for bulk transportation of agricultural commodities.

Dock Strikes 4.585

We urge legislation to allow suits for compensation when a dock strike 2 or slow down causes loss of trade or revenue. In such emergencies, in order to protect the public interest, state government, under emergency powers, should operate the facilities until a mutually satisfactory solution 5 is agreed upon and ratified. (17)

Tow Trucks 4.595

- Law enforcement agencies should be notified by tow truck operators
- when the tow truck operators trespass. The law should provide:
 - a. A penalty for enforcement;
 - b. A form to be completed by the tow truck operator that goes to the
- law enforcement agencies and to the address where the vehicle
- was towed from; and
 - a. Immediate notification to the law enforcement agency if a safety hazard exists.

Policy No. 4.600, Cardlock-Keylock, was deleted in 2005

Bulk Purchase of Fuel for Agricultural Buyers 4.610

- We support the creation of a law to allow the bulk purchase of fuel to
- 2 be resold to no more than five additional agricultural buyers for economic
- 3 benefit. (09)

Propane Quality

4.615

- 1 Propane quality should be monitored and tested as is done with gas and
- 2 diesel. Propane with higher Propylene levels should still be available but
- 3 needs to be identified as such.

Vehicle and Engine Emission Regulation 4.620

- 4 We oppose vehicle and engine emission rules issued by the state for new
- 5 and existing units that are more restrictive than the national emission
- 6 rules issued by the EPA. (21)

Tolling

4.700

7 We oppose tolling on all existing public roads in Oregon. (22)

V. FORESTRY

General Forestry Statement

5

6

7

8

18

5.001

The state forestry laws and rules must be built on a sound basis for 2 the general benefit to natural resource industries and for encouraging 3 individual enterprise. (07)

Forestry 5.010

We support clear cutting as a forest management practice west of the Cascades Crest.

We support necessary silvicultural practices according to sound 4 management principles, developed and used by foresters and landowners.

We support legislation requiring the owner that was responsible for the logging to be responsible for the reforestation.

We urge that controls be established to regulate the kinds of seeds or 9 plants utilized for reseeding of burned over forest and rangeland, and that 10 all seeds or plants have a known origin.

We request research by Oregon State University to ascertain that the 12 seeds or plants used are not harmful to agriculture production. We also 13 request that the research for small woodland owners be continued.

14 We support strong service forestry and/or extension service programs 15 with an emphasis in the field.

16 We urge a continued program of seeding public lands with grasses 17 and legumes to increase forage for livestock and wildlife.

We support Right to Practice Forestry laws.

National Forest Receipts

5.020

Issues raised in national forest planning should be resolved to sustain 2 a continuing and economically viable supply of timber from national 3 forests. It is of extreme importance that the flow of revenues to the counties from national forests be maintained to provide support to counties, citizen 5 employment and community stability.

6 We support the return to logging of O&C (Oregon & California 7 Railroad) lands.

We support a state constitutional amendment that would allow 9 counties to exceed the property tax rate limitation to replace federal forest 10 receipts that were only used for property related services. All counties 11 should petition the state for revenue to provide for non-property related 12 services. (02), (04), (07)

Forestry Programs

3

4

8

9

14

5.030

The future health of the timber industry demands intensified management of small and medium sized timber parcels by the landowners.

We support education programs, incentive programs, capitalization 5 rates and tax policies that encourage private landowners to achieve optimum production.

We support the present method of funding the Department of Forestry programs with the funds going before the Ways and Means Committee for their review of General Fund appropriations.

10 We support monitoring of the USDA forest service initiative regarding 11 coordination of public and private forest lands. (Referred to AFBF, 2012) 12 (12)

Oregon Department of Forestry Jurisdiction on Rangelands 5.040

We oppose the actions of the Oregon State Department of Forestry to 2 expand their jurisdiction over the management of and activities on lands 3 classified as rangelands including juniper dominated rangelands. (05)

Forest Practices Act

5.100

The Forest Practices Act (FPA) should be administered only by the Oregon Department of Forestry. County overlay zones should not be used for this purpose. The Forest Practices Act should be adequately funded to accomplish its objectives. We oppose increased buffers and other 5 regulations in the Forest Practices Act which will negatively impact private small and medium woodland owners.

We oppose FPA requirements that forest operators notify all residents 8 within 500 feet of a pesticide spray project.

Crops grown under agronomic cultural practices should be considered 10 an agricultural crop and not be subject to the Oregon Forest Practices Act.

We support amending the Forest Practices Act to reduce the time of 12 reforestation to three years and to increase the minimum stocking rate to 13 200 trees per acre in western Oregon. (04), (05)

Oregon's "Private Forest Accord" and all resulting administrative rules 15 should apply only to timber operations of 5,000 acres or more. (22)

Protection 5.200

Government should manage public lands regardless of how the land 2 is classified in order to assure that fire prevention, suppression and control measures are taken to prevent the spread of fire on those lands and also on private lands. Once a fire is detected, it should be staffed with 5 firefighting resources within 8 hours. We support legislation that will allow 6 local and state firefighting resources to be deployed on land managed by 7 other agencies in a timely manner when federal agencies do not actively

8 engage a wildfire that has a potential to damage private or state managed 9 lands. (17)

We believe that the public owes a responsibility to contribute to fire 11 suppression costs on private land. The state should fund a minimum of 12 50% of the fire protection costs and landowner in-kind contributions should 13 be counted as part of the landowner's share of the costs.

We support a fire protection policy in high-risk wild land/urban 15 interface fire zones that offer an incentive based approach to fire 16 protection.

We support national public land policies that prevent wildfires through 18 fuel load reduction by thinning, selective harvesting and grazing. We 19 support government recognition of targeted grazing as an important tool 20 for fuel load management to prevent wildfires on private, county, state and 21 federal lands.

In order to prevent wildfires and reduce the fuel load caused by the 23 government's decrease in public lands grazing, we strongly support the 24 expansion and prioritization of grazing by livestock on lands managed by 25 the government, as it is the most economical method of fuel load reduction 26 on rangelands. (15)

We support changes in policy that all state, federal and local agencies 28 should promptly conduct an analysis once a fire is declared controlled and 29 move expeditiously to salvage reforest and restore the fire-burned 30 landscapes, which involves a ten-year management plan which would 31 include developing buffers and identify water sources for firefighting. (02), 32 (07), (08), (17)

We support the government, both state and federal, maintaining forest 34 roads for fire prevention practices, protection and access, making it possible for firefighters to reach fires. (20)

We oppose the inclusion of agricultural crops and pasture lands, 37 irrigated or non-irrigated, from the definition of "Vegetative Fuels." (22)

38 We oppose home hardening standards being applied to ag exempt 39 structures. (22)

40 We oppose the state using wildfire risk as a reason to interject itself 41 into local land use planning. (22)

Wildland Fire Protection

5.201

- 1 We support Forest and Rangeland Protective Associations functioning
- 2 as the primary source of initial attack resources for suppressing wildfires
- on privately held lands. We oppose any legislation, administrative rule, or
- executive order that would prevent these Associations from providing
- wildfire protection. (22)

10

14

17

27

33

36

Prescribed Fire on Forestland

5.202

- We support timely and judicious use of prescribed fire on private lands
- classified as "Forestland." We are opposed to any legislation,

- 3 administrative rule, or executive order that would prevent landowners from
- 4 use prescribed fire to manage their lands. In the case of a federal or state
- 5 agency prescribed burn on public lands trespassing on private lands, the
- 6 private landowner should be entitled to appropriate compensation for
- 7 damages, including suppression costs. (22)

Forest Protection

5.205

- 1 Forest and agricultural lands fire protection is funded by property tax
- 2 assessments and forest protective association dues. We request the
- 3 Bureau of Land Management continue their cooperative agreement with
- 4 the Oregon Department of Forestry for the protection of BLM and O&C
- 5 Lands in Western Oregon. (19)

Salvage Logging

5.210

We support a state and national policy that promotes prompt salvage logging in areas of burned, diseased, or pest damaged forests on public lands. (02), (04), (05)

State Forests 5.300

Forests managed by the Department of Forestry should be managed in such a manner as to best insure the maximum production in the long run, and to provide the highest possible payments of forest generated revenues as payments to counties and school districts in the form of an offset to property taxes. (04)

Forest Service Timber Harvest Policy 5.400

It is in the best interest of the State of Oregon to continue to allow the states to determine the distribution of U.S. Forest Service timber sales receipts. We favor the present 25/75 ratio used when determining the distribution of such sales receipts. We oppose efforts to allow use of these funds for social programs.

We support the planned allowable harvest levels set by the U.S. Forest Service.

Timber Product Export Restrictions 5.600

We oppose any restriction or limitation on exports of Oregon forest products unless negotiated by treaty.

Sudden Oak Death 5.605

- 1 We support funding, education, research, and land management
- 2 techniques needed to control and stop the spread of sudden oak death.
- 3 We believe all utilities, land managers and users of property in areas
- 4 designated with sudden oak death shall take extra precautions to wash
- 5 their equipment, tools and vehicles especially the undercarriages and tires
- 6 to reduce its spread.

VI. ENVIRONMENT

General Environment Statement

6.005

The state environmental laws and rules must be built on a sound basis 2 that recognizes the general benefit to agriculture and encourages 3 individual enterprise. (07)

Economic Impact

6.010

An economic impact statement should be required as part of every 2 environmental impact statement and each should be given equal weight. 3 The statements must allow for protection of the customs and culture of 4 local communities. (05)

Resource Management

6.020

No one agency should be allowed to override the evidence regarding 2 resource management projects such as river bank revetments, channel 3 maintenance, animal grazing, etc.

Environmental Program Funding

6.025

The responsibility for declining populations of flora and fauna 1 2 demands a broad-based public commitment and understanding that the 3 burdens of restoration are being shared by all of society. We oppose in 4 principal and in policy any private-sector tax used to fund environmental 5 programs benefiting the "public good." The conservation and restoration of all species requires action and sacrifice across the entire economic and geographic spectrum of Oregon.

Government Accountability

7

15

6.030

A state agency or local government should not refuse to issue a permit 2 to a person applying for a permit in order to protect their property, both 3 personal and real. Property, including, but not limited to, natural resources 4 and irrigation access should be protected from flood, fire and other natural 5 hazards unless denial of the permit is necessary to protect public health 6 and safety.

A state agency or local government that fails to issue such a permit 8 should be liable for damages resulting from the denial. A written explanation for the denial should be provided to the applicant within two 10 weeks of the denial. The explanation should include specific reasons for 11 denial.

12 Any person(s) damaged by reason of the denial of the permit should 13 be allowed at their discretion, to bring an action in the circuit court having 14 jurisdiction over the damaged property.

All approved permits should be issued within two weeks of being 16 received. Conditions on such permits should be limited to only those that

- 17 are required to protect public health and safety from legitimate, science-
- 18 based risks. Fees associated with approved permits, as they relate to
- 19 agriculture and private property, should not be used as a revenue
- 20 generation source. (05)

Department of State Lands

6.100

OFBF appreciates the efforts of the Division of State Lands to work cooperatively with the agriculture industry on "fill and removal".

OFBF favor the repeal or amendment of state laws, rules or regulations that allow the Department of State Lands to have any regulatory authority over any private property used for agricultural purposes including stream beds and banks or other lands. We oppose any new fees or fee increases on agriculture by the Division of State Lands. (03), (05), (06), (09)

Multiple Use

6.200

We favor the multiple uses of public lands and publicly controlled or managed natural resources.

Criminalization of Environmental Law 6.315

Environmental laws should exempt persons who conduct farming, a ranching, mining, and logging activities from criminal liability. Any violation of environmental laws that do not result in demonstrated harm to public health and safety should be subject to civil liability only.

Subsurface Property Rights

6.320

6.400

All lending institutions should discontinue the policy, during foreclosure, of retaining geothermal and other rights which were acquired lawfully by the pervious landowner (title owner). Such rights should remain with, and not be severed from, the land.

Public Lands 6.350

We support the concept of allowing private access to public lands for economic purposes. Such access should be managed by appropriate public entities to permit private interests to pursue their economic goals with only those rules and regulations absolutely required to protect the resources, as determined by a competent scientific determination. (02)

Natural Resources Revenues

Revenues received from all natural resources on federal lands within Oregon should have a minimum of 50% returned to the county from which it was derived.

Recreation 6.410

More attention should be given to provisions for family type recreation in undeveloped areas of federal land.

Fees for the use of recreation facilities should be charged where 4 services are provided but should not be charged merely for access to 5 undeveloped areas.

Recreation Cooperation

6.415

We will cooperate with local, state or federal agencies and with 2 recreation and wildlife groups to develop plans and procedures for better outdoor recreation opportunities, better utilization thereof and education in 4 sportsman-like conduct.

Reclamation Law 6.420

1 We oppose any acreage limitation on any Bureau of Reclamation 2

The Bureau of Reclamation should not negotiate to divert water from 4 irrigation to recreation use. (05)

Withdrawn Land Transfers

6.430

We are opposed to any jurisdictional transfer of withdrawn lands 2 between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Land Management 3 unless both agencies mutually agree.

Wilderness Areas

11

6.440

Multiple-use is the best utilization of our federal lands; therefore, no more Oregon land should be allocated as a wilderness designation area. Those areas already designated as wilderness areas should be periodically re-evaluated.

We oppose the study or creation of new wilderness areas and 6 expansion of present wilderness areas. When a new wilderness or national monument is created, we support the continuation of existing 8 resource management practices and natural resource economic 9 enterprises within the boundaries of that new designation in a manner that 10 protects local communities (see also Antiquities Act 14.050). (19)

Lands designated for wilderness areas should be subject to local 12 zoning ordinances.

We recommend that the Wilderness Areas Act be amended to control 14 fire, noxious weeds, insects and diseases. Where there is a fire threat to 15 adjacent multiple use areas, the maintenance of irrigation systems, should 16 be continued. (05)

Stewardship 6.450

We support and encourage use of the Bureau of Land Management 2 Stewardship Program.

Road Access Policy 6.455

The system followed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in 2 establishing certain roads and rights of way for the alleged purpose of 3 access in certain agricultural areas of Oregon is not justified when considering:

1. Private property values;

5

7

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1

- 6 2. Destruction of ranch operations;
 - 3. Costs in relationship to benefits received;
- 4. Burdens of patrol imposed on ranchers whose lands are dissected 9 with roads and rights of way;
- 10 5. Impacts on community economy; and
- 11 6. The erosion of tax bases.

12 We ask that such road building projects be delayed until an aggrieved 13 landowner, the community and others concerned, have an opportunity to 14 review and arbitrate the cost, inconvenience and mechanics of the 15 proposed access to lands.

We ask that the permit holder and the BLM have control of access 17 when there is danger of fire, particularly in summer and late fall, or from 18 one rainy season to another.

Sale or Lease of Public Lands

6.460

When the state and/or federal government put public land up for sale, or lease agreement, we believe the following conditions should be adhered

- 1. All existing contracts should be honored;
- 2. The first right of refusal should be given the present user, and then to the adjacent farmers and/or ranchers;
- 3. A base value should be established with the means of financing to be determined:
- 4. Price modification of the sale should be given to the adjacent farmers and/ or ranchers; and
- 11 5. Government agencies are encouraged to sell lands to the private 12 sector that are of limited value to the public. (05), (06)

Public/Private Land Exchange

6.465

We support the voluntary exchange of public and private lands, 2 particularly in cases where public and private land holdings are 3 intermingled (checker-boarded), thereby complicating the access and 4 management of both. (09)

Land Ownership

6.466

The Oregon Farm Bureau disapproves the US Federal Government 2 from acquiring additional natural resource land in Oregon. (13)

Climate Change/Pollutant Pricing

6.500

We believe that agriculture has a positive impact on the global or local 2 3 climate and sequesters carbon.

4 Market-based incentives, tax credits, grants, and/or cost sharing programs

5 are preferable to government mandates.

6 We support:7 • A vol

8

16

17

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

- A voluntary pollutant credit system designed to avoid competition among commodities.
- Support for efficiency improvements to agriculture operations.
- Compensation to farmers for planting crops or adopting farming
 practices that keep carbon in the soil or plant material
- Off-setting other taxes to maintain national and global competitiveness.
- The inclusion of the agriculture community as a full partner in the development of any policy or legislation.
 - An agricultural exemption for indirect source air emissions from regulation.

18 We Oppose:

- Climate legislation that establishes mandatory pollutant trading provisions.
- Climate legislation that is not equitable, affordable, or achievable
- Reporting of any greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by an agriculture entity.
- Legislation that would make Oregon farmers less competitive, increase production costs, and put undue costs on Oregon agriculture, business, and consumers.
- Legislation that prescribes agriculture practices and mitigation programs. (18)
 - Any legislation, administrative rule, rulemaking or executive order that would evaluate a farms climate score, elevate one farming practice over another or discriminate against a farm based on a perceived pollution potential.
- The regulation of indirect source air emissions from ag related equipment and machinery as if they are direct source air emissions.

VII. WATER

General Water Statement

7.005

The state water laws and rules must be built on a sound basis that 2 recognizes the general benefit to agriculture and encourages individual 3 enterprise. (07)

Navigable Rivers

7

8

7.010

We oppose all actions by the State of Oregon to recommend streams 2 and rivers throughout the state as navigable, unless these are rivers that 3 are in fact now used for commerce between states and foreign countries and which need federal government supervision and financial support.

The State of Oregon should provide well-documented, historic data 6 that streams were in fact navigable on February 14, 1859 with respect to the navigability studies now under way.

We oppose the expansion of the navigable waterway definition or 9 determination and seek legislation and/or signatures on an initiative 10 petition to halt such illegal activity and to restore ownership and remove 11 any cloud on the title to land that has been taken to date.

12 We oppose further designation of navigable waters in Oregon. We 13 support voluntary incentive-based programs of public recreation, such as 14 providing recreational leases, easements and cooperative agreements to 15 increase public access to private lands through financial incentives, tax 16 credits and compensation.

We support increased recreational development of public lands for 17 18 navigable access. (05)

Navigable Determination

7.015

Definite determination should be made of the river bottom lands 2 claimed by the state. Ownership of contested lands should be adjudicated.

Scenic Rivers 7.100

We oppose the further expansion of scenic rivers to other streams or 2 tributaries.

Legislation regarding scenic rivers should exempt agricultural 4 management practices. Lands adjacent to scenic rivers and recreation 5 trails should be subject to local zoning ordinances. (05)

Eastside Ecosystem Plan

7.110

We oppose further federal expenditures to complete or implement the 2 Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) and 3 the Upper Columbia River Basin (UCRB) project as long as the plans are 4 contrary to federally legislated public land management policies. We will 5 not support any alternative that goes contrary to our national policy that 6 sets multiple-use as the goal for management of public lands.

Water Conservation

1

3

7

8

9

7.200

We support voluntary conservation by an individual or irrigation district using practices to improve efficiencies of delivery and application of water.

We will support a state water conservation program that would define conservation as the "wise and beneficial use of water." A state water conservation program should address all of the state's water resources and stress voluntary involvement to:

- 1. Improve efficiencies of delivery and application;
- 2. Improve efficiencies of in-stream use; and
- 3. Store surplus flows for future in-stream and diverted uses. (01)

Storage of Willamette Basin Reservoir Water 7.220

We support the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and others with jurisdiction over the Willamette River Basin placing the summer and seasonal water needs of agriculture, municipalities and businesses in a higher priority and adopt a management system to fill and store water behind the thirteen dams and reservoirs in a timely manner that supports both the seasonal water needs of agriculture, municipalities, and businesses and the flood control and fisheries needs of the Willamette River Basin system.

Measurement and Reporting of Water Use 7.225

We oppose statewide blanket measurement and reporting of water use. We support water measurement within individual watersheds to resolve water conflict between water users. (09), (17)

If the state is going to require measurement and reporting, reporting should only be required annually; individual user data should be protected and only available to third parties at an aggregated, basin wide scale; the reports should not be used as evidence in a forfeiture proceeding; and the reporting should impose as little administrative burden on the user as possible; the state should cover the cost of measurement devices, and recognize that not all systems will require measurement devices to measure water use. Reporting should not occur unless the department actually has the resources and infrastructure to process the information required. As new technology becomes available, the Legislature should continue to adequately invest in the appropriate water measurement equipment for the water system. (19)

Riparian Management Zones

7.250

We oppose non-voluntary regulatory riparian set-asides or other imposed riparian restrictions on private agricultural land. If regulations and

3 improvements are proposed to protect riparian lands on private agricultural4 property, then the following conditions should be met:

- 1. These regulations should be incentive-based;
- 2. All such regulations should be reasonable; and
 - 3. All costs of these regulations and improvements should be paid by the government agency. (05)

Water Laws 7.300

We support continuance of the prior appropriation doctrine as the proper method to determine water law administered by the Water Resources Commission.

We support a system of one vote per irrigated acre within an irrigation district or irrigation company.

The Director of the Water Resources Department should be appointed by the Water Resources Commission and confirmed by the Governor.

We support the beneficial use under the constraints of irrigation districts' and/or an irrigation companies' bylaws. (05)

11 State and Federal Water Relief Programs 7.301

12

5

6

7

8

2

5

6

7

9

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 13 State and federal drought relief programs should be available for partial or
- 14 full water curtailments caused by state or federal regulation, including the
- 15 Endangered Species Act, tribal reserved water rights for fisheries, and
- other regulatory programs that are not part of the ordinary "call" of water
- 17 rights among consumptive water users. (20) (Refer to AFBF)

Water Adjudication

7.305

We support a fair and fast state adjudication process if the following provisions are met:

- A requirement that all entities, particularly Tribal Government and US Government claimants submit, and make public, biological studies and the data developed in those studies, when biological/environmental studies are a basis for their claim;
- A provision allowing for sufficient time for peer review after the submission of the aforementioned studies and data and prior to the contested case hearing. At least one year should be allowed for peer review;
- A provision requiring the State of Oregon to fund unbiased scientific studies sufficient to determine the accuracy of data, and authenticity of all federal claims;
- A requirement that Oregon Water Resources Department defend existing adjudicated water rights when such water rights would be jeopardized by in-stream or lake level claims filed by government in an adjudication process; and
- A requirement, if the adjudication of in-stream water rights or state
 or federal reserved rights deprives any farm or ranch of water, the

20 government pays just compensation to the farmer or rancher for 21 all economic loss due to the loss of water.

Water Use Board of Appeals

7.306

We are not in favor of a Water Use Board of Appeals unless there are specific sideboards that protect water right holders. These sideboards should consist of between three and five individuals who are selected by an independent source and include Oregon licensed privately practicing attorneys with a minimum of five years of experience practicing water law.

Water Rights 7.310

We oppose federal preemption of state water rights. The right to use
water is a property right which should not be taken from the owner without
due process of law and just compensation.

4 We believe that water and water rights from both surface and

5 underground sources must stay with the land, particularly when lands are

6 classified for agriculture use under the state's land use planning program.

Water rights on EFU lands should not be used for any other purpose until
 all agriculture needs are met and assured for the future. We believe that

9 areas where ground water is available under EFU lands that no other use

10 should be allowed unless there is an adequate supply of water for all EFU

11 lands located above the ground water source.

12 We request that the present Oregon water rights law be administered

13 in accordance with established customs and adjudicated court decisions.

14 We hold irrigation water to be property rights appurtenant to the land

15 and that irrigation water rights are owned by the landowner.

16 When water rights are applied for and developed by a landowner, the

17 ownership rights to appropriate and make beneficial-use of that water right

18 vests solely in that landowner.

19 We hold that Irrigation Districts are a critical component of Oregon's

20 agricultural infrastructure. Irrigation Districts must be managed for the

21 benefit of all patrons.

22 Irrigation Districts shall operate based on direction provided by an

23 elected board representing the district members.

24 Water rights held within a district should stay on land in that district.

25 Notwithstanding operation of the Endangered Species Act, water that is

26 unusable by an irrigation district for irrigation should be available for other

27 landowners or districts with access to the same water source for irrigation

28 purposes only. (18)

29 Oregon Water Recourse Department (OWRD) basin plans for water

30 availability should be required to restrict rural, residential, municipal or

31 industrial development near or on land zoned exclusively for farm use

32 where non-farm demands will adversely impact the adjoining agricultural

33 operation or other existing uses.

