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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 is the voice of agricultural producers at all levels. (00), (05), (08), (09)
Farm Bureau Philosophy

We believe in the traditional American family; in self-government; in limitations upon governmental power; in maintenance of equal opportunity; in the right of each individual to worship as he chooses; in separation church and state; and in freedom of speech, press and peaceful assembly.

Property rights are among the most basic human rights essential to 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 rights or the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

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

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

General Education Statement 1.001

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

Basic Education 1.002

We recommend the legislature periodically review the basic education program. 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 the American republic and citizens' responsibility and involvement.
4. Give increased emphasis to the teaching of the fundamentals of free enterprise in our economic system.
5. Give increased emphasis to the fact that agriculture is a major contributor to the economic system.
6. 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)

The annual legislative review process mandated by the Oregon Educational Act should require that student performance data be reported in a manner that allows timely evaluation of each of the specific sets of teaching practices that are being initiated in the state. We continue to support local control, cost effectiveness, and measurable academic goals throughout all publicly funded schools of learning. We support parental involvement over course content and values instruction. We urge the dedication of school funds, resources and personnel to attain the highest level of academic achievement by people, 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**

1. 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.
2. All K-12 teachers should be required as a part of their continuing education to take a course on the role that agriculture and the natural resource industry plays in the wellbeing of the citizens and economy of Oregon.
3. 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**

1. 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. (09)

**College Terms 1.100**

1. 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**

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. We recommend that out of state students pay the full cost of their education in Oregon. (05)

**Oregon State University 1.120**

1. 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

We support the concept and continued emphasis of career and 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
1 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.
2 We recommend that schools use lay membership advisory committees to support and promote educational decisions and practices.
3 (04)

School District Reorganization 1.410
1 We favor continued effort and encouragement towards voluntary reorganization which will result in more effective and efficient education programs.
2 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.
3 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 school districts. (07), (09)

Educational Vouchers 1.455
1 We support education vouchers and encourage their utilization in all school districts. (11)

School District Transportation Fee 1.500
1 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
1 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
1 The state tax structure must be built on a sound basis for the general
2 benefit of business and for encouraging individual enterprise.
3 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
5 finance services that are for the general benefit of society. (00)
6 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 2.075
1 We are opposed to a value added tax.

Sales Tax 2.100
1 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
3 2006), that is revenue neutral, broad based, holds individuals and families
4 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
6 property taxes.
7 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
11 following provisions.
12 1. The rate and agricultural exemptions are established in the
13 constitution.
14 2. Prescription drugs, food purchased for home preparation, livestock, seed, pesticides, processing or cleaning of
15 agricultural products, fees for agricultural business services
16 performed, farm equipment, parts and repairs for farm equipment
17 and any item that is consumed or used in the production of, or
18 becomes a part of, an agricultural product shall be constitutionally
19 exempt from the tax.
20 3. No county, city, district or other municipal corporation or political
21 subdivision may impose a general retail sales-and-use tax.
22 A listing of these provisions does not constitute an endorsement of a
23 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
1 Profit or non-profit land trusts, federal, state or local government or
2 other sovereign nations owning land for purposes other than farming in an
3 agriculture or a forest use zone should be required to pay, to the county
4 tax collector, the applicable tax penalty and pay annually an amount in lieu
5 of and equal to the property taxes that would have been levied if the
6 property were not in a resource zone.
7 While the land remains in farming, the owners of such land should be
8 required to pay an amount in lieu of taxes at its farm use value. (00), (07)

Homestead Exemptions 2.210
1 Homestead exemptions for property tax relief must be constitutionally
2 funded by State General Funds at a level of 100% and only apply to levies
3 assessed by districts providing public education. (00)

Tax Exemption-Personal Property 2.220
1 All farm personal property should be included in the personal property
2 tax exemption. The definition of farm personal property should include all
3 personal property and equipment used in on-farm processing facilities.
4 We believe underground irrigation installations should, for assessment
5 purposes, be treated the same as above ground irrigation pipe. (00)

Tax Exemption-Real Property 2.225
1 There should be a tax incentive to encourage the joining of any two
2 adjoining parcels, such as a reduced tax rate for some period. Such an
3 incentive could be a temporary property tax reduction granted on the
4 smaller of any two adjoining parcels, when one or more of which are
5 smaller than the minimum lot size, which are voluntarily combined by
6 amending the legal description to join both parcels. (10)