34 We support the presumption that a water right application be

35 considered in the public interest, if the use is authorized in the basin

36 program and the water is available.

- 37 Water rights should be described in terms of recorded property deeds.
- 38 An affidavit showing a five-year period of nonuse within any preceding
- 39 seven-year period should accompany all petitions initiating cancellation
- 40 procedures.
- 41 We support allowing any owner of any agricultural water right to
- 42 receive a waiver of the five-year cancellation for nonuse if the owner has
- 43 a sufficient reason for requesting the waiver.
- 44 We support repealing that portion of the water right law which says, "A
- 45 water permit or water right may be canceled after five years of nonuse."
- 46 Valid reasons for the waiver include, but are not limited to the
- 47 following: government programs such as the current 10-year Conservation
- 48 Reserve Program; improvements in Management programs; changes in
- 49 crop production programs; changes in ownership; weather cycles; land
- 50 litigation and temporary long-term economic conditions.
- 51 A farmer should have the option to accept or reject use of sludge or
- 52 treated water. The use of such water should not result the in loss of water
- 53 rights. Water quality testing should be the responsibility of the supplier,
- 54 with tests done by a testing agency.
- 55 State law should be amended to allow representation from the
- 56 following nine basins:
 - 1. Rogue, Umpqua, South Coast;
 - 2. Klamath, Gooselake;
 - 3. Lower Willamette, Sandy;
 - 4. Mid Willamette, Mid Coast;
 - 5. Upper Willamette, North Coast;
 - 6. John Day, Deschutes, Hood;
 - 7. Grand Ronde, Umatilla;
 - 8. Powder, Malheur Lake; and
 - 9. Malheur, Owyhee
- 57 Stock ponds and retention impoundments in use in an agriculture
- 58 environment should be grandfathered under Oregon water rights.
- 59 The water right application backlog in the OWRD should be cleared
- 60 within a 3 month period before the department conducts any present or
- 61 future rule or policy making, hires any new employees, or has their budget
- 62 approved by the next legislature.
- 63 Governmental agencies should not be exempt from water rights
- 64 application fees.
- 65 We support a fee being charged to file an appeal for granting a water
- 66 right application. The fee should be equivalent to all costs incurred by a
- 67 water right applicant and the cost of appeal to Oregon Water Resources Department. Appellants if successful should have the fee
- 68 returned.
- 69 If the appeal is lost, then those filing the appeal would lose their fee
- 70 and be required to pay any costs incurred by Oregon Water Resources
- 71 Department and the water right applicant due to the appeal. These
- 72 provisions should apply to state and federal agencies, tribal governments,
- 73 nongovernmental, and nonprofit organizations as well.

- 74 It is the responsibility of OWRD to actively enforce the shutoff of illegal
- 75 water withdrawals and damming of streams on properties with no water
- 76 rights. (15)
- 77 We do not believe there should be a fee to file appeals for instream
- 78 water rights. When the state files for instream water rights in a basin or
- 79 watershed, there should be one application. (18)
- 80 We oppose any mandatory or regulatory implementation of
- 81 cooperative, voluntary water management plans or arrangements. (17)

Water Right Applications

7.320

- We support legislation which requires the Water Resource Commission to direct the Water Resource Department to process water
- right applications according to the administrative rules in effect on the date
- 4 of application.

Domestic Water Well Permits

7.330

- New exempt domestic wells should be regulated by the Water Resources Department.
- Before drilling new exempt domestic wells in groundwater limited
- 4 areas, a landowner should be required to obtain a permit from the Water
- 5 Resources Department. We support limitations on the use of exempt wells.

Basin Closures

7.332

- We do not support the state closing basins to new or existing 2 appropriations of water. If the state closes a basin, it should be temporary and they should consider historical analysis, current science, ground truth science, and recognize the technologies available for water efficiencies.
- 5 They shall give 3 years notice, take public comment, and develop rules on
- 6 how they will address the needs of all current water right holders. (22)

Hydrological Connection

7

7.335

- Oregon Water Resource Department must use accepted, peer-8 reviewed and ground-truthed scientific techniques for determining connections of water between wells and surface water.
- Before a well can be regulated due to hydraulic connection to a 10 11 surface water source, the department must prove the connection and that 12 the impact is within the same irrigation season. (14), (17)
- Restrictions imposed on areas determined to be hydrologically 14 connected to surface water resources with no initial scientific basis should 15 sunset within five years unless scientific documentation proves a 16 hydrologic connection. (06)

Maintenance of Streamflow Gauges

7.340

- If the Oregon Water Resources Department is regulating agricultural
- 2 water use based on streamflow, the Department must maintain streamflow gauges that are regularly calibrated, accurate, scientifically acceptable,

- 4 and placed in a location that will actually capture the full flow of the stream
- 5 being measured. (18)

Stored Water Application Process

7.350

We support legislation for a streamlined application process for water 7 right applications to access stored water for irrigation where the water has 8 already been earmarked for irrigation.

Irrigation District Elections

7.360

Irrigation District elections should fall under the authority of the 2 Secretary of State and be made to abide by the same election provisions 3 and requirements as other special districts in the State of Oregon, with the exception of the weighted voting by acreage. (01)

Water Transfer

1

11

13

14

15

16

17

7.375

We support the ability of farmers, ranchers, and irrigation districts to 2 transfer water rights, both stored water and live flow rights, as needed for their operations, provided that such a transfer does not cause injury to 4 other farmers, ranchers or irrigation districts. (18)

If an irrigator or district uses less water than their water right allows 6 for, they should be able to transfer the water rights of the water saved to another parcel of land under the same ownership for agricultural use within the existing water authority. If the irrigator does not transfer the rights of 9 the water saved to another parcel, he should not lose the rights to that 10 water.

The state should broaden its policy on the transfer of water rights to 12 include the following:

- 1. Provide for a simplified temporary transfer of a water right from the identified parcel to other parcels under the same ownership or operation. The transferred water right should be limited by both the acres of the original right and the volume of water covered by the original right taken from and returned to the same source.
- 18 2. Permit the leasing of a water right on a year-to-year basis to other 19 farmers having access to the same water source. This transfer 20 should be considered a "beneficial use" to the owner of the water 21 right.

Allocation of Conserved Water

7.380

- When a water right holder implements a permanent conservation
- practice, that water right holder should have the first opportunity to apply
- 3 for a water right to use available conserved water on additional land. If the
- water right holder who implements the permanent conservation practice
- does not exercise their right to irrigate additional land, the conserved water
- should be available to other water users in the basin. (17)

Leasing of Water Rights

- 1 We oppose the permanent sale of water rights to in stream use
- 2 because junior water users cannot be protected from injury arising after
- 3 the sale of water rights to in stream use. Leases, as opposed to sales, can
- 4 be broken if injury is discovered at a later date.
- 5 We are not opposed to transfers in character of the use of water rights
- 6 by lease for five years or less. This includes transfers of irrigation use to
- 7 in stream use. The transfer must be conditioned to prevent injury to all
- 8 existing water users. Water available for transfers to in stream use must
- 9 be limited to actual consumptive use, and shaped to mimic/resemble
- 10 customary use within the stream system during the irrigation season.
- 11 Leasing programs should allow temporary leases for other agricultural
- 12 39 uses. (03)

Water Resources Commission

7.400

The Water Resources Commission should be composed of ten commissioners, one of which should be appointed by the Governor and the remaining nine of which should be elected by the qualified voters of each of the nine districts. Such districts should be composed of four counties having at least one border in common with one or more other county within such district. The designation of the counties which should form the nine districts should be determined by the Secretary of State. The elected commissioners should serve for three-year terms following the establishment of the initial commission whose members serve for one, two and three-year terms. Those elected commissioners receiving the greatest percentage of votes should serve for three-year terms, those with the next highest percentage of votes should serve for two years, and those receiving the least percentage of qualifying votes serve for one-year terms in the initially established commission.

Place-Based Planning

7.425

We believe that in order to apply for a place-based planning grant, the application has to be signed off by a majority of the county commissioners in the affected counties in order to recognize the merit and value of the stakeholders.

Place-based planning should not overturn prior appropriation.

Place-based planning should prioritize the needs of water rights holders. (22)

Water Development

5

7.450

- 1 We support the sale of bonds by the Oregon State Treasury for
- 2 financing water development and land drainage projects. Funds should be
- 3 used to provide for modern technology, facilities for supplemental water,
- 4 recharging aquifers, development of semiarid lands and for domestic
- 5 water supplies. Such developments will stabilize and enhance the
- 6 agricultural economy and contribute to the wealth of Oregon and the 7 nation.
- B We support programs for water development to reserve suitable
- 9 upstream storage sites and for initiation of conservation to store water for

- 10 flood control; recreation; domestic; industrial and agricultural uses;
- 11 hydroelectric power; and to stabilize stream flow.
- 12 We seek necessary changes in laws and rules to expedite the building
- 13 of small scale reservoirs of 500-acre feet or less for the purpose of
- 14 retaining seasonal runoff to enhance stream flows, provide sources of
- 15 water for fire suppression, irrigation, and for wildlife enhancement.
- 16 In emergency low water years, minimum stream flows should be
- 17 suspended in favor of domestic and agricultural uses. OWRD should make
- 18 provision for livestock watering during times of drought if that water can be
- 19 delivered simply by opening a diversion until the livestock water pond has
- 20 sufficient water. (14)
- 21 We support reasonable, cooperative and scientific studies of
- 22 underground water supplies and the drilling and maintenance of
- 23 recognized monitor wells. In classifying a "critical groundwater" or
- 24 declaring a moratorium on groundwater development, these studies
- 25 should include data gathered from properly constructed monitor wells
- 26 funded and maintained by the Water Resources Department.
- 27 The state should provide funding for the information to adequately
- 28 manage Oregon's water. Livestock watering should be an exempt use
- 29 and be allowed in ditches, streams, and from groundwater as necessary
- 30 to support livestock operations. (02), (12), (16)

Section 208 of the Clean Water Act 7.475

We favor implementation of Section 208 of the Clean Water Act by the Oregon Soil and Water Conservation Commission and local Soil and Water Conservation districts, acting in coordination with the Oregon Department of Environmental quality and other appropriate state, local, and federal agencies. The Oregon Soil and Water Conservation Commission should take leadership in bringing together such agencies at the state level; Soil and Water Conservation Districts should take responsibility at the local level. A voluntary program with maximum local control should be realized, fulfilling the strategy and guidelines outlined by the State 208 Policy Advisory Group. Implementation should be initially examined under a voluntary program administered through the Soil and Water Conservation District. Regulatory control features should proceed with reasonable caution. We support the use of best management practices by owners as conclusive proof of compliance under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act.

We urge Farm Bureau members to participate in discussions, planning meetings and public hearings, and to exert their influence to whatever extent possible regarding this planning process.

We support the right of individual counties to develop their own Best Management Plan (BMP).

We support research and monitoring to determine the extent of 22 nonpoint source pollution. Agriculture must not be blamed as the sole 23 source of Non-point Source (NPS) pollution.

- Oregon's 208 Plan should not be more restrictive than the federal regulations.
- 26 The voluntary 208 program for Confined Animal Feeding Operations
- 27 (CAFOs) should be administered by the Division of Soil and Water
- 28 Conservation instead of the Department of Environmental Quality. Funds
- 29 should be provided for the program. If sufficient funds are not provided we
- 30 recommend the removal of all ordinances concerning animal wastes.

Water Quality 7.485

- 1 We support efforts to protect and/or improve the quality of our state's
- 2 surface and ground water, provided such point and non-point programs
- 3 are:
- 4 Based on sound science.
- 5 Management based and plan oriented.
- 6 Incentive based with minimal regulation.
- 7 Encouraged voluntary action.
- 8 Required to coincide with and minimize the effect on all uses.
- 9 Attainable, site specific standards that are based on the ability of the water body or system, if functioning properly, to achieve those standards.
- 10 Designed to protect private property and the owner's ability to economically use their land for agricultural purposes.
- 11 Designed to consider natural and background characteristics of each individual natural water system.
- 12 Based on the overall goal that each water body or system function in a proper and healthy manner given the system's potential, judged in light of natural conditions as well as current and projected land use.
- 13 Required to provide monitoring to measure each water body or system's progress or trend from an established baseline to a predetermined desired goal or condition necessary to achieve site specific water quality standards.

Landfill Impact on Water Quality 7.486

We oppose the expansion or the creation of landfills that will negatively and/or quantifiably impact the ground or surface water quality through

3 flooding, leaching and other means. (09)

Wildlife Fecal Coliform Study 7.490

1 We support requiring the US Fish & Wildlife Service and the Oregon

- 2 Department of Fish & Wildlife to conduct a study to determine the extent
- 3 to which wildlife on public and private lands, including refuges, contribute
- 4 to the existence of fecal coliform in the waters of the state. (01)

Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) 7.495

- 1 We believe that state CAFO regulations should closely mirror federal
- 2 regulations. Where state standards already exceed federal standards,
- 3 we oppose any changes to the CAFO program that significantly increase
- 4 the cost or reporting burden on producers beyond existing levels. (19)

Water Use Fees

7.500

We oppose all water use fees. But if one is initiated, we recommend that the fees be proportionately charged among all water users, including all state and public agencies and recreational users of water for consumptive and non-consumptive use.

Falling Water Charge

7.510

We oppose any Falling Water Rain Charge. (05)

Allocation of Water

7 525

We oppose any water allocations of any Bureau of Reclamation projects for uses other than those for which the project was authorized.

We support legislation that will prevent residential or urban development from restricting or reducing water available to commercial agriculture holdings established by water rights.

We oppose the automatic granting of water rights for domestic and recreational use for non-resource dwellings and other non-resource uses in resource zones. The burden of proof should be with the applicant to demonstrate that the additional water demands will not adversely affect neighboring agricultural or forestry practices within the same watershed or aquifer.

Municipalities should be prohibited from demanding increased instream flows to dilute industrial and human wastes to meet minimum pollution requirements. We oppose the transportation of water out of water sheds for non-agricultural use if it adversely affects agriculture.

Groundwater Priority Allocation

7.550

The groundwater priority allocation should be the same as presently established on surface water allocation.

The Water Resources Commission should have the authority to enforce the critical groundwater statutes.

In groundwater matters, prior water rights are all inclusive and damage to such should merit compensation furnished by the individual or parties causing such damage or loss.

Notification Requirements

7.575

Notification to all affected users should be required whenever the Water Resources Department intends to conduct a proof survey which

would have the effect of reallocating allotments from a water permit. Waterpermit holders should also be given the results of the survey.

Release of Impounded Water

7.600

We ask that the Army Corps of Engineers be required to give prior public notice of any sudden release of impounded water.

Pacific Northwest Water

7.650

We oppose the diversion of water out of the Pacific Northwest region.

Soil and Water Conservation

7.700

Soil and water conservation districts should be granted the 2 responsibility for reviewing and approving conservation and sedimentation 3 control plans related to nonpoint sources of pollution and soil erosion.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the Natural Resource 2 Conservation Service should use their resources to fund farm ponds and 3 storage as a priority project. (09)

Reallocation of Irrigation District Water Rights Lands 7.710

- When land within an irrigation district transitions out of agricultural
- production, the district should map the water to other agricultural land
- 3 within their district or transfer to junior agricultural water right holders within
- the basin.

8

Municipal Water Rights Permit Renewal

7.715

- 1 When cities renew their permit, they must prove that they need the full
- 2 extent of their water rights, and the unneeded water must be put back into
- the system for the next user.

Municipal and Industrial Waste Water Reuse 7.720

- We support the use of treated, reclaimed water for agricultural
- 2 purposes when the water is treated to a level that will not lower or degrade
- 3 the quality of the farmland on which it is applied. (06)

Fill and Removal Permit Requirements 7.750

No farm or farm operation should be assessed criminal penalties for 2 violation of the fill and removal laws. Civil penalties should be limited to no 3 more than \$100 per day for an alleged violation.

Agricultural fill or removal projects on private property that were assisted by the federal government prior to 1982 should be grandfathered including allowed maintenance without need for permits or any other interference.

Farmers or ranchers, attempting to carry out normal farm or ranching 9 operations, should not have to live in fear of state government 10 enforcement of fill or removal laws.

11 Farmers should be allowed to maintain historic waterways to continue 12 water flow to irrigation sites.

The local Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) representing 13 14 the private landowners should be given the same authority as the Oregon 15 Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W) regarding the waiver of fill or 16 removal permits or at least be given a mutual review process.

17 We support the retention of all exemptions for agriculture contained in 18 the 1999 Oregon fill and removal law (ORS 196.800 through 196.905).

19 If the exemptions are not fully retained, in the Oregon fill and removal 20 law, we will oppose the law as written.

A person engaged in activities customarily associated with agriculture 22 should not be required to obtain a permit in order to remove materials from 23 or add materials to an area defined as "essential indigenous anadromous 24 salmonid and/or other fish habitat." Activities customarily associated with 25 agriculture should be broadly defined to include, but not limited to the 26 following:

- 27 1. All agriculture activities described in 33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1);
- 28 2. Farm use activities described in ORS 215.203; and
- 29 3. Necessary repair and maintenance activities associated with 30 agricultural operations that occur on a non-annual or an infrequent basis.

When permits are required, the process to obtain them should be 32 simplified to reduce the time required to obtain a permit. More authority for 33 permit approvals should be granted to local jurisdictions.

We oppose the assumption by the State of Oregon of the Federal 35 Clean Water Act's Section 404 fill and removal program in a manner that 36 would remove or alter any agricultural exemptions from state or federal 37 law. (18)

38 We support repeal of statutory changes made to the Oregon fill and 39 removal law enabling the Department of State Lands, or any other state 40 agency, to obtain federal authority to administer permits under Section 404 41 of the Federal Clean Water Act. (02), (03), (04), (05)

Channel Management

21

31

5

We believe that the ban and restrictions on gravel removal and or 2 harvesting (i.e., dredging) should be revoked and the permitting process should be revised or simplified. Such permits should be issued on a time certain basis.

We urge local, state and federal agencies to conduct gravel bar 6 removal and rip-rap addition activities in Oregon's rivers to help stabilize the river banks, to preserve agricultural soil, to prevent water pollution by 8 land erosion, and to make the body of the river more usable to river traffic. We support legislation that will allow land owners bordering a stream to do what is necessary to protect the stream bank and to keep it from eroding the land.

We support the stabilization of the rivers within their existing banks and support the rights of farmers to maintain their drainage systems. We oppose any state or federal projects that would weaken the river banks, threatening local drainage systems and farmlands. (00), (05) (10), (Referred to AFBF, 2010)

Regulation of Drainage Districts and Irrigation Districts 7.765

1 Drainage districts and irrigation districts support important functions for 2 rural communities, including maintenance of agricultural land, flood control, irrigation, and public safety. We support the ability of districts to continue to maintain drainage and irrigation facilities for their members without burdensome state and federal regulation. Districts should be able to fully perform their necessary drainage and irrigation maintenance 7 functions consistent with their statutory obligations. In exercising these functions, the state and federal government should not force districts to regulate their members' operations or require their members to maintain 10 specific agricultural practices in order for the district to maintain their 11 drainage systems. (16) Districts should not have to accept liability for water 12 quality or quantity issues arising from discharges of stormwater into district 13 facilities from any source. Districts must be able to retain their Clean Water 14 Act exemption for irrigation return flow and agricultural stormwater. (18)

Fish Screens 7.770

We believe that the financial burden of installation, maintenance and replacement of fish screens, should be borne by the state, federal, or tribal government rather than the producers, if required by law or rule. (05) (Refer to AFBF)

Peak and Ecological Flows 7.790

The state should not make policy on peak and ecological flows that will prevent the storage of all available winter water. We recognize the need for balance between uses. Protection of peak and ecological flows should be based on aggregated peer reviewed science and analysis of each projects unique needs and benefits. (10)

Minimum Stream Flows 7.800

We support the concept of minimum stream flows as provided in ORS 536.310(7) and (8) which reads:

3 "The maintenance of minimum perennial stream flows sufficient to 4 support aquatic life and to minimize pollution shall be fostered and 5 encouraged if existing rights and priorities under existing laws will permit.

Watershed development policies shall be favored, whenever possible, for the preservation of balanced multiple uses. Project construction and planning with those ends in view shall be encouraged."

We support a change in the water resource policy which would provide 10 that support for human life, livestock, crops, etc., should have priority over aguatic life and in-stream water rights.

We cannot stress strongly enough that existing rights should receive 13 top priority over other rights including those of aquatic life.

The cost of establishing upstream impoundments or any costs 15 necessary to ensure these minimum flows, must be shared by all 16 beneficiaries in proportion to the anticipated benefits or value received.

17 Any agency applying for an in-stream water right should provide 18 environmental impact and economic assessment studies and these 19 should be subject to verification by independent scientific review and 20 verification if so requested by any citizen or resident of the state. Failure 21 of verification should preclude the granting of any such right. All previously 22 issued in-stream water rights should be subject to the same review and 23 should be adjusted to comply with the standards herein set forth.

Water Withdrawal from the Columbia River 7.825

7

9

11

12

14

8

10

17

19

We encourage the State of Oregon to beneficially withdraw the state's 2 allocation of water from the Columbia River for agricultural purposes. (09)

Wetlands 7.850

The state definition for wetlands should be the same as the federal 2 definition, and the local federal farm agencies should have the final say as to wetlands classification.

Any former wetlands that were Agricultural Stabilization Conservation Service (ASCS) assisted should be exempt from reconversion to wetland, as well as any area less than twenty acres. We encourage tax incentives or just remuneration for all other reconversions.

Only one designated government agency should be allowed 9 jurisdiction over wetlands administration.

When the owner of private land is denied agricultural use of 11 designated wetlands, the land should be automatically assessed at the 12 lowest value as long as the nonuse designation remains. The burden of 13 proof for a wetlands designation should be on and funded by the agency 14 that is responsible for the designation.

15 Owners of private wetlands should be able to mitigate wetland 16 conversion on an acre-for-acre or value-for-value basis.

We support a strong policy that the status of prior converted wetlands 18 should be maintained as long as the property owner wishes to do so.

We oppose any land converted with funding from government, NGO, 20 and non-profit sources, to wetlands, which reduces agriculture production 21 on a permanent basis. If lands are converted into a wetland, those lands 22 must have insect, rodent, and weed control as part of the program. (02),

- 23 (05) Nutrients, temperature of the water and water level must be
- 24 monitored. The conversion must not affect the character of the neighboring
- 25 properties. In addition, the wetland needs to be monitored for water-use
- 26 and cannot exceed the current water right. The landowner must submit a
- 27 public report annually.
- 28 (02), (05), (22)

8

Elk Creek Dam 7.900

We urge the continued federal funding for the completion of the Elk Creek Dam in the Rogue basin.

We also support funding for the Mill Town dam on Elk Creek in the 4 Umpqua Basin. (04), (07), (11)

Catherine Creek Dam

We urge that the Catherine Creek Dam decision be appealed.

We favor working with the Confederated Tribes in developing an 2 3 upstream impoundment or other improvements on Catherine Creek that 4 would be beneficial to both Union County and the Confederated Tribes.

7.910

Dam Removal 7.920

We oppose any attempt to remove or breach any existing dams in the 2 Pacific Northwest when such breach or removal would be detrimental to agriculture. Specifically increase in electrical power rates where USDA programs promote conversion of flood to sprinkler irrigating with 5 corresponding need for pumps. Loss of renewable hydropower would 6 have to be replaced with environmentally unfriendly coal fired or other 7 expensive generating plants.

We support the building of fish-friendly dams for agriculture, irrigation 9 storage, fish, recreation, flood control, hydroelectric power production, and 10 domestic water, and other beneficial uses for the local community, 11 including the completion of the Elk Creek Dam.

If a dam is to be removed, the public should not pay any destruction 12 13 tax or a fee. (01), (10), (11) (Referred to AFBF, 2010)

VIII. CHEMICALS

General Chemical Statement

8.005

The state chemical laws and rules must be built on a sound basis that 2 recognizes the general benefit to agriculture. (07)

Agricultural Chemical Liability

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

5

8.010

We support legislation exempting producers, who apply pesticides properly, from liability claims for environmental pollution.

Because federal or state regulatory agencies have the power to levy 4 fines and enforce the laws concerning agricultural chemical misuse, private citizens should not be allowed any monetary gains from the proceedings.

We urge that state and national legislation be enacted to:

- 1. Require that individuals or groups that file injunctions against the proper use of registered chemicals should reimburse farmers, timber growers, contractors, federal, state and county governments for all court costs, legal fees, financial losses and other costs that arise from an injunction if the injunction is shown to be unfounded or is overturned in a court of law.
- 2. Require a bond guaranteeing payment of aforementioned filing the complaint, in an amount to be set by the court and subject to review upon motion by defense counsel and increase in amount if the court finds appropriate after conducting a hearing thereon.
- 3. Compliance with federally approved label instructions should absolve farmers from liability claims of environmental pollution.

Chemical Use Criteria

Criteria used to establish or prohibit domestic and foreign use of an 2 agricultural chemical should be uniform and equitable.

We also oppose any system which is funded by a tax or surcharge on pesticides, farmer or farming operations. Any such system should be 5 funded from the General Fund so the cost is shared by all taxpayers. (10)

Agricultural and Forest Chemicals

8.040

Agricultural chemicals are an essential tool of agricultural production. 2 We support reasonable regulation of their use. We support an expanded 3 program to inform and educate the public on the need for agricultural chemicals and the protection against their misuse.

We believe implementation of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended, based on credible scientific information would benefit farmers, the environment and the public.

We support improved training programs on the proper handling and 9 safe use of pesticides. We believe that the EPA/state pesticide applicator 10 training and certification programs should be periodically upgraded to ensure they are a sound and effective source of training and information.

11

12

17

26

29

37

39

40

42

43

47

50

We support improved safety information on labels of agricultural 13 chemicals. Expanded information on labels concerning poison control 14 centers, medical information, worker protection and possible adverse 15 environmental effects will assist farmers to better protect themselves and 16 the environment.

We recommend that compliance with federally approved label 18 instructions should absolve farmers from liability claims of environmental 19 pollution. We support added training requirements to address dissipation 20 of chemicals (drift and volatilization) to the core pesticide training program. 21 Training should also include education regarding application timing to 22 prevent damage to non-target plants. This training should be prepared and 23 delivered by the Oregon State University Extension Service or a specific 24 program approved by the Oregon Department of Agriculture to insure 25 credibility.

To avoid the use of ineffective pesticides, we believe a labeling system 27 covering the date of manufacture; effective life and proper storage 28 requirements must be required.

We encourage continued research and development of pesticides 30 which degrade more rapidly, are less environmentally persistent and are 31 compatible with accepted integrated pest management practices. We 32 support the environmental and economical concept of integrated pest 33 management.

We support expanded biological pest control research to determine 35 where biological pest control measures can provide practical and feasible 36 substitutes for, and supplements to, chemical controls.

We urge that chemicals cleared for use on edible food crops to control 38 a specific pest be automatically cleared for control of the same pest on ornamental and other seed crops.

Provisions providing for experimental use, emergency exemptions 41 and state registration are particularly important until federal registration are completed.

We oppose any curtailment of the safe and proper use of agricultural 44 chemicals and drugs unless research and scientific data determine that 45 injury to health and wellbeing would result. We also request reevaluation 46 of previously canceled pesticides based on current scientific data.

We will work with and encourage the agricultural chemical industry to 48 present through its advertising a positive and professional image of 49 farmers and agriculture to the general public.

We oppose politically mandated buffer zones.

We support the use of vegetable oils as the base or carrier for 52 pesticides and herbicides and also in the development of practical 53 equipment for farm applications.

51

54

58

60

63

15

19

We recommend the agricultural chemical industry and agricultural 55 producers work with the appropriate state agencies to develop a durable 56 and safe container and an economical and logistically feasible plan for 57 reusable pesticide containers and for disposal of pesticide containers.

We oppose the inclusion of a "Private Right of Action" provision in the 59 statutes.

We support the use of maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) in 61 establishing drinking water standards for pesticides and urge that EPA 62 expedite the standard setting process.

No food product should be imported into the United States from 64 countries which allow the use of agricultural chemicals or pharmaceutical 65 products that the American farmer is prohibited from using. Food products 66 treated with agricultural chemicals in foreign countries should not be 67 imported unless those chemicals are registered for use in the United 68 States.

69 We support the use of approved pesticides for timber production 70 management. Landowners should be guaranteed the right to use approved management practices in forestry zones. (05), (10)

Pesticides 8.050

We support the use of pesticides as an essential tool of agriculture 2 and forestry. We support the American Farm Bureau Federation pesticide policy and the extension of that policy to Oregon State laws and 4 regulations. We support an expanded program to inform and educate the public using more positive terms, stressing the need for agricultural chemicals for the health and protection of our plants and animals.

We support reasonable legislation that does not require more records 8 to be kept than are required by the federal government for noncommercial 9 restricted use pesticide applicator for two years. These records should 10 only be released to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, and only after 11 a specific need their release has been demonstrated to exist. Reasons for 12 the release of application records from the noncommercial applicator may 13 include such things as illegal restricted use pesticide usage, pesticide 14 contamination of groundwater or a documented complaint.

We believe the existing means of tracking the sales and use of 16 agricultural pesticides in the state is adequate and we oppose any system 17 which identifies individual growers or farming operations or makes 18 available their pesticide use records to the public.

Any public "pesticide right to know" legislation would be inadequate 20 without a complete accounting of all pesticides used by every individual 21 household. Any legislation should also require a provision to insist that 22 anyone who purchases or applies pesticides should meet the 23 requirements established for agriculture by FIFRA, WPS, EPA and the 24 State of Oregon.

25 We also oppose any system which is funded by a tax or surcharge on 26 pesticides, farmer or farming operations. Any such system should be 27 funded from the General Fund so the cost is shared by all taxpayers. (09), 28 (10)

Certification and Education

8.051

We support improved training programs on the proper handling and 2 safe use of pesticides. We believe that the EPA/state pesticide applicator training and certification programs should be periodically upgraded to ensure they are a sound and effective source of training and information.

We support added training requirements to address dissipation of 6 chemicals (drift and volatilization) to the core pesticide training program. Training should also include education regarding application timing to 8 prevent damage to non-target plants. This training should be prepared and 9 delivered by the Oregon State University Extension Service or a specific 10 program approved by the Oregon Department of Agriculture to insure 11 credibility.

12 We support an expanded program to inform and educate the public 13 using more positive terms, stressing the need for agricultural chemicals for 14 the health and protection of our plants and animals. (10)

8.052 **Pesticide Sales and Use Reporting**

1

5

14

18

We support an alternate paper reporting system for reporting pesticide 2 use.

We will only support extension of the Pesticide Use Reporting System 4 if all general public retail sales are also required to be reported in the system. (02), (06)

We support reasonable legislation that does not require more records to be kept than are required by the federal government for noncommercial 8 restricted use pesticide applicator for two years. These records should 9 only be released to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, and only after 10 a specific need their release has been demonstrated to exist. Reasons for 11 the release of application records from the noncommercial applicator may 12 include such things as illegal restricted use pesticide usage, pesticide 13 contamination of groundwater or a documented complaint.

We believe the existing means of tracking the sales and use of 15 agricultural pesticides in the state is adequate and we oppose any system 16 which identifies individual growers or farming operations or makes 17 available their pesticide use records to the public.

Any public "pesticide right to know" legislation would be inadequate 19 without a complete accounting of all pesticides used by every individual 20 household. Any legislation should also require a provision to insist that 21 anyone who purchases or applies pesticides should meet the 22 requirements established for agriculture by FIFRA, WPS, EPA and the 23 State of Oregon. (10)

Pesticide Labels

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

17

18

23

25

31

8.054

To avoid the use of ineffective pesticides, we believe a labeling system covering the date of manufacture; effective life and proper storage requirements must be required.

We support improved safety information on labels of agricultural 5 chemicals. Expanded information on labels concerning poison control centers, medical information, worker protection and possible adverse environmental effects will assist farmers to better protect themselves and 8 the environment. (10)

The Food Quality Protection Act

All legislation that requires review of chemical exposure risks should incorporate the following elements:

- 1. Ample time for data collection, including a use pattern, application rates, and other relevant exposure rates.
- 2. An allowance for minor crop uses:
- 3. A top priority for streamlining the Section 18 registration process so products are quickly and readily available for emergency use;
- 4. Incentives for registrants to register new products and reduced risk products for minor crop, food and non-food uses; and
- 5. A requirement that growers are consulted prior to the cancellation of chemicals used in agriculture.

12 USDA must be an active partner in the regulation of chemicals in 13 agriculture.

USDA must be encouraged to continue working as an advocate for 15 farmers by collecting and disseminating essential chemical use and 16 residue information, especially for the minor crops, both food and nonfood.

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and other advanced crop 19 protection techniques help to reduce overall chemical use. IPM programs 20 are weakened when chemicals that target specific pests are lost. The EPA 21 and USDA should consider the impact on lost IPM use when deciding 22 whether or not to reregister a product for agricultural use.

Research must be promoted that accurately identifies exposure risks 24 to consumers of food and other horticultural products.

Implementation of any food quality regulations must rely on accurate 26 and adequate scientific data which precisely quantifies the risk exposure 27 levels and the benefits of agricultural products. New regulations should not 28 be implemented until all available scientific information and use data are 29 collected and evaluated. Any statutory deadlines deemed unreasonable 30 should be changed.

We support legislative solutions to ensure the availability of minor crop 32 use pesticides. These solutions should include, but not be limited to, 33 expanded IR-4 activities, tax credits to registrants who maintain these 34 uses, and reduced third party registration liability.

Purple Loosestrife Control Research

We encourage the American Farm Bureau Federation to lobby for 2 federal funding for the Cornell Research Team to continue importation and 3 testing of biological control agents of Purple Loosestrife for release in the

5 We encourage the Oregon State legislature to provide funding to 6 continue biological and chemical control research and complete field surveys being conducted by the Oregon Department of Agriculture and 8 Oregon State University.

Chlorofluorocarbon Exemption

Agriculture should be given an exemption to the 1996 phase-out of 2 chlorofluorocarbons.

We encourage the retention and use of Freon or other feasible, 4 economical types of coolants.

Restricted Chemicals 8.080

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

Provisions should be made for the use of restricted chemicals when 2 no effective alternatives are available. Protection of food production and forestry resources should have priority over limited environmental consideration.

We support reasonable regulation of restricted chemicals, but 6 restrictions should be based on residue and toxicity rather than for use on specific crops.

Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration (RPAR)

In order to establish an orderly manner of reassessing and re 2 registering agricultural chemicals, and to develop and maintain an adequate number of these same chemical tools necessary to agricultural production, we support Oregon's RPAR Response Team by the following action:

- 1. Notifying our county Farm Bureaus and through them our county Farm Bureau members of the eminent danger of loss of use of agricultural chemicals posed by EPA through the established RPAR process.
- 2. Request development of an active program of communication with EPA, our Congressional delegation, and our RPAR team (This means at least 5 copies of each letter).
- 3. Obtain all possible media publicity on the plight we face should EPA not adopt a reasonable attitude on RPAR.

15 We urge that the burden of proof in support of, or in opposition to, use 16 of agricultural chemicals be placed upon the scientific community and not 17 upon individuals, as hearings continue for RPAR.

Food Quality

7

8

16

17

18

19

23

26

29

We support the production and marketing of pure, wholesome food. 2 Modern agriculture cannot continue to provide sufficient quantities of high quality food, fiber and other agricultural products to meet the nation's 4 needs without the judicious use of agricultural chemicals and drugs. Any 5 undue curtailment of the safe and appropriate usage of these products will 6 result in lower quality and/or quantities of food and fiber at higher costs to consumers.

8.100

In any evaluation of chemicals and drugs, the possible detrimental 9 effects must be considered in relation to the benefits derived. We support 10 the establishment of sound research criteria for the range and dosage 11 levels to be tested, the replication needed for valid results, the use of 12 animals as subjects in the research and the determination of applicability 13 of the results to humans. A direct correlation between artificial exposure to 14 carcinogens and ill effects, as compared with natural exposure, should be 15 proven before an additive is deemed unsafe.

All legislative and regulatory decisions on food irradiation should be based on valid research including safe levels of usage on food products. Irradiation should be defined as a food process and not a food additive.

We support legislation to require qualified people to prepare and 20 publish in advance of final rulemaking an agricultural cost benefit analysis 21 statement on proposed regulations having a significant effect upon 22 agricultural producers.

We support uniformity in pesticide residue standards. States should 24 not be allowed to establish residue tolerances which differ from those set 25 by the federal Environmental Protection Agency.

Pesticide residue tolerances established for imported raw and 27 processed agricultural commodities should be identical to those set for 28 domestically produced agricultural commodities.

We encourage increased frequency of the USDA inspection of foreign 30 raw produce imports to guarantee chemical use safety and equality.

31 We support legislation to create a study commission of highly 32 competent, non-crusading scientists to conduct an in-depth study of the 33 current situation regarding the detection and assessment of carcinogens.

Medical History and Pesticides

We actively seek a mandate from EPA (and other decision-making 2 agencies) to study the medical history and background of users and their 3 families as a part of the data assessed in determining the safety of 4 pesticides (both those currently being used and those pesticides which 5 have a history of use within the past 15 years).

Industrial and Municipal Waste 8.300

We support the need for reasonable legislation for developing proper disposal methods of solid wastes.

The producer of municipal or industrial waste should provide disclosure (i.e. "truth in labeling") on all waste products applied to all lands.

We oppose the placement of municipal bio-solids on agricultural land unless applied in a safe and appropriate manner that includes involvement of both local and state agencies and notification of neighboring landowners.

Bottle Bill Law 8.320

We support the Bottle Bill being expanded to include all glass, plastic, and aluminum carbonated and non-carbonated beverage containers and increase the deposit to 10 cents. (06)

Recycling of Pesticide Containers 8.330

1 Empty pesticide containers made of plastic or steel that are one gallon 2 or larger and that are triple rinsed on the farm should be returnable to the 3 dealer of origin or other disposal and recycling sites that have a controlled 4 access.

We support the efforts in cooperation with the Oregon Agricultural Chemical Association and the DEQ in the voluntary program to get empty pesticide containers off the farm.

Air and Water Pollution 8.400

Water and air pollution are serious problems affecting farmers and rural communities. Extensive research and education are important in the development of practical private, local and state programs of abatement. Emphasis should be placed on mutual understanding of the relationship between agricultural operations and water and air quality.

We support maintenance of the agricultural exemption in the Air Pollution Act, and the abolishment of DEQs proposed inspection and maintenance program.

Federal Section 319 Fund Advisory Committee 8.405

We support the appointment of an advisory and review committee by the Environmental Quality Commission. The committee should be composed of potential non-point source pollution stakeholders to review, evaluate, prioritize, and make recommendations to the department and commission on all Section 319 grant applications.

Underground Storage Tanks 8.410

- The Underground Storage Tank (UST) State Insurance Fund should be funded by:
- Generators of hazardous waste materials;
 - 2. The oil over charge refund revenues, and
- 5 3. Fees on underground storage tanks.

4

- The state should create the option of supplementing or supporting private insurance companies as an incentive to encourage private insurance to offer this coverage.

 Proper tank installation ought to be assured by passing a DEQ certified inspection. Installation should not be restricted to a licensed
- 11 contractor.

IX. FISH & WILDLIFE

General Fish & Wildlife Statement

9.005

The state fish and wildlife laws and rules must be built on a sound 2 basis that recognizes the general benefit of business and encourages 3 individual enterprise. (07)

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODF&W) 9.010

ODF&W is encouraged to recognize the vast scope of high quality fish 2 and wildlife habitats on private lands, the natural resource stewardship of 3 private landowners and managers and the property rights associated with 4 both ownership and resources management reserved to private lands. 5 Landowners are recognized as full and equal partners in resource 6 management policies that are adopted by resource agencies and ODFW ensures appropriate cooperation in the implementation of these programs. 8 (17)

9 We are opposed to ODF&W having the authority to require a private 10 landowner to adopt a wildlife management plan in exchange for the 11 approval of a building permit. (04), (08)

Fish Hatcheries

7

5

9.030

We believe that the State's fish hatchery program is an important and necessary tool in the process of recovering and protecting our region's salmon and steelhead. Sound hatchery management will have a more positive than negative effect on our region's fish.

Excess fish returning to hatcheries should be used in a manner that 6 helps with the State's efforts to protect our fish populations or provides recreational opportunities for Oregonians.

Excess fish should be used to support the hatch box programs, 9 introduce fish to waters without populations or allowed to spawn naturally 10 in the water they have returned to.

Excess salmon should not be killed other than for egg and spawn 12 harvest or for scientific purposes. (00), (09)

Elk Production and Sales

9.040

We support the raising and selling of domestic privately owned elk, 2 deer and buffalo and the products resulting from the production of such 3 animals, except in cases where the USDA/APHIS, Oregon Fish & Wildlife, 4 or Oregon Department of Agriculture have issued an import/export 5 moratorium. (00), (02), (08)

Game Animal Transplanting 9.050

A moratorium should be instituted on the transporting and 2 transplanting of big game animals until new guidelines can be established

3 from an impact study by representatives of the livestock industry, the U.S.

Forestry Service, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the 5 Oregon Department of Agriculture.

We support requiring health inspections on all game and non-game 7 wildlife, including avian species moved interstate or intrastate, including movements by state or federal agencies.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife should be required to 10 meet the interstate health laws for domestic livestock and the introduction 11 or reintroduction of game animals should not reduce the allotted Animal 12 Unit Months (AUMs) for private livestock producers that use public lands.

Domestic Sheep 9.075

All sheep (ovine) privately owned and in production should be 2 classified as domestic and private property and accorded full protection in 3 accordance with the law, except in cases where USDA/APHIS has issued 4 an import permit stating a different classification.

Game Animal Numbers 9.100

Population levels of large game animals, predators, and other wildlife 2 numbers are the result of rules and programs designed to achieve state and/or federal management objectives. When damage occurs to or on private lands due to the number of game animals, predators, and other 5 wildlife, the land owner should be compensated. (09), (17)

Hunting and Fishing License Cost

Hunting and fishing licenses be at a price that all can afford to buy 1 2 them.

We support allocation of sufficient General Fund dollars to the Oregon 4 Department of Fish and Wildlife so that the department is not overly reliant 5 on hunting and fishing fees to fund their management program. (15)

Closure of Hunting Season 9.120

State or Federal Wildlife departments should not be allowed to close 2 an entire hunting season on game animals or birds because of a 3 subspecies' low population when natural processes are the predominate 4 cause for the loss of the subspecies. (04)

Hunting Tags 9.125

1

People who live and/or work in in their prescribed local hunting unit 2 should receive first preference upon ODF&W issuance of any hunting tags 3 before those individuals who do not live and/or work in their prescribed 4 local hunting unit. ODFW is encouraged to issue unallocated tags to 5 hunters listed on landowner permission forms prior to making them 6 available to other hunters. We request removal of the legal limitations that 7 prohibit landowners from taking more than one elk per year. (17)

Wildlife Refuges

9.130

- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be required to plant or
- 2 maintain adequate acreage of crops suitable for winter feed for wildlife on
- 3 all National Wildlife Refuges.
- 4 Any water used should be obtained without adversely impacting
- historical uses of or creating a precedent for water.
- We propose that the funds from the Pittman Roberts Act be used to
- seed refuges for the feeding of the wildlife and waterfowl. (04)

Goose Depredation Plan

9.140

In order to implement an effective plan to reduce the amount of damage done to agricultural products by geese, all seven of the following points must be put into effect:

- 1. The goose population must be reduced so that there are fewer geese on agricultural land.
- 2. Take maximum advantage of statewide hunting opportunities of geese. We must maintain hunting at a level that will allow effective hazing of geese on agricultural lands.
- 3. Refuges should be farmed to grow crops that will attract and feed the waterfowl population and must be maintained at optimum levels to attract geese away from agricultural land.
- 4. Stable funding must be provided to USDA/APHIS Wildlife Services to help alleviate damage cause by geese.
 - 5. There should be a compensation program that reimburses producers for lost crop yields. (03), (04), (09)
- Non-migrating/resident geese should be exempt from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. (10), (Referred to AFBF, 2010)
- That the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife identify and recognize the different areas in the state that are having goose damage and develop a specialized plan for control of those geese that can include adding a hunting season for the area of damage outside of the eight hunts now. Also, ODF&W is to work with the Federal program to allow the additional hunting seasons. (17)

23 24 25

27

31

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We support the increased hunting of resident geese by adding an 26 additional hunting season. (05), (07), (09), (10)

We recommend to ODF&W to begin the Goose Hunting Season in the 28 fall when the birds start arriving no later than the opening day of Duck 29 Season which is around the middle of October. Hunting shall be allowed 30 every day during hunting season. (15)

Oregon and Federal Fish & Wildlife design a landowner preference 32 tag program similar to the one for deer and/or elk that can be used by 33 farmers and ranchers throughout the state.

Predator & Predatory Animal Management 9.200

Predator and predatory animal management must be an essential part 2 of an overall wildlife management program to maintain a reasonable compatibility with other wildlife, to reduce livestock and crop losses, and 4 for the public interest, health and welfare including control of rabies and other diseases that may be transmitted to humans.

Property owners should be allowed to haze or take action to eliminate predators and predatory animals before they cause damage.

The keeping of recognized breeds of Livestock Guardian Dogs that 9 are used specifically for predator and predatory animal management is an acceptable farm practice. Livestock Guardian dogs should be officially included in statute as a farm animal.

We support the supervised use of chemical toxicant as part of a 13 management program and request that research be conducted to find 14 additional new methods for control. Financing for research should include 15 appropriations from the federal government, state general fund, game fund 16 and counties.

17 We support an amendment to the rodent control law to authorize 18 county governments to establish rodent or predator control districts. (05)

19 It is at the animal owner's discretion if they want to have any additional 20 health care exams or treatments when they only want to have vaccinations 21 given to their animals. (15)

We oppose any efforts to impose any restrictions on the take or 23 manner of take of predators or predatory animals. (21)

Authority over Predator Management 9.201

- 1 Management of predators must remain under the Oregon
- 2 Department of Agriculture. (21)

Cougar Hunting

7

8

11

12

9.205

We support the use of dogs to assist in controlling cougar numbers 2 where a perceived threat to livestock or humans occurs. (03)

Animal Damage Control

9.210

Landowners possess constitutionally protected rights to prevent 1 2 damage to private land from wildlife belonging to the state or federal government. We recognize that certain management programs are being 4 conducted to reduce wildlife depredation to private land. We request 5 legislation requiring the respective authority entrusted with the control of 6 wildlife, including endangered and migratory species, that ensures implementation of effective methods to prevent damage. Non-lethal 8 control measures, including, but not limited to, hazing, fencing, or planting 9 lure crops, while often available to landowners are the primary 10 responsibility of the respective agency to implement at their own cost. 11 When damage cannot be avoided, the respective agency must provide 12 depredation or damage permits directly to the landowner in numbers 13 necessary to remedy damage and that are to be used at the landowner's 14 discretion. We request removal of the legal limitations that prohibit 15 landowners from taking more than one elk per year.

We encourage and support efforts to meet with the Oregon Fish and 17 Wildlife Commission for control and management of wildlife.

Upon request, any landowner should be supplied with a complete list 19 of hunters available to assist landowners with wildlife control efforts 20 through the damage program. When property damage occurs that cannot 21 be addressed through control efforts on private land, ODF&W is 22 encouraged to use their authority to conduct emergency hunts within an 23 identified boundary suitable to address the damage, including public land 24 if necessary. All permits issued under an emergency hunt, including those 25 provided to a landowner, should be available for use anywhere within the 26 hunt boundary irrespective of ownership but on private lands only with the 27 permission of the landowner.