Tax Exemption-Condemnation 2.227
1 When private property is taken under the threat of eminent domain for
2 public benefit, all compensation received from an easement, lease, or sale
3 to any public, private, or government entity should be exempt from state
4 and federal income and capital gains taxes. (06)

Property Tax Administration 2.230
1 We favor administering the property tax assessment law at the county
2 level. (00)

Appeals on Assessment of Appraisals 2.240
1 We oppose any fee for appealing an appraisal and/or assessment to
2 the County Board of Property Tax Appeals. (04)
Farm Use Assessment Principles 2.250
1 Land in EFU zones should be assessed based on its ability to produce
2 farm income from crops and livestock typically grown in the area. All land
3 in EFU zones should be assessed at farm use value except land that is
4 being used for a non-farm use.
5 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 2.255
1 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
3 based on purchases of structures not located in farm zones.

Farm Use Assessment Criteria Land 2.260
1 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
5 production.
6 To determine the correct appraisal of farmland, the weighted average
7 use of a class of land for at least five years should be the criteria on which
8 values are based.
9 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.
12 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.
15 All lands in EFU zones, except those being used for a use other than
16 farm use should be assessed at farm use value.
17 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.
22 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.
28 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

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

Agricultural Nurseries

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

Recreation

Land which meets the qualification for farm use assessment which is also used for recreational purposes either by voluntary consent or for a fee should not be disqualified from farm use assessment.

Non-EFU Land Income Test

One hundred percent of the value of farm products produced on a parcel and used for personal use should be counted when computing the income test for a parcel outside the EFU zone attempting to qualify for farm use assessment.

Government Actions

Valuations for property 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 all endangered species habitat, all of which may decrease production capabilities and/or property value for agriculture use. These practices should reflect appropriate decreases of assessed values for property tax purposes.

Exemptions

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

Adjustment of January 1 assessed values should be made when real or personal property is damaged or destroyed by acts of God. (00), (02), (05)

**Tax Court**

In the event of a disagreement on farm use valuation between the assessor and the Board of Review, the matter should go directly to the tax court for final determination. When a private citizen prevails in a contested property tax case, the county government should be obligated for the 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 in succeeding higher courts. In matters brought before the Oregon Tax Court by an individual property owner, we believe that the burden of proof should be on the County Assessor or Department of Revenue.

**Double Majority**

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**

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
1  We support ten years as the number of years a tax penalty and interest
2  must be paid when farm lands receiving farm use assessment are
3  changed to a non-farm use.
4  There should be no tax penalty for temporarily changing a homesite
5  use from one in conjunction with farm use to one not in conjunction with
6  farm use unless the change involves a parcel separation. (05), (07)

Port Bonds 2.290
1  We oppose Port Districts selling tax free bonds to finance business
2  projects on private property.

User Fees 2.300
1  Fees imposed or increased by state agencies should only be used as
2  a resource to the agency assessing the fee. Government operations
3  funded by fees should directly benefit those paying the fee. (00)

System Development Charges 2.330
1  We support the use of system development charges as an important
2  tool for sharing the cost of applicable infrastructure. We strongly oppose
3  the use of system development charges for agricultural and forestry
4  activities in resource zones. (18)

Construction Tax Exemption 2.340
1  We support an exemption from construction taxes on agriculture
2  buildings when such taxes are authorized by school districts for capital
3  construction projects. (07)

Mass Transit 2.350
1  We support an agricultural exemption from all mass transit and
2  transportation district taxes. Non-highway fuel uses should be exempt
3  from fuel taxes levied by mass transit districts.

Budgets-Local Government 2.400
1  We favor retaining the portion of the local budget law that requires
2  publication of municipal corporations' budgets in a newspaper of general
3  circulation, and all features of the local budget that inform and protect the
4  taxpayer.
5  We support legislation allowing local government to retain control of
6  all salaries subject to the local budget law.
7  Because of the difficulty of comparing one year’s budget to the next,
8  we support line item budgeting. Salaries should be determined before
9  budgets are adopted. (00), (04)
Policy No. 2.410, Budget Expenditure Limitation Local, was deleted in 2004

Budget-State 2.430
1 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
1 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
1 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
1 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
1 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
1 While we oppose capital gains taxes, 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. 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)
Federal Capital Gains Tax 2.521
1. 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
1. 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 2.540
1. We favor indexing of the Oregon State Income Tax dollar brackets for inflation. (04)