Any demand from ODFW for compulsory public access to private 29 lands, including in exchange for the issuance of damage or kill permits, is 30 an impermissible diminishment of landowner rights to protect private 31 property. Kill permits should be assignable to any designated wildlife 32 control agent of the landowner. ODFW retains the responsibility to retrieve 33 and dispose of carcasses from control efforts unless prior alternatives are 34 made with the landowner.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture should maintain control of the 36 Animal Damage Control (ADC) Program.

When publicly funded, USDA Wildlife Services equipment (traps, 38 snares, large bear/ cougar traps etc.) are properly set to remove 39 dangerous/ damage causing animals and are vandalized, damaged or 40 destroyed, the state shall prosecute those responsible or act to protect 41 both public and private interests. (15), (17)

42 We support direct compensation for the economic losses in 43 agricultural production and forestry from damage caused by wildlife. (22)

Wildlife Overlay Zones

- We oppose any designated wildlife overlay zones and their resulting 1
- 2 limitations on property rights to protect wildlife habitat in wildlife overlay
- 3 zones and corridors. When wildlife overlay zones are designated, a
- 4 management plan that involves and is supported by the landowners,
- 5 neighboring landowners and producers that are impacted by the
- overlay zone will be developed with the wildlife management
- agencies whether state or federal or both to manage the wildlife in that
- zone. (17)

16

18

28

35

37

- ODFW is encouraged to recognize the constitutional rights to hunt and fish and critical conservation role of the private landowner on property under their ownership.

The primary focus and consideration of the Landowner Preference (LOP) program should be to recognize that landowners provide quality habitat for the State's wildlife and not to address wildlife depredation.

There should be no restrictions for assigning LOP tags. Private 8 landowners should be allowed to designate preferred non-family persons to obtain landowner preference tags to be used on landowner's property.

10 We request legislation that would allow a LOP tag to be used in any 11 open season while adhering to the bag limitations and other restrictions of 12 each particular season.

13 The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W) should be 14 required to return to the traditional rule of requiring a minimum of 40 acres 15 for landowner preference tags throughout the state and to refrain from 16 making rules which violate the constitutional right of a portion of the 17 citizens of the State of Oregon. (17)

Animal Unit Months Allocation Ratio and Game Numbers 9.230

We support a program to establish game herd numbers and a 2 reasonable animal unit month allocation ratio, which does not damage private or public rangelands. (04)

The ODFW Commission must consider private land uses and the damage that can be done on public and private lands by game animals when setting hunting seasons and bag limits. ODFW should be limited in calculating available forage to public lands. (17)

Wolf Hybrid Registration

4

11

12

We support legislation to require the registration of all canine with wolf 2 blood, either raised in Oregon or brought into the state, and to require such

9.250

3 animals to be tattooed for permanent identification.

If a canine with wolf blood is caught by a trapper or shot by a hunter, 5 the trapper or hunter should not be in violation of the Endangered Species 6 Act. (07)

Grav Wolf 9.255

We support the removal of Gray Wolf from the Oregon Endangered Species list and the federal Endangered Species List and we oppose any efforts to create a Gray Wolf recovery plan. (18)

However, as party to the wolf conservation & management plan, we 5 support a wolf control management plan to facilitate the federal and state delisting of the Gray Wolf. Within 12 months of when criteria are met, the state should honor its agreement to delist the Gray Wolf statewide. Additionally, any plan should include the opportunity to compensate 9 livestock owners for economic losses from wolves and should allow 10 livestock owners the ability to take wolves on public lands and private property that are a threat to humans and/or domestic livestock.

We support allowing the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to 13 manage wolves in Oregon using lethal and other methods. (04), (05), (07)

Policy No. 9.260, Oregon Wolf Management Plan, was combined with 9.255 (07)

Trapping 9.275

We support the use of trapping for subsistence, recreation and predatory animal control, including the use of leg holding traps, snares, livestock protection collars, and other methods. We support having no trap check interval for the unprotected and predatory animals, but if there has to be one, that it is no less than 76 hours. We support a trap check interval of not less than every 48 hours for furbearing mammals and support the removal of all trapped animals when traps are checked. For killing traps and snares, we support a trap check interval of no less than 30 days.

Special Designation

9.300

We oppose any policy that requires protected areas on private land and forbids any farming and/or forest operation in such area. (04)

Horse and Burro Management

9.350

We support repeal of the Federal Wild Horse and Burro Act. We support the repeal of the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. Further, all public land agencies with horses and burros, be they wild, feral or abandoned domestic, on their districts should be required to maintain herd numbers no greater than set forward in their most recent management objectives. (09), (Referred to AFBF, 09)

If wild horses and burros are found to be contributing or causing rangeland health standards to be exceeded within Bureau of Land Management/Forest Service grazing allotments and wild horse and burro populations exceed applicable management objectives, the Bureau of Land Management/Forest Service should be required to reduce herd levels to management objectives before it may require any changes to livestock grazing management. (15)

Feral Pigs

9.375

We oppose the importation of feral pigs into Oregon for the purpose of stocking hunting ranches and we support the eradication of existing stocks of feral pigs. (06), (07)

Endangered Species Act

9.400

We support a regional approach to achieving sustainable native fish stocks in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Plans of action must be socially, scientifically and economically verifiable in order to be effective and implemental. All planning must be sensitive to management practices initiated by irrigated agriculture that is intended to protect fish habitat. We support reform of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to prevent creation of incentives to sue and recover attorney's fees on issues that the federal

8 government and communities are working to address. We support a prohibition on citizen suits to enforce the Endangered Species Act when 10 the federal government or communities are actively working to meet their 11 obligations under the Endangered Species Act. We also support 12 limitations on the entities that can recover fees under the Endangered 13 Species Act, including limitations related to the value of the assets of non-14 profit organizations who seek attorney fees under the act and a cap on the 15 amount of fees and hourly rate an entity may receive. We also support 16 the creation of legislation that requires those seeking attorneys' fees to win 17 on each claim prior to being able to recover any funds for any lawsuit. We 18 also support the creation of legislation that requires individuals or groups 19 to post a bond if their lawsuit will have an effect on producers. We support 20 continuing to keep pressure on agencies and the DOJ regarding misuse 21 of ESA citizen suit provisions. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16). Cost 22 effectiveness of implementation of plans is essential to obtain long term 23 positive results. Local participation in the planning process is equally 24 essential.

We support the protection of any sea going threatened or endangered 26 fish species by enforcing a 200-mile limit on any foreign fishing vessel.

25

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

The national and Oregon Endangered Species Act should be amended to provide that:

- 1. Listing a species as endangered shall be upon an endangered basis alone, and not on the basis of "rarity";
- Encroachment upon economic agricultural or silvicultural practices should be prohibited;
- 3. Proof of species endangerment should be upon the petitioner or the Department of Fish and Wildlife and not on the general public;
- 4. A person proposing an animal or plant's designation as an endangered species should be required to post a bond for damages incurred by a land owner if the species is subsequently not found to be endangered;
- 5. The state and federal government should be strictly liable for any and all injuries or damages to property caused by, or in any way, arising out of the allocation or re-establishment of an endangered species, especially carnivores such as wolves and bears;
- 6. Before the Endangered Species Act may be used to enjoin any public or private activity, the party seeking the injunction should post a bond with the court in the amount of three times the estimated damages that may result to the enjoined person or entity from the issuance of such injunction.
- 7. Scientific data supporting the inclusion of a species should receive wide dissemination to landowners and private organizations which represent the rights of landowners;
 - Where there is a conflict, human need for food and energy should have priority over the protection of endangered species;

9. Endangered species should be taken or removed from private lands if it is causing damage to private property, or if payment of compensation for the damage is not allowed by the state or federal government;

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87 88

89

90

91 92

94

95

- 10. If endangered species are transplanted into other areas by the Department of the Interior or Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, that the act does not provide endangered species protection or prohibit insect control in the area of transplanting;
- 11. In an area where an endangered species has not been sighted for two years, the area should be withdrawn as a designated habitat;
- 12. An economic impact study should be required of all actions taken under the Act that would perpetuate the existence of an endangered species;
- 13. Any agency, organization or person requesting a rare or endangered species classification to be placed on species or requests a critical habitat designation should be required to:
 - a) Provide and fund an environmental impact report with emphasis on the economic impact of the action;
 - b) Conduct a DNA analysis on the proposed species to be introduced to ensure that it is qualified as a unique, genetically pure species.
- 14. Before a fine is levied against a landowner for causing the death of an endangered species animal a scientific necropsy (to be paid for by the fining agency) should be conducted by an independent lab or fish biologist to determine the exact cause of death. Written results of the findings should be made available to the alleged violator. Inconclusive or suggestive results should not be used as a basis for fines.
- 15. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act should not be applied to federal insurance programs, such as the National Flood Insurance Program and crop insurance programs. The Endangered Species Act should be amended to expressly not apply to federal insurance programs and those programs should be made nondiscretionary for purposes of the Endangered Species Act. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16)
- 16. We support the use of the 4(d) rule at the time of listing a species as threatened, to protect farmers and ranchers from "take" lawsuits. (18)

We oppose label restrictions on essential agricultural pesticides for the 93 protection of endangered species when such restrictions jeopardize agricultural production.

Until effective and economically affordable alternative chemicals or 96 methods of control are approved and are available for use; label 97 restrictions under the proposed plan are premature and should be 98 withdrawn.

99

107

110

112

116

We oppose the introduction or reintroduction of endangered species, 100 wolves and bears on public and private lands or the spread of these 101 animals outside of experimental population areas. We encourage counties 102 to develop ordinances that would prohibit such activities. In addition, 103 animals and their subsequent offspring from experimental programs 104 should not be classified as endangered when they escape the 105 experimental area. We support laws that would make it legal to take said 106 species that have wandered onto private lands.

We support the right of landowners to protect themselves, their 108 families, livestock and properties from all predators including bears, 109 mountain lions, wolves and those listed on the Endangered Species Act.

We support a program of landowner/operator compensation for 111 protection given the endangered species.

Because a threatened or endangered species is deemed to be of 113 social value, no single industry or facet of society should be called upon 114 to bear a disproportionate share of the responsibility or cost of recovery. 115 (03), (05)

Any artificial reintroduction of anadromous fish stocks into state 117 waterways, previously stopped by hydro and irrigation dams should be 118 defined as artificial fish stocks and not considered endangered. (07), (09)

Removal of Species from Threatened and/or Endangered List 9.410

We petition the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife and the Oregon 2 Department of Forestry and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to remove the spotted owl from the threatened species list.

Efforts should be made to expedite the process of removing a species 5 from either or both the federal or state threatened or endangered species 6 list(s) when it is scientifically warranted. (09)

Marine Mammal Protection Act 9.450

We support amending the Marine Mammal Protection Act to allow 1 2 easier use of lethal control measures on seals and sea lions deemed 3 detrimental to protected fish species. Marine Mammal Protection Act 4 should not apply to fresh water in the Western states. (11), (Referred to 5 AFBF, 2011)

Grazing Fee Formula 9.500

We support retaining the present federal grazing fee formula, which is tied to cattle prices and other factors. We do not oppose reasonable grazing fee increases calculated within the formula.

Research of other types of grazing fee programs should be continued 5 as an appropriate option for the benefit of the grazing industry. Any 6 alternative to the Public Rangeland Improvement Act (PRIA) formula must consider all factors affecting a permit holder's ability to use the resource.

We encourage the establishment of a grazing fee formula on the basis 9 of economics and scientific principles for federal lands. We oppose an 10 administrative approach to reform federal land management without 11 congressional approval. We support the continuation of permit holder 12 advisory groups with the possible addition of two local members from the 13 general public in the affected areas.

Grazing Permit Applications

A federal or state land management agency should respond with an 2 affirmative or negative answer within 30 days after a grazing permit application is filed. If a successful applicant suffers economic loss due to delays on the part of a federal or state agency, the federal or state agency 5 should be held financially liable.

Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative 9.520

We endorse the national Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative for 1 2 private grazing lands and recommend that the American Farm Bureau 3 Federation also endorse the initiative. (05)

Range Improvement

9.530

We support appropriating sufficient funds to implement the Range Improvement Act. We support government agencies' efforts to increase

We recognize the value of prescribed burning as a tool of forest 4 (woodlands) and range management. (05)

Weed and Brush Control

3

6

11

9.600

We support aggressive legislation and management that will result in 1 2 more effective noxious weed and brush control.

State and local weed enforcement rules should be enforced.

We recommend public financing for control of priority noxious weeds 5 as determined by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

We support research by the State of Oregon and/or Oregon State 7 University and chemical companies for biological and chemical control of declared noxious weeds. The control of all noxious weeds should be 9 mandatory for each individual or government agency holding land within 10 the state.

It should be the physical and financial responsibility of the holders or 12 owners of confiscated and foreclosed property to maintain adequate weed 13 control and levels of activity to prevent reversion to non-managed 14 classification for wetland delineation.

However, we favor the ability of operator/landowners to commercially 15 16 cultivate and harvest plants normally considered to be noxious weeds. 17 Such persons should be responsible for containment of the plants. If the 18 plant is an "A" Class weed, the operator/landowners must work with the 19 local and/or state weed board. At the point when such commercial 20 cultivation ceases, the landowner should be financially responsible for the 21 eradication of the noxious weed on such land.

Weed and brush control provisions should be extended to artificially 23 created wetlands.

If the state of Oregon grants an easement across state lands, the 25 grantee shall maintain a noxious weed abatement program (along with a 26 performance bond) for noxious weeds within the easement as defined by 27 the Oregon Department of Agriculture and the County Weed Board, where 28 the easement resides.

All state and county road right-of-ways must be managed to prevent 30 the spread of weeds that cause economic problems for agriculture.

Before the state, a county, and/or a municipality purchases any 32 additional land, money must be budgeted and designated to maintain in 33 perpetuity the acquired land free of weeds that can move off site, (07), (09)

Any federal or state entity who funds a conservation program near 35 agriculture lands will be required to ensure that the land enrolled in the 36 conservation program has noxious weed control program ensuring that 37 weeds do not spread onto privately owned farm or ranch land.

We support rules that would require the use of only Oregon 39 Department of Agriculture Certified Weed Free Forage on all state lands, 40 including forests and parks.

41 An adequate percentage of gas tax be dedicated to road right of way 42 noxious weed control. (15)

Wild Bird Seed

Wild bird seed should not contain noxious weed seeds, unless the 2 seed is sterilized. Sterilization should be verified through germination testing by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

No Spray Signs 9.610

When a landowner places a "NO SPRAY" sign on a road or right of 2 way, the landowner should be responsible for controlling the weeds and 3 brush or for the damage they cause.

Crop Pollinators 9.615

We support and encourage the scientific community including Oregon 1 2 State University search for solutions to Pollinator Population decline. We 3 recognize the general benefit to agriculture of a healthy pollinator population. We encourage all farms to enhance pollinator habitat.

9.700

- We support legislation to require cooperative cost sharing on fencing
- 2 or the value thereof of a legal fence between adjoining land owners and
- between land owners and federal or state land only when necessary for
- control of livestock in an open range that becomes a closed range
- livestock district. Fencing required because of a change to a closed range
- livestock district, should be funded and maintained by the enforcing
- government agenda.

22

24

29

31

Unapproved Techniques of Fish Habitat Restoration

9.710

We oppose the building of unproven technology for fish habitat

improvement, where it has short and/or long-term negative impacts on downstream users. (18)

Fish Passage 9.720

We oppose the implementation of one size fits all fish passage 2 requirements on farm infrastructure on minor waterways and agricultural 3 drainage ditches. Specifically, we oppose ODFW's fish passage 4 requirements for tide gates and culverts where there is no proven 5 appreciable benefit to providing fish passage or where a non-fish passage 6 tide gate originally exists.

Where ODFW insists on fish passage, they should not specify 8 engineering requirements and they should only require benefit from the passage that existed with the current structure, not a new standard of fish 10 passage. Economic constraints should also be considered as part of the 11 project evaluation. (19)

12 We believe that the financial burden of permitting, installation and 13 maintenance of fish passage compliant tide gates shall be borne by the 14 state, federal, or tribal government rather than the producer.

Beaver Management

9.730

We recognize the potential ecological benefits of beaver for natural 2 water storage and fish & wildlife habitat enhancement. However, because 3 of potential conflicts between beaver activity and public & private land uses and infrastructure, we support ensuring that beaver management can continue to occur to protect agricultural lands and conservation projects from damage and ensure that flood waters do not infringe on 7 private lands and public infrastructure. We support classifying beavers as predatory animals on private lands to allow them to be excluded or taken without authorization from ODFW. Also, beaver removal is a 10 critical tool on public lands, including State & county roads, state lands, 11 and federal lands, which helps protect public and private lands and 12 infrastructure from beaver damage and flooding, and must be 13 maintained. We support state and federal programs that offer financial 14 and technical assistance to private landowners for beaver management, 15 mitigation, and removal. (20)

Essential Salmonid Habitat

9.740

- We support limiting essential salmonid habitat (ESH) to natural,
- perennial streams and ensuring that waterways that are part of agricultural
- ditch systems are not listed as ESH. If a ditch is erroneously listed as ESH,
- we support the landowner having a process to petition ODFW for its
- removal. (20)

- We support incentive-based management programs for landowners
- 2 for wildlife control measures if control measures have shown positive
- 3 results in the local area. (22)

X. COMMODITIES

General Commodities Statement

10.005

The state commodity laws and rules must be built on a sound basis 2 that recognizes the general benefit to agriculture and encourages 3 individual enterprise. (07)

Fair Market Competition

10.006

We oppose any legislation and or regulations that impose any burden, 2 financial or otherwise, on agriculture producers that is not required of all competitors, foreign or domestic, unless the cost of that burden is 4 reimbursed.

5 In addition, we seek repeal of, or reimbursement for, all existing 6 regulations that burdens agriculture producers, financial or otherwise, for 7 costs not required of all competitors, foreign or domestic. (07)

Agricultural Research

6

10

10.010

Agricultural research is essential for reducing costs, improving the quality of products, expanding markets and for more efficient processing and marketing methods, which benefits both producers and consumers. It is high priority for an expanded program of research projects to accomplish 5 these purposes.

We oppose closure or major change of any research station branch 7 until people in the affected area have a chance to evaluate the performance of the station and express their opinion. Funds for research 9 stations and their related work should have first priority.

We support the agricultural education and research program carried 11 out by Oregon State University and support expansion and funding of 12 those programs.

We request vigorous research to define and solve the problems of 14 agriculture. Each county Farm Bureau should be prepared to present facts 15 and figures to substantiate this need before the legislature, administrators 16 and the general public.

Definition of Livestock

10.015

We support a definition of livestock that means ratites, horses, mules, donkeys, cattle, llamas, alpacas, sheep, goats, swine, domesticated fowl and any fur-bearing animal bred and maintained commercially or 4 otherwise, within pens, cages and hutches. (19)

Animal Health and Plant Disease 10.020

We continue our support for accelerated livestock and plant disease 2 research. Emphasis should be placed on related human disease problems 3 and on methods to prevent the spread of livestock, poultry, and orchard 4 and crop diseases from farm to farm. Livestock, poultry, orchards and

5 crops which are destroyed because of disease should receive full

6 indemnification.

Brucellosis Programs

10.030

1 We support the findings of the National Brucellosis Technical 2 Association in regard to strengthening a National Brucellosis Program.

Use of Antibiotics

10.035

We support protection of the ability to judiciously use approved antibiotics on meat animals. We support allowing producers to work cooperatively with their local veterinarian to ensure appropriate and responsible use of antibiotics and to determine which antibiotics can be used and their recommended doses. (16)

We support an exemption for beekeepers from Veterinarian Feed Directive requirements. (16)

8

9 By Products from Food Production

10.037

- 10 We support the use of by-products from food production and food
- 11 services for animal consumption or soil amendments. Transportation,
- 12 storage, and use of these by-products should be exempt from waste
- 13 hauling laws. (20)

Veterinary Services

10.040

- 1 We support excluding the following practices from regulation as the
- 2 practice of veterinary medicine and establishing certification programs for
- 3 these practices: embryo transfers, pregnancy, sterility or fertility
- evaluations, equine dentistry, livestock chiropractic and massage, and
- 5 other practices determined by ODA. (19)

Animal Welfare

10.050

Proper care and welfare of livestock and poultry are essential to the efficient and profitable production of food and fiber. No segment of society has more concern for the wellbeing of poultry and livestock than the producer. This is best exemplified by the high levels of production and low mortality rates being achieved in modern livestock and poultry operations.

We oppose any legislation or regulatory actions which would tend to prohibit good poultry and livestock husbandry practices and increase the cost of food to consumers.

We support legislation that would make it illegal to secretly record and distribute videos of farms and punish those who take jobs on farms only to gain access to record how the animals are handled. (11)

12 It is the livestock owner's discretion if they want to have a vet treat 13 damaged livestock. If the authorities cannot reach the owner of the

14 livestock, then they may require a vet. (15)

- 15 We support defining "good animal husbandry" as normal accepted
- 16 practices for the management, training, and use within the state, region,
- 17 or community for the species, breed, physical condition and type of
- 18 animal. In determining whether a practice is "good animal husbandry,"
- 19 law enforcement is required to consult with veterinarians experienced
- 20 with the type of animal that is subject of the action and any local or state
- 21 industry groups that work with that industry sector. (17)

Service Animals at Farm Stands 10.055

- 1 Farm stands or any other entities selling food items to the public
- 2 should not be required to accommodate service animals other than
- 3 seeing-eye dogs. (14)

Theft of Farm Property 10.060

Prevention of crime, including theft, is a public responsibility. Law enforcement agencies must give more recognition and increased surveillance to increasing losses of farm property from theft. We urge that complaints be more vigorously investigated.

The taking of any agricultural item of less than a \$500 value from privately held farm lands without permission should be prosecuted under the shoplifting law, in addition to any possible criminal penalties.

We support legislation encouraging scrap dealers to keep transaction records which include the identification of sellers, in order to facilitate law enforcement efforts.

Illegal Killing of Domestic Livestock 10.070

The penalty for illegal killing of domestic livestock should be equal to or greater than the penalty for illegal killing of wildlife. We urge stronger measures to insure the enforcement of federal, state and local laws concerning the theft, molestation, or illegal killing of any type of domestic livestock and poultry. We further recommend that not less than the minimum penalties be given in cases of conviction. We urge that statutes providing penalties for livestock larceny be amended to include a higher minimum as well as maximum fines and sentences. We urge stiffer penalties for illegal killing of livestock.

Environmental Terrorism 10.075

We support full prosecution of persons involved in acts of terrorism against the natural resource industry on public or private land.

Pest Control Districts 10.080

We urge the establishment of pest control districts (e.g., fruit fly, apple maggot) in agricultural production areas, particularly when noncommercial producers are near commercial operations.

Truth in Menu

1 We support adoption of a truth in menu law.

Irradiation 10.095

The use of irradiation should be allowed in the food processing industry.

USDA Forecasting

10.100

10.090

We oppose the forecasting of all agricultural prices by the USDA.

Export Ban

10.110

We oppose any legislation that restricts the export of raw agricultural and forest commodities from private lands.

Market Negotiations

10.120

Strong marketing programs should be implemented to strengthen farmers' bargaining positions. Statute changes should be made to protect growers' associations from unfair business practices.

Third Party Grading

10.130

We support "third party" grading for agricultural commodities when it is requested by a majority of the producers delivering the commodity to a buyer or processing facility. The option for producers to reject state grading should be maintained.

We favor inspection of all potatoes and onions for human consumption in interstate and intrastate commerce. We request that potatoes and onions for fresh market be inspected at delivery for calculating payments to growers.

Marketing Orders

10.150

We support enabling legislation to formulate guidelines to allow commodity groups to establish state marketing orders.

For an agricultural commodity referendum to be valid, at least 50 percent of the registered producers should have voted with more than 50 percent casting an affirmative vote.

We support deletion of the acreage control part of marketing orders.

We do not support a federal tart cherry marketing order.

Agricultural Commodity Quotas

10.155

We oppose federal agricultural production commodity quotas. (01)

Marketing Development

10.160

1 We support market development programs to expand export sales of

2 Oregon farm products.

Trade with the ASEAN Countries 10.170

We favor the State of Oregon maintaining a Trade Counselor in Northern Asia and a Trade Counselor in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries to promote Oregon products and services.

Product Labeling

10.180

We aggressively support country-of-origin labeling for both domestic and imported agricultural commodities and an education program that helps consumers understand the difference in the quality and safety of foreign and domestic commodities.

Labeling must state in large, bold letters whether this exporting country does or does not have a safety and health inspection system comparable to the United States' inspection system for its own agricultural commodities. (00)

Imported Agriculture Products

10.190

Any commodity imported into this country, when the same commodity is under a price support by the exporting country, should not be sold for less than the market price in this country.

We support the legal action taken by the ranchers' and cattlemen's legal foundation related to fair trade violations by Canada.

Federal Farm Programs

10.200

The federal regulations governing the review and establishment of actively engaged Federal Farm Program determinations and personal determinations for those producers applying for Federal Farm Program benefits should be revised to require that such determinations be made only when a producer's projected benefits exceed \$25,000.

We support requiring cross compliance in all government farm programs.

When the US Secretary of Agriculture, the USDA, or supporting gagencies declare that an emergency or shortage exists in a program commodity (as defined in the 1985 Farm Act), farms with established bases for the short commodity should be allowed to increase their production acreage for that commodity and retain cross compliance on other program crops.

Establishing Wheat Yields for Government Wheat Programs 10.210

Wheat and/or feed grain yields for each farm should be updated each year. Support programs should be calculated on the actual production records from the past three to five years, or the county production average.

Catastrophic Crop Insurance

10.220

The purchase of Catastrophic Crop Insurance should be voluntary and not a requirement to receive crop deficiency payments.

Department of Agriculture

10.300

We recommend maintaining the Department of Agriculture as a principal agency of state government.

We support retaining the Agricultural Development and Marketing Division within the Department of Agriculture. As exports are vital to the economic wellbeing of agriculture in the state, we believe it is essential that this activity be maintained and identified with the Department of Agriculture.

We support any action that would limit the legislature from overriding a crop production decision made by the Oregon Department of

10 Agriculture or crop production decision made by the Oregon State

11 University Extension Service. (13)

Grass Seed Use

10.305

Federal & State agencies should continue to allow the use of nonnative grass seed varieties. (06), (09)

Product Liability

10.310

1 Consumers should be held responsible for their actions and decisions, 2 as well the producers and sellers of legal agricultural products. (02)

Policy No. 10.320, Product Promotion was added to Policy No. 10.325 in 2011

Farmers Markets

10.325

We support the concept of Farmers Markets and other opportunities for farmers to increase the marketability and profitability of their crops.

To protect commercial food producers from the spread of undesirable disease and pests, a grower outside a special district desiring to market produce inside a special district, should follow state ordinance recommendation spray guide for that area. (02), (11)

Internet Commodity Marketing

10.330

We support efforts of all agricultural commodity producers to market their goods over the internet.

Commodity Commissions

10.340

We favor product promotion by commodity commissions and other

2 organized commodity groups. We approve the use of grower assessments

3 by commodity commissions for only the promotion, production and

4 marketing research and protection of the commodity being assessed.

Commodity Commission money belongs to the growers and should only be used for the purposes for which it is collected.

We support the State of Oregon and the state universities recognizing 8 that commodity commissions, cooperatives, and agricultural associations 9 have legal rights to the intellectual properties that result from research 10 funded largely by commodity commissions, cooperatives, or agricultural 11 associations.

Commodity commission budgets and assessment rates should be 13 developed and adopted prior to the growing season so a maximum number of producers would have opportunity to participate.

12

17

20

24

26

6

7

If assessment rates do not generate sufficient funds to meet the 16 budget, the commission should adjust the budget accordingly.

We believe a commodity commission should be able to take action to 18 raise the assessment cap for that commodity only after notification has 19 been given to all of the producers currently being assessed.

A vote of the producers should determine increases in commodity 21 assessments. The commission should send a ballot to all eligible producers and a majority vote, as defined by the commodity commission's 23 bylaws, should prevail.

We oppose the use of Commodity Commission funds for political 25 candidate contributions.

We oppose Commodity Commission legislation that increases the 27 authority of any government agency with regard to the way commodity 28 commissions operate or function. We support a provision that would allow 29 individual producers, under specified provisions in the commission's 30 bylaws, to receive a refund of all assessments paid in the current calendar 31 year. (02), (08), (10), (11)

Oregon Agricultural Economic Competitiveness 10.350

We request that Oregon State University and the Department of 2 Agriculture research and determine the total added value derived from all 3 manufactured or processed agricultural commodities produced and sold 4 in this state. This total should be publicized as the agricultural contribution 5 to the Oregon economy.

The Oregon State Legislature should direct a study to assess the economic competitiveness of Oregon agriculture products within the US market on a regular basis. The study report should take into consideration 9 not only the external factors and pressures that have impact on our 10 farmers and ranchers, but also the overall regulatory burden on Oregon 11 agriculture entities, compared to other agriculture sectors in other states. 12 The reports should be presented to the legislature and be made available 13 to the public.

Milk Usage Audit Law 10.400

Although the Milk Audit and Stabilization Law has been terminated, 2 we favor keeping the law in case the need arises to administer it again.

We support the transfer of milk stabilization funds to the Nutritional Educational Services/Oregon Dairy Council for educational purposes throughout Oregon.

Raw Milk Sales 10.410

Raw milk production for sale should be regulated for food safety registration and inspection requirements. We oppose proposals that would require the pasteurization of all milk to be used in fluid or processed form. 4 (11) (12)

Dairy Products Minimum Standard 10.420

We support an increase in the minimum level of nonfat solids in fluid milk from 8.25 to 8.75 percent.

FDA Standards 10.430

We support regulations that do not allow nondairy substitutes to be labeled as dairy products.

We oppose any law and/or legislation that allow processors to add thickeners or any other nondairy products to low fat and nonfat fluid milk. (11)

Beef Check-off 10.500

We support the National Beef Check-off as it is presently (2014) administered. Any increase must be through the present program. We do not support increases to the Beef Check-off that would be administered separately under another program with its own administration cost. We continue to support beef Check-off charge exemption for calves selling for \$25.00 or less. (Referred to AFBF, 2014) (14)

Meat Inspection 10.510

We support the retention and expansion of small commercial meat packing facilities. We support increased funding for the retention and expansion of these facilities. We support a state meat inspection program.

All foreign agricultural imported products should be produced and transported according to US inspection standards.

Countervailing duty laws should be strictly enforced. (08)

We support actions that would encourage Indian Nations, located in Oregon, to construct and operate meat processing facilities for the benefit of both Oregon livestock producers and the Indian Nations. (13)

Protection of the Term "Meat" 10.513

We support prohibiting the use of commonly known and industry recognized "meat" terms in the labeling and advertising of all cell cultured tissue and plant-based alternatives. (18)

Horse Import Permit

10.514

We support horses to be classified as livestock or tools of husbandry and oppose being classified as pets or companion animals. (11)

Slaughter Houses

10.515

The application of federal and state meat and poultry inspection programs to custom slaughtering plants, locker plants and producer slaughters can have a serious and adverse effect on farmers. State law should provide for small-scale and portable slaughter houses for custom livestock processing and retail sales. We urge that the regulations governing these operations be reasonable so as not to limit the processing of meat for home use.

We favor investigating the possibility of dual federal meat inspection standards which would tend to alleviate problems encountered by the maller packing facilities.

We recommend there be state and federal regulations requiring the use of humane stunning methods before bleeding in all livestock and poultry slaughtering facilities. (08)

Livestock Auction Markets

7

8

9

11

12

10.520

10.530

Livestock auction markets are an essential part of our marketing system and must remain a part of our competitive free enterprise system. Standards and regulations, other than for safety, sanitation and animal health, should be reasonable so they do not create a hardship on small yards that perform a needed service to local communities. We oppose proposals to "franchise" auction markets that would limit or restrict the opportunity for an individual, organization or corporation to establish and operate livestock auction markets.

Identification of Livestock

We support the continuance of the existing hot iron branding, bangs and scrapie ID systems registered to the owner of the livestock. There should be flexibility in how animals are identified. Conventional ear tags, RFID ear tags and ownership brands should all be allowed.

We support the establishment and implementation of an animal dentification system provided:

- It is voluntary and market driven and enables participants in marketing organizations to take advantage of international markets without requiring the whole industry to individually identify their livestock:
- It includes financial and technical support for animal disease control and eradication;
- It can respond rapidly and effectively to animal health
 emergencies such as foreign animal disease outbreaks or
 emerging domestic diseases;

- 4. It protects producers from liability for acts of others after the
 livestock leaves the producer's ownership;
 - The program is economically feasible having an adequate costshare among government, industry, and producers. Total cost of an individual animal's identification and recording should not exceed \$5;
- 22 6. The premise ID number is only registered to the owner of the livestock, and is the same for all of the species that the owner must ID; and
 - 7. It has a well-run, well managed database that will benefit the industry and is controlled by the industry, not government. In addition, it is important that this database is not considered part of the public domain. A Premise ID database should not be subject to Freedom of Information Act. (04), (05), (06)

Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) 10.531

If Animal ID becomes mandatory it should be incorporated into a COOL meat labeling program. (06)

If a producer is in favor of promoting their product as locally grown, they should be able to do so, but it should not be mandatory. (16)

We oppose labeling of meat not born, grown and processed in the United States with labels that lead consumers to believe the subject

7 meat was born, raised and processed in the United States. (19)

Brand Inspection

18

19 20

21

25

26

27

28

29

10.540

We support continuation of the brand and ownership inspection programs to be administered by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

The Brand Inspection Department should develop a concise coherent plan designed to establish fiscal stability of the program.

We support a reciprocal agreement between states honoring the state of origin's brand inspection on cattle destined for a sale yard in a neighboring state for the period of time that the inspection papers are valid.

Loose Livestock 10.545

Livestock owners should not be cited under criminal law for animals that are loose through no fault of the owner. This should not relieve the livestock owner from paying for property damage done by the livestock. (11)

Payments to Growers

10.600

We support the licensing of dealers, priority liens, and bonding the act of merchandising to guarantee payments to growers for raw product deliveries. Legislation should take into consideration the uniqueness of participation contracts between growers and purchasers.

Oregon law should give agricultural producers immediate protection for the amount they are owed for their products. That protection should 7 extend until they are paid in full. Protection should be simple and 8 inexpensive to maintain.

9 It should be clear that a commodity covered by the grain producer's 10 lien continues to be covered by that lien regardless of whether the 11 commodity is a proprietary variety grown under contract or not and not as 12 an agricultural services lien.

Growers should be paid no later than 30-days from the time of shipment or in case of non-shipment within 10-months following the harvest year. (02)

This protection should apply to producers of all varieties and species of-seed. (16)

Disaster Payments

78

10.620

We support changing the natural disaster provisions to provide that the amount received by the producer reflects the loss of income due to lower crop quality and/or volume.

Bonding of Produce Wholesalers 10.630

1 We support the establishment of a prorated scale for the bonding of 2 produce wholesalers.

Central Filing of Commodity Liens 10.650

If central filing is implemented, information released must only pertain to whether a lien is filed on a particular commodity and the name of the lien holder. Information released should only be available to a lender or a purchaser of the commodity.

Cannabis 10.660

1 More restrictive cannabis laws should not be expanded to adversely 2 impact other agriculture. (15)

Cannabis, including both Marijuana and Industrial Hemp, is considered to be a legal agricultural crop under Oregon laws and as such should be afforded equal protections under state and county Right to Farm provisions. (16) The Oregon Farm Bureau advocates for the reclassification of Marijuana as a Schedule II controlled substance. (19)

We support changing the definition of industrial hemp from .3% delta-9 to a more standardized, 1% total THC. (19)

Hemp extracts, concentrates, and byproducts derived from legal hemp should be afforded the same legal status and protections as the hemp they originated from, and growers, handlers, processors, and those associated with bringing hemp to the marketplace should be held to the same transportation standards as other agricultural commodities. (19, 20) (Refer to AFBF)

We support regulation of the hemp industry that is in line with other agricultural commodities and standards. We support the creation of

- 18 industry standards by the hemp industry to ensure product quality. (20)
- 19 (Refer to AFBF)
- 20 We support Legislation that delineates industrial hemp grain and fiber
- 21 from cannabinoid floral hemp by definition and regulation, including
- 22 removing background checks and mandatory THC testing for industrial
- 23 hemp grown for grain, fiber or industrial seed production. (Refer to AFBF)

Certification of Field Crops

10.700

- 1 We are opposed to the use of any other criteria than varietal purity,
- 2 mechanical purity, varietal integrity, or germination in the granting of
- 3 certification to alfalfa and clover seeds grown in Oregon.
- 4 Any seed company offering seed for sale should have to include the
- 5 year the seed was produced, along with the other seed specification
- 6 information on the container.
- 7 OSU seed certification should strengthen its standards for the
- 8 modified land history program for perennial crops to require an additional
- 9 field inspection in the second year following establishment to maintain
- 10 varietal purity standards." (09)

Oil Seed Crops

10.705

- 1 We support the ability of the Oregon Department of Agriculture to
- 2 regulate the production of oilseed crops to protect other seed production
- 3 from weeds, disease, and insects. We are opposed to an
- 4 outright ban on oilseed production. (05)

Cross Pollination

10.706

- 1 Rules and guidelines in the Certified Seed Production Handbook 2 developed by Oregon State University that are used to prevent the cross
- 3 pollination of crops should be considered in any legislation adopted by the
- 4 Oregon Legislature that would govern the planting of crops.

Seed Trade Rules

10.710

We support legislation that recognizes the NORAMSEED Rules as the regulatory standard for the trade of seed for planting in Oregon.

Failure of a seed dealer to comply with these rules should result in the loss of their Oregon Department of Agriculture's Oregon Seed Dealer's License. (00)

Weed Control

10.712

- All owners of land in resource production areas (exclusive farm use, farm forest, etc) should be required to maintain a minimum standard of
- 3 weed control, including lands owned and managed by public agencies.
- Enforcement of non-compliance should be enforced using regulatory
- 5 structure including existing nuisance laws. (17)

Brassica Seed Crops

10.715

- 1 We support the ability of the Oregon Department of Agriculture to
- 2 regulate the production of brassica crops to manage seed production
- 3 regarding weeds, disease & pests. Regulation should be based
- 4 on the best available science and treat all species and subspecies the
- 5 same, unless unique pest, disease & weed aspects exist. Any system
- 6 used to identify fields must have accessibility for all growers. We support
- 7 pinning systems to adequately isolate fields for cross-pollination protection.

Technology in Agriculture

10.716

- 1 We support the development and utilization of new and existing
- 2 practices and technologies to benefit agriculture. These should include
- 3 but not be limited to biological, chemical, mechanical, genetic and organic.
- 4 We recognize the need for coexistence of diverse production practices and
- 5 methods and that all are important.
- 6 Biotechnology has been widely used for decades and is an important
- 7 component of production agriculture. New research for drought tolerance,
- 8 yield, disease control, insect tolerance and edible oil quality are but a few
- 9 examples of traits for a wide range of commodities including fruits and
- 10 vegetables and will be even more important in a world looking for more
- 11 food.
- 12 Biotechnology products should be approved for agricultural use only
- 13 after thorough research and deregulation. USDA should retain the
- 14 authority over this process.
- 15 We encourage all agriculture industries to distribute to all media
- 16 sources more understandable and visible information about the safety of
- 17 all approved agricultural products produced in Oregon and the United
- 18 States. (14)

Plant Breeding Programs

10.720

We favor a continued and expanded program of public plant breeding at both the state and national level with the release of foundation seed of the best new plant varieties to the general agricultural industry.

The USDA Research Service should reinstate their plant breeding program and release their varieties on a schedule to prevent monopolization of plant varieties.

Release of Public Seed Varieties

10.730

We seek a change in USDA policy to ensure releases of public seed varieties and that allow for the development of a check off system at the foundation project level for seed advertising and promotion.

Agricultural Burning

10.750

We support the continuation of necessary burning at the highest acreage level possible. We are opposed to any legislation or the adoption of any state agency administrative rule that would further restrict the 4 accepted farm practice of "agricultural burning." However, if any agency attempts to restrict any form of agricultural burning, an approved effective alternative practice must be in place. (14)

We support stack burning for grass seed and cereal grain straw 6 disposal. Stack burning should be considered ag burning when done 7 during the approved agriculture burning times as determined by the local fire marshal. All propane flaming should be considered an agricultural

8

12

21

7 8

10 We also support allowing farmer's permission to clean and clear land 11 for agricultural production without government interference.

Because weather conditions are extremely local, agricultural burning 13 must be managed at the local fire district level. A briefing should be held 14 between growers and the county or fire district prior to setting the dates so 15 that agriculture producers can share their expertise and concerns, rather 16 than setting arbitrary dates. Local fire chiefs should not be allowed to 17 prohibit agricultural burning unless extreme fire safety conditions exist in 18 the agricultural area. We support using the state criteria of humidity, 19 temperature and wind to determine when agricultural burning should be 20 allowed.

We oppose any additional regulation of agricultural burning that might 22 affect wilderness areas, when temporarily affected by smoke intrusions 23 caused by agricultural burning which is already regulated under the 24 direction of the DEQ and the industry's own smoke management programs 25 or local smoke management districts.

10.755 Field Burning

1 We are opposed to extending the provisions of the Department of 2 Environmental Quality (DEQ) ag and field burning regulations to any community which already has successful programs of its own.

We support legislation that would identify limited field burning as a tool 5 to manage weed, pest & disease issues (including invasive species) on all agricultural land. Such legislation should give sole authority to the Oregon Department of Agriculture to allocate the location and quantity of the acreage.

9 We support the continuation of a reasonable grower fee for support of 10 the Smoke Management Program.

When any government agency's actions include controlled burning, 12 they should be under the same regulations applicable to private industry 13 in that location. (13), (14)

10.760 Field Burning Hotline

Oregon Department of Agriculture's burning hotline should separate calls that are made on non-field burning days from those made on approved burning days. It should be noted that the cause is not from field 4 burning. Calls made from the same phone number should also be 5 identified. (08)

Field Burning Liability

10.775

We support legislation declaring that field burning is not an ultrahazardous activity and that negligence must be proven before "liability" can be imposed.

Farming by Corporations

10.800

- We support the implementation of policies to:
- 1. Continue to study the effects of the entry of huge nonagricultural firms into farming.
- 4 2. Avoid creating tax advantages which encourage such entry.
 - 3. Strengthen the ability of farmers to bargain with an integrator and other handlers.
 - 4. Strengthen the economic position of farmers by encouraging more effective group action in buying and selling.
- 9 We support presentation of proposals for bargaining association 10 legislation to the Legislative Committee on Trade and Economic 11 Development.
- We support legislation requiring corporations to report their involvement in farming.

Sustainability

2

5

6

7

10.900

- Any definition of sustainability must balance economic, ecological and social benefits of agriculture and recognize agriculture's ability to sustain
- 3 for generations. (Referred to AFBF, 2008) (08)

XI. LABOR

Labor Laws and Regulations

11.010

The overall guiding force influencing commodity prices is the economic law of supply and demand. It is imperative that government recognize the volatility of this force when adopting, amending or repealing statutes and administrative rules. In general, we are opposed to statutes and administrative rules that ignore this force and reduce our ability to compete in the local, national and international market place.

We support those statutes and administrative rules which assist Oregon producers to become more competitive. (07)

Statewide Labor Policy

11.01

Farming operations are often times in multiple cities, counties and other municipalities in the State of Oregon. To ensure a farm can successfully employ workers in multiple jurisdictions around the state, farmers need to have a consistent set of laws regulating their employees. We support uniform statewide labor laws that farmers can enforce to all employees regardless of where their field of operations is located. (14)

Labor Regulations

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

11.020

Agricultural employers are encouraged to give special attention to improving employee/employer relations within the following areas:

- 1. Improve the earnings of workers by proper training, supervision and continuity of employment.
- 2. Improve conditions where necessary for field sanitation, hazard communication, pesticide labeling procedures and payroll practices.
- 3. Defend the rights of the workers in the community by conducting a public relations program among civic, business and church organizations.
- Improve worker relations by expressing appreciation of a job well
 done.
- 13 5. Promote such projects that will improve the general welfare and wellbeing of the workers.
 - 6. Improvement of labor management skills including:
 - The use of handbooks or written policies;
 - Providing training sessions and workshops related to current labor issues;
 - Keeping informed of changes in laws that affect the agricultural labor supply; and
 - Emphasis should be placed on the proper approaches to prepare for agency hearings.

We encourage an accelerated program which provides information related to the rights and responsibilities of workers and employers during 25 inspections by agencies and during labor disputes or any organized labor 26 activity.

27 We are opposed to any effort to allow criminal penalties or civil suits 28 against employers for workplace safety violations which occur without 29 criminal intent.

11.021 **Family Leave**

We oppose the development and or expansion of the Family and 2 Medical Leave Act for agricultural operations. We oppose legislation that 3 would require employers to pay a family leave benefit for farm workers. 4 Farmers operate on extremely thin margins and would be unduly 5 burdened by a requirement to pay for family leave or track unpaid family

6 leave for farm workers. (07), (16), (18)

1

Mandatory Paid Sick Leave

We oppose mandating paid sick leave for farm workers. There are 2 times on a farm when everybody's presence is critical to a farm operation. Food safety is not jeopardized when a worker can move to a 4 job where there is no direct food handling. Mandating farm operators to 5 pay someone's sick time wages and their replacement wages, places an 6 undue hardship on the farm owner. (14)

11.022

11.026

We oppose the requirement to track, record and report hours of unpaid 8 sick time that have been accrued and used. The allowance of unpaid sick 9 time was provided to lessen the burden on employers, but requiring 10 onerous tracking and adherence to all provisions of the paid sick time law, 11 puts an unfair burden on farmers and ranchers. (16)

Mandatory Predictable Scheduling 11.025

We oppose mandating predictable schedules. Weather, livestock, and 2 crop maturity are uncontrollable, and perishable crops must be picked in 3 a timely manner. Farmers need a reliable and available workforce during 4 the harvest period and require "all hands on deck." Mandating predictable 5 schedules does not recognize the unique needs of agriculture and burdens 6 the farm owner. Agriculture should be exempt from any statewide or local 7 policy that mandates predictable schedules. (15)

Mandatory Flexible Schedules

We oppose mandating flexible scheduling. Requirements for crop and 2 livestock work vary daily with weather conditions, life cycles, and markets. Thus, farmers have a "bona fide" business reason for not providing every employee with a flexible schedule at their request. Agriculture should be exempt from any statewide or local policy mandating flexible schedules. 6 (15)

Labor Poster 11.030

We request state agencies to coordinate and consolidate, into one 2 poster size sheet, all of the posters that employers are required to display.

Head Start Services 11.040

We support expansion of the Migrant Head Start programs to include 2 families of seasonal agricultural workers who do not currently receive Migrant Head Start Services solely because of their failure to meet migrant eligibility requirements. (08)

Farm Labor Housing

1 2

3

11

18

22

27

28

32

11.050

We favor continuing the property tax exemption for nonprofit corporate seasonal farm labor housing.

We favor clear, concise regulations and reporting standards, not 4 subject to interpretation. Inspections and enforcement must be totally 5 consistent with the clear language of the regulations. H2A housing, other 6 guest worker housing and farm labor housing should have the same 7 regulations and be approved and inspected by only one state agency. It 8 must also be recognized by regulatory agencies that farm labor housing 9 often meets all legal requirements at the beginning of the season, but wear 10 and tear may take it out of compliance from one day to another.

If possible state farm labor housing health, sanitation standards and 12 other housing regulations should not be more complex, costly or arduous 13 than federal farm worker housing standards. If state regulations exceed 14 federal farm labor housing standards, then they should be reasonable and 15 necessary to protect the health and safety of farm workers and should not 16 be more complex, costly, or arduous than generally accepted housing 17 standards of rental housing in the area.

It is our position that permanent employee housing and migrant and 19 seasonal farm worker housing on the farm is not part of the workplace 20 and thus should not be subject to regulation by the Oregon State Employment Act or Oregon OSHA.

Ag Labor Housing should be defined to include only housing that is 23 occupied by migrant seasonal workers and never include housing 24 provided to the permanent farm workforce.

All temporary seasonal farm labor housing should be classified as 26 agricultural buildings, not dwellings, for the purposes of construction or occupational permits.

State and County Building Codes should make provision for 29 reasonable standards for temporary seasonal migrant labor housing. 30 Items such as insulation for summer housing and handicap provisions 31 should not be required.

Enforcement activities and construction controls of farm labor camps 33 should be coordinated through one agency. The agency should also

34 have the responsibility for educational programs and technical 35 assistance. These programs should be implemented before any fines 36 and penalties are levied.

37

42

49

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

So long as the state inspects and approves electrical and plumbing 38 installations in order that they meet code in farm labor housing, Oregon 39 law should be amended to delete the requirement that licensed 40 electricians and plumbers must be used during the construction or 41 rehabilitation of farm labor housing. (07), (11)

If compliance with farm labor housing laws is expected by agencies, 43 changes should be kept to a minimum and at the most be approved only 44 once per year by January. All regulations by all state agencies relating to 45 farm labor housing should be published in one manual and released to 46 farms in January of each year. Any changes considered by state 47 agencies should have a complete financial impact analysis after 48 obtaining information from affected farms.

We support nonprofit corporate seasonal farm labor housing and 50 community-based housing following all regulations, enforcement, and 51 reporting requirements as employer-provided housing. (20).

Policy No. 11.080, Farm Labor Recruitment, was deleted in 2008 **Seasonal Labor Force**

We support an adequate supply of authorized temporary seasonal agricultural workers. We favor a temporary seasonal worker program that:

- 1. Ensures the availability of authorized temporary seasonal agricultural workers;
- Respects self-determination on the part of the worker; and
- 3. Has an advisory commission with representation from the employment sector of Northwest agricultural community;
- Develops and implements guest worker programs that provide a streamlined easy access of foreign workers which allows for a special status to come and go but not stay, where the H2A program isn't viable. (Referred to AFBF, 2011), (11)
- 5. We may accept visa caps as long as they do not restrict farmers and ranchers from using the visa program and getting their labor needs met. (Refer to AFBF)

15 It is our position that the State of Oregon Employment Department 16 (state workforce agency) and other state agencies should assist and not 17 inhibit Oregon agriculture efforts to hire and employ legal guest workers. 18 Housing inspection for guest worker programs should only be 19 administered through one state agency. (16, 20)

I-9 Verification 11.120

The Employment Department should complete the I-9 verification

process for all agricultural employees, including special agricultural

workers and replacement workers, before referring them to a job. (11)

Illegal Immigration

1

10

15

20

27

29

31

32

Agriculture should not be required to be an enforcement arm of 2 immigration policy. Known undocumented workers should be reported to 3 those responsible for enforcing those laws. (07)

Workers' Compensation Insurance

11.200

We support remedial legislation and administrative changes that will 2 reduce the cost of workers compensation insurance. We support voluntary safety programs to reduce accidents. We request that information being used to establish Workers' Compensation rates for the State Accident 5 Insurance Fund be made available to the public.

Employees should be responsible for fifty percent of the premium for 7 their coverage under workers' compensation insurance. The appropriate 8 amount should be deducted from each paycheck and transmitted in the same manner as money withheld for Oregon income tax.

We request that standards developed under the Oregon Safe Employment Act be reasonable and practical. Employers should exercise 12 their rights to participate in establishing or modifying these standards. The 13 state standards should be modified to include exemptions or changes 14 made in the federal act or standards.

An employee who refuses to follow his employer's instructions with 16 respect to compliance with safety standards, and who thus jeopardizes 17 himself or his fellow employees, should be subject to citation. In such 18 cases, any penalty that might be imposed on the employer should be 19 assessed against the negligent employee.

Workers' compensation risk should be based on the number of hours 21 worked in each work classification, not the amount of wage in each work 22 classification. Therefore, Workers' Compensation premiums should be 23 computed on a per-hour basis, much the same as the Workers' Benefit 24 Fund. The formula for determining the workers' compensation benefits of 25 injured workers should reflect the historical wage level of the worker and 26 the fact that most agricultural employees do not work 12 months a year.

Workers should have a maximum 48-hour time limit for reporting an 28 on the job injury accident to the employer.

In order to help eliminate fraudulent claims, we recommend that 30 injuries claimed later than 30 days after employment termination be confirmed by at least two or more physicians.

Workers on permanent total disability should be transferred to state 33 and federal disability programs rather than being paid by workers' 34 compensation.

An injured employee, after a doctor's work-release, should not be 36 required to return to the same employer and the exact same job in order for wage loss compensation to be discontinued.

38 We support ongoing education programs provided by workers' 39 compensation service providers to minimize industrial accidents.

40 We oppose a state monopoly in compensation insurance (state and 41 self-insured coverage only). (05)

Workers' Compensation Rates

1

2

1

6

7

8

9

20

24

25

29

11.220

The Workers' Compensation Classification Guide for reporting wages should be changed to more accurately reflect the risk, and to provide that the same premium rate is applied to the reported activity regardless of the end use of the commodity being produced. (07)

OR-OSHA 11.250

We support state and federal exemptions from regular occupational safety and health inspections of farming operations employing 10 or fewer employees, unless ag labor housing is maintained by such an operation.

We support the mandatory inspection of farming operations only in the 5 event of a:

- 1. Serious and disabling accident;
- Fatality; and/or
- Valid complaint signed and revealed to the operator.

This inspection should be conducted only in the accident or complaint 10 area of the farm.

If an OR-OSHA inspector finds a safety violation on a piece of 12 equipment that is being operated as it was delivered from the factory, the 13 employer should not be subject to a fine for the violation but should be 14 required to fix the violation. OR-OSHA should also be required to notify 15 the equipment manufacturer of the safety violation. The equipment 16 manufacturer and OR-OSHA should work together to best solve the safety 17 violation on the manufacturer's equipment. Employers should then be 18 notified of the potential safety violation and how to correct the problem. 19 (08)

When OR-OSHA undertakes rulemaking or enacts requirements that 21 will impact employers or increase the cost of doing business, OR-OSHA 22 must engage farm employers in development of the rulemaking, and ensure that OR-OSHA's requirements are both necessary to protect employees and the most cost-efficient method of achieving the objective.

We support ensuring that requirements related to working in heat 26 recognize the climatic conditions employees are accustomed to working 27 in and do not go beyond what is necessary to avoid heat exhaustion and 28 heatstroke.

Requirements related to protection from smoke or poor air quality 30 should provide employees with the option of wearing respirators or other protection if they would like, but not require their use.

32 Any regulations enacted in response to a public health emergency 33 should be temporary and be the minimum needed to protect worker health, 34 and enforcement should not be the obligation of the employer. These 35 regulations should not be allowed to extend beyond the public health 36 emergency. Refer to AFBF (21)

We oppose mandatory vaccine or COVID-19 testing requirements as 38 a condition of employment. If such requirements are imposed by the 39 government, the employer should not be required to enforce the mandate 40 and should not have liability for any side effects of vaccines or testing. We 41 support access to vaccines and testing at the employee's choice without 42 cost to the employer. Refer to AFBF (21).

Hazard Communication Rules Applied to Employers

Application of hazard communication rules to agriculture must be 2 limited to permanent employees and seasonal employees involved in 3 pesticide application. Individual written programs detailing how an 4 employer is going to comply with the law must not be required of 5 agricultural employers for employees who are not exposed to pesticides.

Reentry Standards for Pesticide Application 11.290

We support using the EPA registered label recommendation, as the 2 legal reentry standard for farm workers. Enforcement of the standard 3 should be uniform and coordinated by one agency.

Unemployment Insurance

37

The salaries of family held agriculture corporation's corporate officers 2 and their family members should be exempt from unemployment tax 3 assessments.

We recommend the farm gross quarterly threshold for the payroll tax 5 limit be raised from \$20,000.00 to \$80,000.00 immediately and be indexed 6 for inflation and for minimum wage. (07), (10), (11)

Unemployment Benefits

11.320

Unemployment benefits should only be for workers who are 2 unemployed through no fault of the worker. (07)

Seasonal Unemployment Compensation 11.340

We oppose the unemployment compensation program for seasonal 2 agricultural workers, H2A visa guest workers, and any notification 3 requirements regarding program coverage.

We support efforts to restrict benefits to those who have no 5 employment or assurance of returning to employment after a layoff and to 6 require recipients to work in any available position. We support efforts to strengthen incentives for recipients to seek employment and reduce fraud 8 in the program. (07)

Contractor Liability

8

11.400

We seek legislation providing that when the terms of a contract 2 delegates responsibilities to a labor contractor for providing all or any part 3 of the required field sanitation facilities for workers including any 4 responsibilities regarding hazard communication rules, I 9 forms and 5 housing facilities, the licensed labor contractor, not the producer, should 6 be held liable under the law for any penalty or lawsuit resulting from 7 noncompliance.

When a producer contracts with a licensed labor contractor for 9 seasonal employment, the licensed labor contractor should be held solely 10 liable under the law for any penalty or lawsuit resulting from 11 noncompliance with state wage and hour law and state sick time law. If a 12 joint employment relationship exists, we seek clarification that licensed 13 labor contractors are required to share wage and hour and paid sick time 14 records at the request of the secondary employer. (16)

15 We support legislation to exempt from state regulation associations 16 and co-op's who act as farm labor contractors to recruit a workforce for 17 themselves or their members' entirely through federally regulated guest 18 worker programs. (00)

Farm Labor Contractor Bonding

We support a maximum bond of \$10,000 for labor contractors 2 employing 20 or fewer workers and a bond not to exceed \$30,000 for labor 3 contractors without experience hiring more than 20 workers, and a bond 4 not to exceed \$20,000 for labor contractors with five years of good 5 performance, if hiring more than 20 workers.

An individual who co-signs for the bond of a labor contractor should 7 not be held to be a joint employer because of the co-sign.

Harvest Picketing

11.500

We recommend that legislation be maintained which limits an 2 employee of a crop owner from picketing during the harvest of a perishable 3 crop.

Policy No. 11.520, Cannery Strikes, was deleted in 2003.

Secondary Boycott

11.530

We oppose the use of secondary boycotts. Every means possible 2 should be used to stop an illegal secondary boycott including criminal 3 penalties, fines and/or imprisonment.

Collective Bargaining

11.550

We support collective bargaining legislation that would establish quidelines to protect workers and employers from unfair labor practices 3 during union organizing and bargaining efforts.

We support secret ballot elections as the means to determine whether employees want to be represented by a union. We oppose card check and other similar policies. We oppose any labor organizing activities that increase the cost of labor above the ability of the operation to pay.

8 We support the right of employers to communicate freely with 9 employees, without coercion or threats, what the effect of unionization 10 would be in the workplace. (99), (04), (08)

Minimum Wage Indexing

1

11.580

"While we oppose a minimum wage, we support legislative action that would mitigate the financial effects for agriculture employers of the annual indexing of the state minimum wage.

We believe that minimum wage increases based on Consumer Price Index (CPI) growth should also be subject to minimum wage decreases during periods of negative CPI downturns.

If Oregon's minimum wage index is not adjusted downward during periods of negative CPI growth, any subsequent increase in the minimum wage calculation should not include growth in CPI that is only recovery from a prior rate. In years following negative CPI growth, for purposes of calculating the minimum wage, only CPI growth above the preceding highest rate should be included in the calculation. (06), (09), (11)

Minimum Wage Increase

11.59

While we do not support a minimum wage, if there is one it should be no greater than the federal minimum wage. (01), (11)

Minimum Wage Averaging

11.600

We support the principle that earnings from farm work should be determined by the productivity of the worker and not based on a minimum wage.

We support the concept of piecework which offers wholesome summer employment in the fields for so many of Oregon's youth and which is responsible for many of the jobs in Oregon's processing plants.

We favor legislation to provide that, where workers are employed on a piece-rate basis, the employer should considered to be in compliance if the crew average meets or exceeds the minimum hourly wage required to be paid. (05), (11)

Farm Worker Meal and Rest Periods

11.605

We support allowing agricultural workers to choose if and when they want to take a rest period or a meal period. (04)

Wage Penalty Claims

11.610

We support legislation that would eliminate wage penalties that allow employees to benefit financially from failing to report an underpayment to their employer. However, we realize that there must be an adequate 4 penalty for those employers who willfully underpay employees.

Prevailing Wage Rate

11.625

We oppose the Davis Bacon Act and any other law that would establish a "prevailing wage rate" for labor including adverse effect wage a rate in the agricultural work force. (18)

- 1. If the Adverse Effect wage rate is in effect, we support freezing the Adverse Effect wage rate until a more reasonable formula may be developed.
- 8 2. We support proposals that restrict further runaway required wage rates in an effort to move them closer to state and federal minimum wage rates.

11 (Refer to AFBF)

5

6

Health Insurance

11.630

We oppose proposals that require employers to provide mandatory health insurance coverage for employees. We oppose mandated universal health care. If Oregon were to implement Universal Health Care, it should not be paid for through increased taxes on employers. (22)

We support health savings accounts. (06), (10), (11), (Referred to 6 AFBF, 2009)

Christmas Trees

11.650

The growing, tending and cutting of Christmas trees should be defined as an agricultural activity under the Fair Labor Standards Act. (08)

Overtime 11.675

We oppose agriculture being subject to overtime laws. We support peak season exemptions or quarterly averaging that recognizes the seasonal nature of labor needs for perishable crops, nursery stock, and other seasonal commodities; the needs of the livestock and dairy industry; the approaches taken by other states to limit impacts to agriculture; and maintain labor opportunities for agricultural employees. (21) Any mitigation measures adopted by the legislature should not differentiate based on size of operation or number of employees.

9 We support including the nursery industry in the definition of 10 agriculture for purposes of labor laws and overtime. (07) (Refer to AFBF)

Right-to-Work

No person should be deprived of his right-to-work because of membership or lack of membership in any organization. We support Section 14(b) of the Taft Hartley Act.

We support right to work legislation that would eliminate closed union shops. (02)

Farmer's Right to Manage

11.725

11.700

We support the farmer's right to produce, harvest, process and distribute their commodity in the manner most economically advantageous

3 to their particular operation.

At-Will Employment

11.730

1 It should be the policy of the State of Oregon to provide for the right of 2 an agricultural employer to both hire and discharge employees as it suits 3 the overall needs of the farm operation.

4 An at-will employment policy should recognize the right of an 5 employee to discuss working conditions without fear of reprisal.

Political Contributions

1.740

We support legislation to prohibit any employer or union from exacting any dues, contributions or services of any kind from employees for contribution to political candidates.

Youth Employment

11.800

There is a social need to develop a sense of economic responsibility among youth. It is equally important that youth have a beneficial means of utilizing their time. We support provisions which maintain and increase young people's opportunity for employment. Such employment opportunities, however, should be in productive enterprises and not "make work" relief schemes.

We support labor legislation which would set a special lower minimum wage for employees under age 18.

9 We support repealing the federal labor laws which restrict the 10 opportunity for our nation's youth to be employed in agricultural related 11 work. (05)

Legal Aid Services

11.820

When Legal Aid Services brings a suit, the cost of the defendant's legal and court costs should be paid by Legal Aid Services if the defendant is cleared of a majority of the charges.

U.S. DOL Due Process for Investigations

11.900

We support increased transparency of the investigation practices by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). When DOL notifies a grower of apparent wage and hour violations, the department must inform the grower that its requests are strictly voluntary, must accurately represent its legal authority and the rights of the grower, and must provide to the grower all information it relied on to determine the alleged violations. DOL should cite the grower only for violations that investigators actually observed, not ones based on the department's belief or conjecture. DOL should seek hot goods orders only when a grower has demonstrated repeated and willful

- 10 violations and lack of cooperation with DOL. In such cases, the federal 11 government must not contact the grower's customers unless the 12 department has already secured the necessary court orders. (Referred to
- 13 AFBF, 2012), (12)

Roadside Vendors

11.920

- 14 We support that roadside vendors must comply with permitting, health and
- 15 safety, employment, and zoning regulations.

XII. ENERGY

Fuel and Energy

12.300

Production, harvesting, processing and distribution of food should be granted primary priorities for use of fuel and power.

Research should be accelerated for the development and conservation of all available sources of energy.

We support a renewable economically viable energy policy.

Fuel standards need to be economically feasible to agriculture. and timber.

Due to the changes of types of fuels and fuel products that are available we do not support mandatory regulations and/or standards for use for equipment, vehicles, storage tanks, etc. that were built prior to the enactment of the new regulations or standards. Due to the effects of biotuels on existing equipment and storage tanks, the natural resource industry shall be provided an exemption to be able to purchase fuels that are not harmful to the equipment, including bio-fuels.

We support the repeal of the state biofuel mandate requirement. (08),

Green Power

15

12.305

We define green power as any source of power that uses renewable and safe energy sources such as hydropower facilities, wave or tidal energies, solar, bio-fuels, geothermal and wind.

The use of green power must be beneficial to the local area, highly efficient and be environmentally safe. Green power generation must be considered on a regional basis with weighted emphasis on local stakeholder input and economically feasible.

We oppose the taxing of energy that is used on the farm or business that has produced it. (08), (10), (11) We support nuclear being considered green power in Oregon.

Electrical Costs

12.310

We believe that electric utilities should review and revise pump irrigation rates so as to enable the agriculture industry to raise the necessary food and fiber, which benefits all society. Low cost uninterruptible power should be made available for irrigation pumping. (10)

Electrical Power Generation

12.315

We support establishing a "Net Metering" system. Such a system should provide that when a producer creates electricity on site the

3 producer should only be charged for the power used from the electric 4 company. If enough power is produced that the meter runs backwards the 5 electric company should pay the producer for the excess power at the 6 same rate that the power company charges for electricity, less the delivery 7 cost.

We also support "Remote Metering," which would allow an individual or entities to produce power at a remote site to use on the farm or ranch if owned by another person. The cost of the power to the user should be the same rate that the power company charges for electricity, less the delivery cost.

A third party similar to the Public Utility Commission should be established to set the fees that a power company could charge for line fees for net metering and remote metering. (08)

We also support aggregate metering, which would allow an individual or entities to produce power without being limited to meter location. (10)

We believe power companies should be required to allow net

19 metering of multiple meters owned by the same customer rather than

20 strictly per meter. (15)

Electric Utility Deregulation

12.320

1 Prior to changing Oregon laws, we urge the legislature to study the 2 consequences of deregulating the retail electricity industry. (05), (10)

Policy No. 12.330, Power Development, was deleted in 2004

Rights of Power Generation

12.350

We support eliminating local ordinances or state law that prohibits the construction and use of power generating facilities using water flowing through or along a person's property. (10), (16).

Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)

12.360

While we recognize the value of liquefied natural gas to our industry, we are opposed to the placement of pipelines and terminals that will negatively impact agriculture producers and their management practices in Oregon. (08), (10)

Policy No. 12.360, Life Line Rates, was deleted in 2004

Policy No. 12.370, Telephone Solicitation, was deleted in 2004

Policy No. 12.380, Limited Telephone Access, was deleted in 2007

Bulk Purchase of Fuel for Agricultural Buyers12.400

We support the creation of a law to allow the bulk purchase of fuel to be resold to no more than five additional agricultural buyers for economic

3 benefit. (09), (10)

Testing of Motor Fuel

12.410

We support the state testing of motor fuel at the final point of sale for accurate quantity, quality and contamination. (05), (10)

Solar Buy Back

12.420

- 3 We oppose the ability of power companies voiding unused taking of
- 4 energy credits on an annual basis. Energy credits should stay with the
- 5 entity that generated them until used or bought back by the power
- 6 company. Energy credits must be used or purchased by the power
- 7 company no later than 3 years after issuance. Credits used will be first
- 8 credited, first used.

5

6

5

XIII. PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Agriculture Policy for Oregon

13.005

- An agricultural policy for the State of Oregon needs to be adopted that would:
- Acknowledge the importance of agriculture to the state's economy
 and to the wellbeing of all of its residents;
 - 2. Promote agriculture in positive actions that result in a vibrant and healthy agriculture in Oregon; and
- 7 3. Provide that any and all proposed rules and regulations or legislation affecting agriculture should enhance the importance of and the operation of agricultural enterprises in Oregon. (00)

Policy No. 12.010, Voice of Agriculture, was deleted in 2005.

Communication with other Organizations 13.015

We encourage greater communication and cooperation with other agricultural and natural resource organizations at the national, state and county levels. (07)

Action by Farmers

13.020

Farmers and agricultural organizations must become more aggressive and involved in community, state, and national affairs.

Freedom to Farm

13.030

Increasing demand for agricultural lands and increasing concerns about agricultural practices, have created severe restrictions on the freedom of farmers. It is important, therefore, that farmers take an active role in securing reasonable laws and regulations, in areas such as:

- 1. Land use;
- 6 2. Agricultural chemicals;
- Food processing;
- Packaging;
- 95. Marketing;
- 10 6. Noise, dust, air pollution;

- 11 7. Water use; and
- 12 8. Biotechnology. (14)
- 13 Farmers should retain the right to use accepted agricultural practices.
- 14 We oppose any legislation or regulations that restrict or mandate farm
- 15 practices. Accepted farming practices should be exempt from state laws
- 16 and regulations, local ordinances and suits related to dust, odor, noise,
- 17 etc. and other conditions not appreciated by the public. The right to farm
- 18 laws should be strengthened to require that a plaintiff has the burden of
- 19 proving that the farming practice endangers public health or safety.

- 20 Unsuccessful plaintiffs should be responsible for the attorney fees, court
- 21 costs and compensation for other expenses of the defendant. (07)

Beginning Farmer Assistance

13.040

- 1 We oppose the concept of the state acquiring farm land in a beginning
- 2 farmer program. The State of Oregon should encourage retiring farmers
- 3 through tax incentives to rent or sell their land to beginning farmers. Farm
- 4 Credit Services should be encouraged to work with beginning farmers.

Encouragement of New Industry

13.050

- 1 We propose that the state encourage new industries to locate in
- 2 Oregon which have the ability to use the abundance of raw agricultural
- 3 products that are produced here.

State Wildfire Hazard Map 13.060

- 1 We oppose the use of the state wildfire hazard map to impost regulations
- 2 on rural property owners. The wildfire hazard map should only be used as
- 3 a tool to help state and local governments allocate resources to better
- 4 protect Oregon families and businesses.

Policy No. 12.060, Exposition Center, was deleted in 2005

Policy No. 12.100, Citizenship, was deleted in 2008

Jury Duty

13.110

- We support adequate juror compensation that would enable all adults to participate in this very important service to their fellow citizens.
- Key personnel should have the option to delay jury duty until the next available session.

Publications of Government Proceedings 13.115

We favor maintenance of the statutes which require county courts and boards of county commissioners to publish monthly proceedings and expenditures.

Government Surplus Properties

We propose altering the existing practice of disposal of federal real property that has been declared surplus to federal needs. There should be no hierarchy providing preference to any entity when disposing of excess or surplus federal real property. (20)

Policy No. 12.120, Federal State and County Projects, was deleted in 2005

Qualifications for Public Office

13.125

13.117

- 1 We believe the voters should decide whether or not a candidate is
- 2 qualified for public office. We oppose establishment of any new

- qualifications not already prescribed by law.
 Any salary increases for an elected official should not become effective until after the next general election. (05)
 Elected officials should receive the same retirement and health benefits that the general population is eligible for. (17)

Policy No. 12.127, Judicial Elections was deleted in 2005

Voters Pamphlet Information

13.126

- 1 The state should develop a system that enables persons to submit
- 2 voter pamphlet information at each county clerk's office or online instead
- 3 of in Salem at the Secretary of State's Office. (04), (05)

Number of Bills Introduced by Legislators 13.127

- 1 Oregon legislators should be limited to introducing five bills during the one
- 2 hundred sixty-day legislative session and two bills during the thirty-five
- 3 day legislative session.

Oregon Constitution

13.130

- 1 Article II, Section 16 of the Oregon Constitution should be
- 2 amended to require a majority vote for the election of all public
- 3 officials.

Redistricting

13.131

- 1 We oppose gerrymandering in the current and future redistricting
- 2 processes in Oregon. We support Oregon creating an independent
- 3 redistricting commission that is not appointed by the legislature or the
- 4 governor.

6

7

8

9

Initiative Process

13.135

We support the initiative and referendum process that has been part of the Oregon Constitution since the turn of the century. We are concerned that this historic citizen check and balance of state government in recent times is being misused.

The initiative and referendum process should require:

- 1. The prohibition of signature gatherers being paid for each signature obtained;
- 2. That qualifying signatures be required to be gathered equally from each congressional district or similar regions of the state; and
- 3. Constitutional amendments not referred to the voters by the legislature should require a 2/3 majority vote of the voters for adoption. (07)

Oregon Public Employees in Legislature 13.140

We support action to repeal Section 8 of Article XV of the Oregon Constitution which allows public employees to serve in the legislature.

Because it is the responsibility of government agencies to implement public policy, not to formulate public policy, no state or federal agency should publicly take sides on any issue or policy concerning the general public.

We oppose any effort of any government agency in attempting to formulate farm thinking for presentation in support of any legislative farm programs. (05)

Public Employee Strikes

13.141

We are opposed to strikes by public employees. We recommend that all public employee contracts contain a no-strike clause or where union contracts do not exist, the public employees should sign an agreement waiving a strike action as a condition of employment. When binding arbitration is imposed, both parties should submit their final offer to a threemember arbitration board which would accept one final offer from the disputing parties.

8 More attention needs to be given to providing efficient delivery of 9 government services including education. Productivity and performance 10 need to be considerations for salary increases. (04)

Voter Registration

13.150

We support the state election laws which require voters to be registered at least thirty days prior to election. (05)

Religious Life

13.200

Our national life is founded on spiritual faith and belief in God. We favor leaving "In God We Trust" on coins and "Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance. We believe it to be an inalienable right to worship God, to offer prayers, to read the Bible in private or public places, including schoolrooms. This perpetuates the principles on which this nation was founded.

Solutions to problems arising from social and economic change involve recognition of spiritual and moral values. The proper role of churches and organizations of churches in this field is to provide guidance on the moral and spiritual aspects of social and economic problems, rather than to lobby for or otherwise promote specific governmental actions. If churches or church organizations continue to intrude into political action programs, that portion of their resources used for such activities should not be given preferential property tax treatment. (05)

Rural Health 13.400

We urge continued interest and education of our membership in health and disease control programs.

We support incentives to encourage rural hospitals, emergency medical services and clinics.

We oppose employer mandated health insurance. (09) (See also to Policy 11.630)

Policy No. 12.410, Aids Testing, was deleted in 2004

Foods and Nutrition

13.420

- We recommend continued nutritional improvement of school lunch programs.
- 3 We recommend that county Farm Bureaus promote the use of
- 4 domestic and locally produced farm products on school premises.

- 5 Dietary goals should be based upon documented scientific proof.
- 6 We oppose any committee, agency or persons dictating the foods that
- 7 should or should not be eaten. We deplore the spending of the taxpayers'
- 8 money for controlling or attempting to control the diets of the American
- 9 people in any way. (04), (08)

Social Services 13.430

The present Social Services program tends to perpetuate rather than cure the problem. The program should be redesigned to make it more attractive to work than be a recipient of social services. Acceptance of work training should be mandatory for able bodied persons. Incentives should be provided for those taking jobs or work training. Primary emphasis should be placed on the problems and needs of families with children. Aid to the blind, elderly and the totally or permanently disabled individuals must be adequate. We support requiring proof of legal residency and testing for illegal substances for social service recipients.

We support community representation on public social service boards. 12 (08)

Emergency Medical Service

13.440

We support state-wide emergency medical and trauma services.

Volunteer Emergency Personnel 13.441

We support modifications of OSHA rules and Oregon State regulations to recognize and give credit for the expertise of an emergency volunteer's occupation.

Volunteer Fire Fighters

13.442

Oregon should adopt training standards appropriate to the needs of rural fire districts and their volunteers. (03)

Confidential Financial Records 13.500

Any information exchanged between borrower and lender should be considered confidential and privileged. The release of any information should occur only upon the mutual agreement of both parties.

We support legislation to make the unauthorized release of confidential and privileged information between borrower and lender a 6 criminal offense.

We oppose any government entity requesting private financial or tax records to prove compliance with existing law.

Personal Property Rights 13.504

Before the State of Oregon adopts laws, rules, and/or regulations, agencies should first take into account the economic and non-economic impact they would have on private property rights.

We urge legislation protecting the private property interests of farmers 5 and ranchers, for their livestock, including those who choose to raise 6 nontraditional species. (03), (06)

13.505 Trespassing

We recognize that the vast majority of citizens are responsible people 2 who recognize and respect rights of others and the need for protection of 3 their property.

We urge cooperation with organizations of sportsmen and other 5 interested citizens who wish to gain understanding of the trespass problems.

Heavy penalties for acts of vandalism are encouraged.

Violation of the hunting with permission statute in the game laws 9 should be subject to the penalty for trespassing in the criminal code.

10 A landowner is subject to loss of time and considerable cost when a 11 suit or injury is initiated by a trespasser. We support legislation to require 12 the plaintiff to pay legal and other costs incurred by the landowner.

13 We support legislation relieving property owners of liability for injury or 14 death sustained by a trespasser regardless of age.

15 We recognize the need for property owners to have a cost efficient 16 and long-lasting way to post property for no trespassing.

We support the statewide use of painting the tops of fence posts as a 17 18 legal means of posting ones' property for "No Trespassing." (00), (05), 19 (07), (08)

Drone Technology

8

We embrace drone technology for production agriculture. We support 2 laws that protect private property owners from the trespass of drones. (15)

Right to Farm 13.508

3 Accepted farming practices utilized in the production of food and fiber 4 should be protected by "Right to Farm" provisions in the Oregon statutes. 5 (See also policy 3.030) (06)

Nuisances 13.510

Persons or jurisdictions initiating an unsuccessful nuisance suit should 1 2 be liable for the loss of any economic value pre-existing business and 3 facilities of the defendant.

Legal Action 13.515

We must use the courts to test unreasonable laws or regulations. This 2 should be the last resort after all other approaches have been explored

We support a policy that requires any filing party of a government suit 5 to post a bond to cover the legal costs of the prevailing party.

Probate Fee

1 Special priority should be given to the revision of probate fees so they 2 are commensurate with the amount of legal work required.

Small Claims Court Judgments

13.525

We support forcing the payment of judgments won in small claims courts.

Judicial Reform

13.530

We support the maintenance of Justice of Peace Courts. The present system for election of judges should be retained. A maximum limit should be retained for each class of lawsuit. When a defendant prevails, the plaintiff should be liable for all attorney fees and the court costs. (07)

Liability Suits

3

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

13.535

13.537

We support legislation to limit excessive liability judgments. Judgments should be based more closely on the actual economic loss incurred.

We support legislation to:

- 1. Strengthen the legal concept of "fault" as a basis to determine damages. "Strict liability" concepts that hold parties liable for losses when no fault exists are unfair,
- 2. Control expert testimony,
- 3. Eliminate "joint and several liability,"
- Allow for the recovery of medical expenses, property damage and lost wages, pain and punitive damages should be commensurate to company size and financial status,
- 13 5. Allow the payment of large awards for future damages to be made in installments rather than a lump sum.
 - 6. Eliminate double recovery. Court awards should be reduced by the amount of other financial sources such as medical insurance and wage continuation plans, and
- 7. Encourage alternatives to lawsuits such as binding arbitration and mediation. (08)

SLAPP Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation

1 Citizens currently are granted immunity in testifying during the 2 legislative process. We support legislation which would grant citizens 3 similar immunity when testifying at the state or local level. (00)

Third Party Lawsuits-Harassment

When a citizen accuses a landowner of violating agency rules and the agency pursues the accusation, the accusing person should have to testify at any hearing or court proceeding so that the accused may face their accuser. (00)

Liability at County or State Fair 13.538

We support the state providing immunity to state and county government, county fair boards, the state fair board, the livestock/poultry owners from liability in contract or tort for any personal injury, death, or

13.536

4 property damage resulting from the display or exhibition of livestock or

5 poultry at the county or state fair provided that the immune parties

6 exercised reasonable care in exhibiting animals. (17)

Policy No. 12.540, Enforcement-Rules and Regulations, was deleted in 2005

Truth in Real Estate Sales

13.550

We support the concept that all mineral, water and timber rights, 2 easements, zoning constraints and deed restrictions be included in a land 3 sale contract.

Takings of Property

4

10

13.560

We believe that any action by government that restricts or diminishes an owner/operator's right to conduct farming or forest practices on the property constitutes a taking of property.

Therefore, government should provide due process 5 compensation to the exact degree that an owner/operator's right to use 6 the property has been diminished by government action. All claims for loss 7 of value should be filed within two years on new actions. Partial takings of 8 property should be prohibited unless compensation is made for reduction in the value of the total property.

We are opposed to removing the applicability of land use laws as an 11 alternative to financial compensation for loss of property value due to any 12 action by government.

13 Further, government should acquire property or easements through 14 negotiated mutual agreement. The loss of undeveloped property value 15 should be calculated by comparing the value of the property one year 16 before the zoning law was enacted compared to the value one year after 17 the new zoning law was put into effect and the lost value should be indexed 18 for inflation. (00), (04), (07)

Compensation

13.570

When a governmental action results in an economic decrease to the 2 owner because it restricts or adversely affects a farming or forest practice 3 and upon providing proof of the economic decrease, the owner shall be 4 compensated by the public entity both for the amount of the economic 5 decrease and the cost of professional assistance paid by the owner to 6 establish the economic decrease including attorney fees and court costs. (04)

Compensation for Losses

13.575

When an action by government results in an economic loss to the 2 agriculture producer, by limiting or prohibiting the use of real and personal 3 property, including but not limited to, chemicals, water or equipment, the 4 producer should be able to file a claim and be compensated by the 5 regulating government entity.

We are opposed to any government action that results in an economic 7 loss that does not provide appropriate compensation. (06)

Compensation Revenue Sources

5

9

10

1

When Measure 37 or Measure 49 claims are approved for the loss of property value the appropriate method of compensation from the following list of options should be employed:

- 1. State income tax credit for state actions;
- 2. County or city property tax credit for local government actions.

A county compensation fund should be established for future compensation claims and revenue continuously appropriated from the following list of options:

- 1. Farm and forest use assessment tax penalties when land use is changed to a non-farm or non-forest use:
- 11 2. A real estate transfer tax on Measure 37 or Measure 49 claims 12 when the land is sold.
- 13 Installment payments for the loss of property value should be made when 14 the state or local government entity has adequate funding. (07), (08)

Condemnation 13.580

Any government or utility with condemnation authority should be 2 prohibited from exercising that authority on land zoned for farm or forest 3 use without the approval of the county governing body.

If condemnation authority is exercised on land zoned for farm or forest 5 use, the land should be valued as though it were inside an urban growth 6 boundary and zoned for the intended use.

Any public agency or utility that has condemnation powers should be 8 required to pay all legal costs to the private property owner whose property 9 the agency has plans to take for a public use. The agency's or utility's 10 liability should begin with the first notice to the property owner and 11 continue until the final conclusion. (01), (08)

Historic Preservation of the Oregon Trail 13.585

Historic preservation should not conflict with existing and or accepted 2 farming practices. (07)

Parole Eligibility

We urge that parole requirements for repeat offenders be 2 strengthened to a degree which will insure more protection of lives and property from the depredations of habitual criminals.

Policy No. 13.610, Juvenile Delinquency, was deleted in 2005

Capital Punishment

13.620

13.600

1 We support capital punishment for specified crimes.

Greatly increased penalties should be imposed on those convicted of

2 producing, transporting, or selling illegal drugs or recruiting others to do 3 the same. Bail requirements should be maximized. (14)

Additional funds should be appropriated for the education and treatment of our youth. A reward program for informants should be instituted.

We support the right of private employers and government agencies to test employees for drug use. Prospective employees should be informed that drug tests will be given.

We support Law enforcement shall be notified right to know that a marijuana operation is legally sanctioned a mechanism to determine if a marijuana growing operation is actually sanctioned as a medical grow. Necessary information should be subject to the public disclosure laws available seven days a week, 24 hours a day, to local police agencies so they can determine if a grow operation is legal. (06), (10)

Crime Prevention 13.63

We support legislation that will declare the removal or alteration of serial numbers from personal property and owner identification numbers an illegal act.

We support the establishment and continuation of crime prevention programs throughout the state.

Policy No. 12.635, Insanity Plea, was deleted in 2005

REDDI Program

We support the "Report Every Drunk Driver Immediately" (REDDI) program.

13.640

Policy No. 13.700, Racing Funds for County Fairs was deleted in 2004.

State Board of Agriculture 13.705

1 We support maintaining the advisory role of the State Board of 2 Agriculture. (03), (04)

Government Agency Lobbying 13.710

We support legislation prohibiting state and local agencies financed by tax money from engaging a lobbyist for hire. The agency's involvement should be limited to only testimony invited by or information requested by a legislator.

State agencies should be limited to one representative. Their testimony should be limited to the factual effects of the proposed legislation. Additionally, all lobbyists working for organizations receiving taxpayer money should be clearly identified by a name tag which discloses their name and organization when they are within the Capitol building. These requirements should not be considered to apply in any way to

11 elected officials of any jurisdiction of the state.

Administrative Agencies

1

8

9

13

15

22

24

25

27

30

32

1

13.720

The legislature should not delegate legislative authority to 2 administrative agencies, or in cases of emergencies, the appropriate interim committee.

At least a majority of the regulatory body committee members should be present throughout the legislative hearings.

Administrative agencies should not be allowed to impose fines without action by a court. Right of appeal by agencies should be denied after a court decision.

Any state agency charged with enforcing federal laws should not 10 adopt rules more restrictive than the federal rules or apply the rules in a 11 more restrictive manner than the rules are when enforced by the federal 12 government.

Statutory language should be adopted which defines the purpose of 14 each current agency and any new agency when it is created.

State agencies should be permitted to enact administrative rules only 16 to the extent that such rules are necessary to accomplish the purpose for 17 which the agency was formed and only to the extent that such rules do not 18 diminish or detract from the vested private property rights of citizens.

19 All previously enacted administrative rules which exceed the 20 legislatively defined purpose of the agency should be declared null and 21 void.

Any person or persons attempting to enforce rules which exceed the purpose for which the agency was formed should be subject to criminal penalties for abuse of authority.

Any proposed rule should require legislative approval prior to 26 implementation.

All government agencies or their employees, while working in their 28 professional capacity, should be held to the same standard as individuals 29 or businesses in complying with the laws of the land.

Government regulatory agencies should not be allowed to levy fines 31 upon issuance of a citation for noncompliance of regulations.

Civil penalties collected by any regulatory agency should go into the 33 general fund.

Agency Liability

13.725

When an agency charges a landowner with a violation of an agency 2 regulation, and forces the landowner to stop an activity, and in an ensuing

3 investigation and/or court proceeding the land owner is found to be

4 innocent of the charge, the agency should be held responsible for

5 reimbursing any revenue losses and legal fees suffered by the landowner

6 due to the cessation of the activity. (00)

Government Growth

13.730

We oppose the establishment of additional departments and divisions

2 in state government unless it can be proven that such an addition will
 3 reduce the cost of goals or services to the public and the new department
 4 or division will be subject to the "Sunset Law."

We encourage the Oregon Legislature to find a way to update the PERS formulas and eligibility without increasing fees, taxes, and licenses. (17)

Service Fees 13.740

We support legislation to change service fees charged by public agencies so they are commensurate with the cost of providing the service.

Required Local Government Programs 13.750

We support legislation to require the State of Oregon to appropriate funds for local governments to finance programs required by new legislation or administrative orders.

Funding for Enacted Legislation

No law or legislation should be passed by Congress or the State Legislature unless it is also funded by that body.

13.760

State Boards and Commissions 13.770

We request that the Governor appoint at least two farmers or ranchers to state boards or commissions which have authority over land, water and other natural resources.

A majority of persons who are appointed to state boards and commissions should have practical production experience or use of the resource that the board or commission oversees.

We support a uniform system for state agency (commission and 8 director) appointments.

9 All state agency commission members not elected should be 10 appointed by the Governor in a timely manner, approved by the Senate, 11 and should not be changed by the Governor.

Any director of an agency governed by a state agency commission should be appointed by that state agency commission.

All agency directors should be governed by a state agency commission. We support that any forms needed by a state agency and/or commission or board are also offered hard copy and may be faxed, mailed or scanned and emailed to the appropriate agency/commission, etc. (16)

Publishing Legal Notices

13.771

We support continuation, by public agencies, of the existing practice of publishing legal notices in newspapers. (10)

Limiting Legislative Sessions

13.780

We support limiting regular sessions of the legislature to a maximum 120-day session every other year. The Oregon legislature should pass a budget in 75 days after the opening of session. If this is not accomplished, the session should close, the Governor should call a special session and only budget bills should be allowed to be introduced.

We support making the short biennial legislative session for funding/budgets and the long biennial legislative session for policy issues. 8 (19)

We support requiring the names of the legislative sponsor(s) of bill(s) be printed on the bill(s). (19)

We oppose providing free postage for voters. The voter should be responsible to put a stamp on the return envelope for mailing their ballot in to the County Clerk for any election held in Oregon. (19)

Legislative Emergency Clause

13.785

Any legislation with emergency clauses should be approved by a super majority of both houses and shall not disallow a referral by the people in the form of an Initiative. (15)

The Legislative Emergency Clause shall be used exclusively during Special sessions of the Legislature for the purpose of balancing the budget or for responding to natural disasters. (16)

Any emergency declaration or executive order by the governor should 8 have a time limit of not greater than 45 days. After 45 days an extension 9 of the emergency declaration or executive order would require approval 10 by a super majority of both houses. The extension by the legislature shall 11 not exceed 6 months at which time continuation of the extension would 12 again require a super majority in both houses. (20)

Internet Access

13.800

- 1 Access to high speed internet should be available statewide, similar
- 2 to telephone service. (08)

Single Subjects for Congressional Legislation

13.900

Be it resolved that just like the Oregon ballot initiative, all bills must be limited to one issue.

Election Integrity

13.905

- 1 We support security protocols that ensure only one vote per legal voter.
- 2 (20) We endorse voting in person with verification of eligibility. (22)

XIV. NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Gun Control 14.010

- 1 We are strongly opposed to any additional gun and ammunition
- 2 control legislation and / or tax.
- 3 Any entity, be it governmental or private, that restricts private citizens
- 4 from their Second Amendment right to self-defense, shall be held liable for
- 5 the safety and well-being of anyone on their premises. (15)
- 6 We recommend that swift, prompt and adequate punishment be
- 7 administered to persons unlawfully using firearms. (08) (Referred to AFBF,
- 8 08)

Individual Rights

14.020

Any individual should have the right to take such action as is necessary to protect his life and property.

Federal Government Responsibility 14.025

We urge Congress to return to protecting the basic rights of employers and allow private enterprise to use market forces to compete free of excess government regulations.

Trade agreements generally require that producers are neither subsidized by their governments nor disadvantaged with the burden of standards not met by foreign competitors, unless they are reimbursed for those costs.

8 We oppose the removal of existing subsidies until they can be 9 replaced with reimbursements to domestic producers for the costs of 10 environmental and labor laws that imported products are not subject to.

All trade agreements should allow any country to reimburse its domestic producers for the higher standards required by its own citizens. (08) (Referred to AFBF, 08)

Eminent Domain 14.030

We support legislation requiring the federal, state or county or any subdivision therein or any utility, to pay all costs incurred by the land owner for eminent domain proceedings including appeals.

We believe the eminent domain law should provide for compensation, replacement and relocation where necessary, taking into consideration the specific needs and requirements of the damaged property.

We oppose the use of eminent domain for the purpose of redistribution of land.

Condemnation of private land by any government agency should be permitted only when the condemned land would be used for public health requirements or the improvement of the entire community, and remains in public ownership.

We believe that eminent domain should be utilized only as a last resort. (05)

Columbia Gorge

14.040

We oppose federal control of the Columbia Gorge and support continued challenges to the constitutionality of the seizure of private property in the Columbia Gorge.

Antiquities Act

14.050

We believe that the Antiquities Act has been implemented contrary to the original intent of the legislation. We support Antiquities Act reform to require Congressional and state approval of national monument designations, and to prevent the president from unilaterally designating national monuments. Any reform should also require 1) that all existing natural resource uses are protected in such designations, 2) that the Act should only be used to protect Native American artifacts and other archaeological sites, 3) that the acreage is limited to the minimum which contains the artifacts or archeological sites, and 4) that the Act can only be used on contiguously owned federal land and may not be used where a tract of private land will be surrounded by a designated national monument. (Referred to AFBF, 2016). (16)

We support the downsizing efforts of the currently designated National
Monuments and be able to use the land for things such as, but not limited
to grazing, mining and logging timber to maintain and manage the land.
(17)

Federal Land Planning Coordination 14.051

We support 1) the coordination and cooperation between BLM, Forest 2 Service, US Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Services and 3 other federal agencies with states, counties, and other local governments 4 in making land management plans and decisions; 2) providing assistance 5 to states, counties, and local governments in coordination and cooperating agency status, 3) ensuring that the local natural resources community has a strong voice in land management and that decisions are made which 8 benefit the natural resources community, and 4) ensuring that local district 9 offices have the ability to make decisions about land management and 10 engage with local communities in the development of plans. Decision 11 making should not be top down. Oregon Farm Bureau vigorously opposes 12 any changes to existing statutes or rules that reduce the ability of the BLM, 13 Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Services 14 and other federal agencies to coordinate with states, counties, and other 15 local governments in making land management plans and decisions. 16 (Referred to AFBF 2016) (16)

Executive Orders

14.055

1 We support the passage of federal legislation that would limit the 2 effective life of executive orders to two full years unless ratified by 3 congress to extend the life of the order. (01)

Citizen Suits 14.060

- 1 We support reform of the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) to prevent
- 2 creation of incentives to "sue and settle," including limitations related to
- 3 the value of the assets of non-profit organizations who seek attorney fees
- 4 under the act, a cap on the amount of fees and hourly rate an entity may
- 5 receive, and parity between non-profit organizations and individuals under
- 6 EAJA. We also support the creation of legislation that requires those
- 7 seeking attorneys' fees to win on each claim prior to eligibility for EAJA
- 8 funds for any lawsuit. We also support the creation of legislation that
- 9 requires individuals or groups to post a bond if their lawsuit will have an
- 10 effect on producers. We support continuing to keep pressure on agencies
- 11 and the DOJ regarding misuse of EAJA. (16) (Referred to AFBF 16)

Regulatory Reform

14.100

We support a regulatory reform act which would restrict regulatory agencies and commissions from arbitrarily imposing rules and regulations that are contrary to and/or beyond the intent of the legislation.

Policy 13.130, Federal Reserve System, was deleted in 2005

Policy No. 13.140, Monetary and Spending Policies, was deleted in 2005

Presidential Elections

14.145

- We emphatically support the Electoral College for presidential elections.
- 3 Electors should be required to vote for the candidates on the ballots 4 to which they were committed.
- We are opposed to making the popular vote the only determination of electing the President of the United States. (01)
- We support the Electoral College system to elect the President of the United States, which has been used successfully for the past 200+ years. (19)

Congressional Salaries

14.150

We oppose congressional salary raises until such time as Congress balances the federal budget.

Congressional Residences

14.155

- 1 We believe that congressional representatives should maintain their
- 2 primary residence in the district or state they represent. (22)

Policy No. 13.160, Grant Monies, was deleted in 2005

Senate Apportionment

14.170

- 1 We support the reversal of the Baker vs. Carr decision so that one
- 2 house in each state legislature can be apportioned on an area basis.

Food Bill 14.200

- 1 We urge the words "Food Bill" to be used instead of "Farm Bill" to illustrate
- 2 that the majority of dollars go to food assistance programs, not producers.
- 3 The Food Bill would have two sections; 1. Agriculture Production Ag. and
- 4 2. Food and Nutrition Non Production Ag. (Referred to AFBF, 2011) (11)

Policy No. 13.200, U.H.F. Stations, was deleted in 2005 Policy No. 13.220, T.V. Scrambling, was deleted in 2005 National Weather Service 14.230

1 We oppose the sale of the National Weather Service to private 2 enterprise.

Farm Credit 14.300

The federal government should guarantee the bonds issued by the Federal Credit Administration, and if necessary, increase the limit on the volume of their issuance in order to reducing the interest rate.

We support the concept of debt restructuring if debt is restructured only for farmers who run a viable economic operation. Debt should be restructured so that farmers who qualify can pay off their debt.

We support restructuring short term and intermediate term debt into long term debt to give qualified borrowers additional time to repay principal and reduce their annual debt and service obligation.

Management of Lands Under Foreclosure 14.320

When a government agency forecloses on farms or ranches, it should take responsibility to maintain the agricultural integrity of those lands and facilities. We believe the best way to do this is to rent, lease, or sell the land to other farmers or ranchers.

Farm Service Agency (FSA) Foreclosures 14.330

Land foreclosed on, by FSA, should be sold to private interests without special consideration for ethnic origin, age, gender or religion and should not be held by or converted to government use.

Farm Service Agency (FSA) and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Office Co-Location 14.340

To make it easier for producers to access government farm programs, we support co-locating the local NRCS offices and the local FSA offices. (07)

Farm Service Agency Wildfire Relief Programs 14.350

- 1 Farmers and ranchers should be eligible for wildfire relief under FSA
- 2 programs whether the fire is naturally caused or human caused. (21)

State of Columbia

14.400

1 We oppose the creation of a State of Columbia from the District of 2 Columbia.

Foreign Ownership

14.500

1 Except for ownership by resident aliens, we oppose the foreign 2 ownership of U.S. lands. (04)

Policy No. 13.525, Indian Policies, was deleted in 2005

English as the Official National Language 14.550

English should be the official language of the United States of America as it would be helpful in commerce and civic discourse to have a common language. (20)

Anti-Trust 14.600

We support action at the federal level to ensure that the U.S. Department of Justice strongly enforces the anti-trust provisions when reviewing and acting on requests by agricultural processors.

Producer Purchase

14.610

We shall work to include the same tax advantages for producerpurchased companies transitioned into co-ops as are presently available for employee-purchased companies. (05)

Trade Negotiations

14.700

While we support free trade through the reduction of tariffs, Congress and the Administration must at the same time vigorously work to eliminate "reverse tariffs" which are systematically destroying agriculture's and other U.S. business' ability to compete in the world market.

Reverse tariffs impose costs on U.S. producers that are not equally imposed on other countries.

Reverse tariffs are imposed in the form of ever increasing minimum wage laws; Social Security taxes; Medicare; Unemployment Insurance; Workers' Compensation Insurance; OSHA and EPA regulations; other taxes and fees; bureaucratic red tape and numerous other regulations.

Through Congress and the adoption of agency rules the American people have established high standards for businesses and the products we produce. Those standards should not be selectively imposed on just American producers and products.

Any country should have the right of free trade with America when they have the same production standards that we have.

We support placing a moratorium on any new regulation of business until the responsibility of the Department of Commerce is changed to:

- 1. Standardizing all current government regulations;
- 20 2. Require all products imported into the U.S. to meet the same standards;
- 22 3. Determine compliance of imports with U.S. standards;
- 4. Determine the cost to U.S. producers of current and any proposed future regulations; and either compensate producers for these costs or impose import fees equal to the cost of the regulations to the American producers. (04), (05)

Farm Bill Export Programs

19

7

Farm bill export programs should have a high funding priority in Farm Bills. Despite a tremendous growth in export opportunities for farmers and small businesses since the 2002 Farm Bill, federal funding for export programs has not kept pace with farmer and rancher needs nationwide. This money is critical in enhancing U.S. farmers' competitiveness in foreign markets as intended by Congress. (17)

14.705

Trade Agreements 14.710

The AFBF and OFBF should continue to encourage an investigation into whether all segments of agriculture are being treated fairly under trade agreements and to seek corrective action where indicated.

Until such time as the support given by participating governments allow a level economic playing-field for all agricultural producers' and their intellectual property rights and ensures that all patent laws are respected, and until such time as the rules set down in both agreements are enforced by all cooperating governments, and until such time as those violating the rules are penalized for breaking those rules, the portions of the trade agreements that deal with the agriculture industry should be suspended.

Invasive Species 14.715

The land grant colleges and universities (Agricultural Research Service (ARS) & Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Plant Materials Laboratory) should continue to search for and develop plant material for forage production, conservation and wildlife uses.

Universities (ARS & ES) and federal agencies should promote the use of domestically-developed, imported and native plant species for forage production, conservation and wildlife activities.

Public agencies should be prohibited from planting or allowing to grow any invasive species for landscaping or any other purposes.

The best plant species available, native or non-native should be used for forage production, conservation or wildlife purposes.

Further NRCS should continue support and allow the use of domestically developed and/or imported plant species in their cost share programs.

15 Government units that own public rights-of-way land should undertake

- 16 proactive control programs to destroy and prevent the spread of those
- 17 plants that are classified as invasive species onto adjacent farm, ranch, or
- 18 forest lands. (00), (04)

Secure Rural Schools

14.720

So long as timber harvesting is not permitted and/or limited on federal land, we support the National Secure Rural Schools Program to replace the revenues lost. These revenues should be earmarked for the counties where timber revenues were lost. (07)

REAL ID 14.725

The State of Oregon should comply with the federal government to ensure that personal identification in Oregon is an acceptable form of ID at the federal level.

This should be accomplished with minimal adverse effect on the ability of agriculture employees to drive vehicles (see Policy No. 4.180). (07)

New Hires 14.730

We support the repeal of the requirement for reporting of new hires. (07)

Social Security Payments for Refugees 14.735

Foreign refugees should only qualify for social security benefits if they have worked the required number of quarters. (Referred to AFBF, 2008), (08).

Social Security Trust Fund 14.800

We support action now to eliminate the projected deficit in the Social Security Trust Fund. We oppose the so-called "Social Security Totalization" agreements with foreign countries that would award Social Security benefits to foreign workers who use invalid, fake or forged Social Security numbers to work illegally. (09), (11), (Referred to AFBF, 2011)

Balanced Federal Budget 14.900

1 Except during recessions, the federal budget should be balanced. 2 Every effort should be made to use spending cuts to eliminate a deficit.

3 (09)

Federal Reserve 14.910

1 Be it resolved that the Federal Reserve be fully audited. (Referred to 2 AFBF, 2012) (12)

Gold and Silver Currency

14.920

- 1 Be it resolved that the U.S.A. and the State of Oregon allow gold and silver
- 2 to be legal tender and exempt all transactions in Gold and silver from any
- 3 capital gains taxes. (Referred to AFBF, 2012) (12)

Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) 14.930

- 1 We support the Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) performing
- 2 FSMA audits instead of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). We
- 3 support ODA accepting federal dollars to perform the audits.
- 4 We support using data and audit results in third party certification
- 5 audits to be accepted for purposes of FSMA.

Farm Bill Nutrition

14.935

14.940

- 1 We support keeping traditional farm bill programs with the nutrition title
- 2 in one legislative package. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16)

Farm Bill Specialty Crop Allocation

We support collaborating with USDA on how funding can be better spread among numerous entities and an appeal process by which an

- 3 entity can navigate in cases of one sided grants being awarded. (Referred
- 4 to AFBF, 2016) (16)

Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program 14.950

We support incorporating all types of fruits and vegetables (fresh,

- 2 frozen, canned and dried) into the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program
- 3 (FFVP) providing an affordable option for increasing the variety available
- 4 year-round for low income school children and more market opportunity
- 5 for producers. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16)

Farm Bill Specialty Crop Dollars and FSMA 14.960

- 1 We oppose the use of Specialty Crop Block Grant Fund (SCBGF) to
- 2 be used for Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) implementation. This
- 3 congressional mandate must be funded through the Health and Human
- 4 Services (HHS) Federal Drug Administration budget. (Referred to AFBF,
- 5 2016) (16)

INDEX

1099 Reporting Abandonment of Railroad Right of Way	2.570 4.450
Acquisition of Public Lands for Tribal Reservations	13.790
Action by Farmer	13.020
Additional Farm Dwellings	3.510
Administrative Agencies	13.720
Agency Liability	13.725
Aggregate	3.700
Agricultural and Forest Chemicals	8.040
Agricultural Burning	10.750
Agricultural Chemical Liability	8.010
Agricultural Commodity Quotas	10.155
Agricultural Produce Signs	4.390
Agricultural Research	10.010
Agriculture Policy for Oregon Agriculture Working Lands Conservation Easements	13.005 3.680
Air and Water Pollution	8.400
All Terrain Vehicles	4.525
Allocation of Conserved Water	7.380
Allocation of Water	7.525
Animal Damage Control	9.210
Animal Health and Plan Disease	10.020
Animal Unit Months Allocation Ratio and Game Numbers	
Animal Welfare	10.050
Antiquities Act	14.050
Anti-Trust	14.600
Appeals on Assessment of Appraisals	2.240
Application of Byproducts to Agricultural & Forestry Land	3.660
At-Will Employment	11.730
Balanced Federal Budget	14.900
Basic Education	1.002
Beaver Management	9.740
Beef Check-Off	10.500
Beginning Farmer Assistance	13.040
Bike/Multi Use Paths in Farm or Forest Zones	3.043
Bonding of Produce Wholesalers	10.630
Bottle Bill Law	8.320
Brand Inspection	10.540
Brucellosis Programs	10.030
Budgets-Local Governments	2.400 2.430
Budgets-State	∠.430

Bulk Purchase of Fuel for Agricultural Buyers By Products from Food Production Cannabis Capital Gains Tax Capital Punishment	4.610 10.037 10.660 2.520 13.620
Career and Technical Education	1.300
Catastrophic Crop Insurance Catherine Creek Dam	10.220 7.910
Caution Signs	4.318
Central Filling of Commodity Liens	10.650
Certification and Education	8.051
Certification of Field Crops Channel Management	10.700 7.760
Charter Schools	1.450
Chemical Use Criteria	8.020
Chlorofluorocarbon Exemption	8.070
Christmas Trees	11.650
Citizen Suits	14.060
Climate Change/Pollutant Pricing	6.500
Closure of Hunting Season Collective Bargaining	9.120 11.550
College Terms	1.100
Columbia Gorge	14.040
Commercial Activities in EFU Zones	3.630
Commodity Commissions	10.340
Communication with Other Organizations	13.015
Community Colleges and Higher Education	1.110
Compensation for Losses Compensation Revenue Sources	13.575 13.577
Compensation	13.570
Condemnation or Acq.of Land by Public or Priv Utilities	3.055
Condemnation	13.580
Confidential Financial Records	13.500
Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO)	7.495
Congressional Salaries	14.150
Construction Tax Exemption	2.340 11.400
Contractor Liability Corporate Activities Tax	2.965
Cougar Hunting	9.205
Country of Origin Labeling (COOL)	10.531
Crime Prevention	13.630
Criminalization of Environmental Law	6.315
Crop Pollinators	9.615
Cross Pollination Dairy Products Minimum Standard	10.706 10.420
Daily i Toddots Willilliam Standard	10.420

Dam Removal Deed Recording	7.920 3.696
Definition of Agricultural Land	3.015
Definition of Livestock	10.015
Department of Agriculture	10.300
Department of State Lands	6.100
Deregulation	12.320
Destination Resorts	3.900
Disaster Payments	10.620
DLCD Staffing East of the Cascades	3.105
Dock Strikes	4.585
Domestic Sheep	9.075
Domestic Water Well Permits	7.330
Double Majority	2.271
Drivers License Classification	4.175
Drivers License	4.180
Drone Technology	13.506
Drug Testing	4.330
Eastside Ecosystem Plan	7.110
Economic Impact	6.010
Education Service Districts Educational Vouchers	1.600
Election Integrity	1.455 13.905
Electric Utility Deregulation	12.320
Electrical Costs	12.310
Electrical Power Generation	12.315
Elementary School Agricultural Education	1.104
Elk Creek Dam	7.900
Elk Production and Sales	9.040
Emergency Medical Service	13.440
Eminent Domain	14.030
Encouragement of New Industry	13.050
Endangered Species Act	9.400
Energy Tax Credits	2.920
English the Official National Language	14.550
Environmental Program Funding	6.025
Environmental Terrorism	10.075
Establishing Wheat Yields for Gov Wheat Programs	10.210
Essential Salmonid Habitat	9.740
Estimated Tax	2.550
Executive Orders	14.055
Export Ban	10.110
Fair Market Competition	10.006
Falling Water Charge	7.510
Family Leave	11.021

Foreign Investment	14.500
Forest Practices Act	5.100
Forest Service Timber Harvest Policy	5.400
Forestry Programs	5.030
Forestry	5.010
Freedom to Farm	13.030
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program	14.950
Fuel and Energy	12.300
Funding for Enacted Legislation	13.760
Game Animal Numbers	9.100
Game Animal Transplanting	9.050
Gas Tax	4.030
General Commodities Statement	10.005
General Education Statement	1.001
General Environment Statement	6.005
General Fish & Wildlife Statement	9.005
General Forestry Statement	5.001
General Taxation Statement	2.001
General Transportation Statement	4.005
General Water Statement	7.005
Gold and Silver Currency	14.920
Goose Depredation Plan	9.140
Government Accountability	6.030
Government Agency Lobbying	13.710
Government and other Ownership Property Taxes	2.209
Government Growth	13.730
Government Ownership of Farm and Forest Land	3.689
Government Surplus Properties	13.117
Grass Seed Use	10.305
Gray Wolf	9.255
Grazing Fee Formula	9.500
Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative	9.520
Grazing Permit Application Green Power	9.510
	12.305
Groundwater Priority Allocation	7.550
Guard Dogs Under Right To Farm Gun Control	3.031
Hand Held Communication Devices	14.010 4.190
Harvest Picketing	11.500
Hazard Communication Rules Applied to Employers	11.274
Head Start Services	11.274
Health Insurance	11.630
High Value Farmland	3.200
Highway Funding Decisions	4.011
Highway Signage for Roadside Stands	4.317
riignway Signage ioi Noausiue Stanus	4.517

Highway Signs Historic Preservation of the Oregon Trail Historic/Cultural Designations Homestead Exemptions Horse and Burro Management Horse Import Permit Hours of Service Exemption Hours of Service Hunting and Fishing License Cost Hunting Tags Hydrological Connection	4.315 13.585 3.034 2.210 9.350 10.514 4.280 4.285 9.110 9.125 7.335
I 9 Verification Identification of Livestock	11.120 10.530
Illegal Drugs	13.625
Illegal Immigration	11.150
Illegal Killing of Domestic Livestock	10.070
Imported Ag Products	10.190
Indexing	2.540
Industrial and Municipal Waste Inheritance Taxes	8.300 2.600
Initiative Process	13.135
Intent to Make a Profit	2.960
Internet Access	13.800
Internet Commodity Marketing	10.330
Interstate Commerce	4.290
Invasive Species	14.715
Irradiation	10.095
Irrigation District Elections	7.360
Judicial Reform	13.530
Jury Duty	13.110
Labor Laws and Regulations	11.010
Labor Poster Labor Regulations	11.030 11.020
Land Use Action Notification	3.625
Land Use Planning Authority	3.020
Land Use Planning	3.010
Landfill Impact on Water Quality	7.486
Landowner Preference Tags	9.220
LCDC Commission	3.120
LCDC Goals and Guidelines	3.110
Leaky or Sifting Loads	4.350
Leasing of Water Rights	7.385
Legal Action	13.515
Legal Aid Services	11.820
Legislative Emergency Clause	13.785

Liability at County or State Fair Liability Exemption for Public Access Liability Suits Limiting Legislative Sessions Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Livestock Auction Markets Local District Property Taxes Local Government Gas Tax Local Involvement Loose Livestock Loss of Private Property Lot-of-Record LUBA Appeals Maintenance of Streamflow Gauges Management of Lands Under Foreclosure Management of Public Lands Mandated Public Access Mandatory Flexible Schedules Mandatory Predictable Scheduling	13.538 3.045 13.535 13.780 12.360 10.520 2.275 4.075 1.400 10.545 3.688 3.575 3.025 7.340 14.320 3.685 3.040 11.026 11.022 11.025
. , ,	
	7.340
Management of Lands Under Foreclosure	14.320
Marine Mammal Protection Act	9.450
Market Negotiations	10.120
Marketing Development	10.160
Marketing Orders	10.150
Mass Transit	2.350
Maximum Speed	4.310
Measure 37 and Measure 49 Right to Farm	3.920
Measurement of Water Use	7.225
Meat Inspection	10.510
Medical History and Pesticides	8.200
Metro and the RCVOG Urban Rural Reserves	3.820 10.400
Milk Usage Audit Law Minimum Corporate Tax	2.515
Minimum Lot Sizes	3.410
Minimum Stream Flows	7.800
Minimum Wage Averaging	11.600
Minimum Wage Increase	11.590
Minimum Wage Indexing	11.580
Minor Aged Vehicle Drivers	4.185
Mitigation for Aggregate Projects	3.720
Multiple Use	6.200
Municipal and Industrial Waste Water Reuse National Forest Receipts	7.720 5.020
National Weather Service	14.230
Natural Resources Revenues	6.400
, tatal all 1 toodal ood 1 to folloo	0. 100

Navigable Determination	7.015
Navigable Rivers	7.010
New Hires	14.730
No Spray Signs	9.610
Non Farm Dwellings	3.550
Non-Farm Activities	3.670
Non-Resource Lands Zoning	3.674
Notification Requirements	7.575
Nuisances	13.510
Oil Seed Crops	10.705
Oregon Agricultural Income	10.350
Oregon Constitution	13.130
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODF&W)	9.010
Oregon Department of Forestry Jurisdiction on Rang elar	
Oregon Public Employees in Legislature	13.140
Oregon State University	1.120
OR-OSHA	11.250
Overtime	11.675
Pacific Northwest Water	7.650
Parole Eligibility	13.600
Payments to Growers	10.600
Peak and Ecological Flows	7.790
Periodic Review	3.805
Personal Property Rights	13.504
Pest Control Districts	10.080
Pesticide Labels	8.054
Pesticide Sales and Use Reporting	8.052
Pesticides	8.050
Plant Breeding Programs	10.720
Political Contributions	11.740
Pollution Control Tax Credits	2.900
Population Allocation	3.810
Port Bonds	2.290
Preamble to Land Use Policies	3.000
Predator Management	9.200
Presidential Elections	14.145
Prevailing Wage Rate	11.625
Private Property Rights	13.504
Probate Fee	13.520
Producer Purchase	14.610
Product Labeling	10.180
Product Liability	10.310
Propane Quality	4.615
Property Tax Administration	2.230
Protection of the Term "Meat"	10.513
Public Employee Strikes	13.141

Public Lands	6.350	
Public Roads Safety	4.300	
Public Utility Commission (PUC) Truck Permits	4.200	
Public/Private Land Exchange	6.465	
Publications of Government Proceedings	13.115	
Publishing Legal Notices	13.771	
Purple Loosestrife Control Research	8.060	
Purpose of Farm Bureau	0.001	
Qualifications for Public Office Railroad Abandonment	13.125 4.400	
Rails to Trails	4.420	
	9.530	
Range Improvement Raw Milk Sales	10.410	
Re Entry Standards for Pesticide Application	11.290	
REAL ID	14.725	
Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration (RPAR)	8.085	
Reclamation Law	6.420	
Recreation Cooperation	6.415	
Recreation	6.410	
Recycling of Pesticide Containers	8.330	
REDDI Program	13.640	
Regulation of Drainage Districts and Irrigation Districts	7.765	
Regulatory Reform	14.100	
Release of Impounded Water	7.600	
Release of Public Seed Varieties	10.730	
Religious Life	13.200	
Removal of Acreage from Production	3.687	0
Removal of Species from Threatened and/or Endangered		
Replacement Dwellings	3.545	
Reporting of Water Use	7.230	
Required Local Government Programs	13.750	
Reserve Fund	2.450	
Resource Management	6.020	
Restricted Chemicals	8.080	
Restructure of LCDC	3.180	
Right of Power Congretion	3.030 12.350	
Rights of Power Generation Right-to-Work	12.330	
Riparian Management Zones	7.250	
Road Access Policy	6.455	
Road Access	4.360	
Road Development	3.690	
Road Rights of Way	3.692	
Roadside Signs	4.314	
Roadside Vendors	11.920	

Rural Broadband Rural Community Stability Plans Rural Health Rural Road Maintenance Sabbaticals Safety Restraints	2.850 3.022 13.400 4.302 1.210 4.340
Sale or Lease of Public Lands Sales Tax Salvage Logging Scenic Rivers School District Reorganization	6.460 2.100 5.210 7.100 1.410
School District Transportation Fee School Finance School Zone Lights Seasonal Labor Force	1.500 2.950 4.316 11.100
Seasonal Unemployment Compensation Secondary Boycott Section 208 of the Clean Water Act Secure Rural Schools Seed Trade Rules	11.340 11.530 7.475 14.720 10.710
Senate Apportionment Service Animals at Farm Stands Service Fees Single Subjects for Congressional Legislation	14.170 10.055 13.740 13.900
SLAPP Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation Slaughter Houses Slow-Moving Vehicle Signs Small Claims Court Judgments	13.536 10.515 4.305 13.525
Social Security Payments for Refugees Social Security Taxes Social Security Trust Fund Social Services	14.735 2.700 14.800 13.430
Soil and Water Conservation Districts Soil and Water Conservation Solar Siting in EFU Special Designation State Board of Agriculture	7.701 7.700 3.678 9.300 13.705
State Boards and Commissions State Forests State and Federal Water Relief Programs State Income Tax State of Columbia	13.770 5.300 7.301 2.500
State of Columbia Statewide Labor Policy Stewardship Stop Lights	14.400 11.015 6.450 4.319

Studdent Work Experience 1.310 Subsurface Property Rights 6.320 Supersiting 3.790 Surveyor's Access 3.695 Sustainability 10.900 System Development Charges 2.330, 3.801 Takings of Property 13.560 Tax Court 2.270 Tax Exemption-Condemnation 2.227 Tax Exemption-Personal Property 2.225 Tax Exemption-Real Property 2.225 Tax on Interest Savings 2.560 Tax Penalties 2.280 Teacher Agricultural Education 1.003 Teacher Continuing Education 1.200 Teacher Tenure 1.220 Technology in Agriculture 10.716 Testing of Motor Fuel 12.410 The Food Quality Protection Act 8.055 Theft of Farm Property 10.060 Third Party Lawsuits-Harassment 13.537 Three Axle Trucks 4.100 Timber Product Export Restrictions 5.600 Timber Taxes 2.810 Titling Fees 4.160
--

Uniform Truck Loads Urban Growth Boundaries Urban Renewal Districts USDA Forecasting Use of Antibiotics User Fees Utility Siting Value Added Tax Vehicle Insurance Tax Vehicle Registration Vehicle Trip Permits Veterinary Services Volunteer Emergency Personnel Volunteer Fire Fighters Voter Registration Voters Pamphlet Information Wage Penalty Claims Water Adjudication Water Conservation Water Development Water Laws Water Quality Water Resources Commission Water Right Applications Water Right Applications Water Use Fees Water Withdrawal from the Columbia River Weed and Brush Control Weed Control Weight Mile Tax Wetlands in EFU Wetlands Wild Bird Seed Wildlife Fecal Coli form Study Wildlife Pecal Coli form Study Wildlife Refuges Withdrawn Land Transfers Wolf Hybrid Registration Woodland Assessments Workers' Compensation Insurance Workers' Compensation Insurance	11.300 4.230 3.800 2.955 10.100 10.035 2.300 3.675 2.075 4.040 4.140 4.220 10.040 13.441 13.442 13.150 13.126 11.610 7.305 7.200 7.450 7.300 7.450 7.300 7.375 7.500 7.375 7.500 7.825 9.600 10.712 4.060 3.691 7.850 9.605 6.440 7.490 9.211 9.130 6.430 9.250 2.800 11.200 11.220
	11.800