Estimated Tax 2.550
1. 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
1. 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
1. The minimum amount required to be reported on the 1099 form should be raised to $2,000 and indexed for inflation. (07)

Inheritance Taxes 2.600
1. We support the phase out and eventual abolishment of all state and federal gift, inheritance, and estate taxes.
2. 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:
3. An exemption in 2010 dollars equal to or greater than $5 million for each spouse;
4. A permanent rate, that is not set to sunset or on a schedule;
5. A stepped-up basis; and
6. Indexed for inflation.
7. The value of all farm land for inheritance tax purposes should be based on its farm use value.
8. Timber should be exempt from estate, inheritance and gift taxes, recognizing that timber will not be harvested by each generation.
9. 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.

Social Security Taxes 2.700

1. Self-employed persons should be able to deduct the employer's share of their Social Security taxes as an expense.
2. We oppose means testing (reducing benefits for high income wage earners) as a way to keep the Social Security system solvent.
3. The social security tax should be a dedicated fund, and used only for the purpose for which it is collected.

Woodland Assessments 2.800

1. 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

1. 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.
2. The value of small tracts of timber land should not be higher than the farm use value of comparable classes of farm land.
3. Any taxes on timber should be for services related to protection, reforestation, fire protection and management of timber and should only be used for such service. (00)

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

Rural Broadband 2.850

1. Communication Services should be available at a reasonable cost to all people. We support:
2. 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.
3. The continuation of the Universal Service Fund (USF) to maintain affordable communication services in rural Oregon. (18)
Pollution Control Tax Credits 2.900
9 We support tax credits for agricultural producers for construction, 10 remodeling, purchasing, or leasing of facilities or equipment for air or water 11 pollution control. An option of credit on income taxes or property taxes 12 should be available.
13 We recommend that capital investment made in equipment or facilities 14 that reduce or eliminate nonpoint source pollution be eligible for Oregon 15 Pollution Control Tax Credit Certification by the Oregon Environmental 16 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
7 Urban renewal districts are not to be used on farm/agricultural lands 8 that are outside a UGB. Any new urban renewal districts within a city will 9 need approval by a vote of the people whose taxes will be affected by 10 designation of an urban renewal district. Purposed districts shall have a 11 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 maximizing profit;
11 2. Lack of prior expertise in running a farm or ranch;
12 3. Being retired from another career outside of agriculture;
13 4. Operating with a good-faith belief that land will appreciate in value;
14 5. Having a prior career or additional career unrelated to production 15 agriculture;
6. Losses in 9 or less in the first 10 operating years, and 5 or less out of 7 subsequently;
7. Inability to recover all losses incurred over the course of business;
8. Outside income of the individual, including but not limited to pension, social security, or spousal income;
9. Deriving pleasure from the process of farming, and the lifestyle associated with it. (19)

**Corporate Activities Tax**

We are opposed to the Corporate Activity Tax (CAT) or other gross receipt-based taxes being applied to agricultural and natural resource production in Oregon. (19)
III. LAND USE

Preamble to Land Use Policies 3.000
1 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 inter-related.
2 The policies included in this section must be interpreted as pieces of a whole, not applied independently. (00)

Land Use Planning 3.010
1 We support the principle of land use planning for the purpose of protecting the resources and the agricultural environment and infrastructure needed for farmers and ranchers to produce food and fiber for current and future generations in a profitable manner. We are philosophically opposed to efforts to remove economically productive farm and forest land from farm or forest zones.
2 We are in favor of agricultural utilization of land by individual owners who live on or lease their property.

Definition of Agricultural Land 3.015
1 Land that should be protected under Goal 3 includes all parcels of predominantly tillable land, irrigated land, grazing land and rangeland necessary to protect the agricultural environment and infrastructure needed for farmers and ranchers to produce food and fiber in an effective manner, and other land necessary to permit farm practices in the area.
2 These lands should be zoned EFU.
3 OFBF does not support redefining agricultural land and forest lands by counties based on factors other than the statewide criteria identified in Goal 3 and Goal 4. While different regions of the state may have varying levels of non-farm development pressure, a standard definition of agricultural land and forestlands under Goal 3 and Goal 4 is key to maintaining the agricultural land base and to minimizing conflicts from non-farm uses.
4 Local governments should be encouraged to use the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system developed by the Soil Water and Conservation Society, as a tool to determine relative value of parcels of land for agricultural use. (00)
5 Profitability should not be considered for the purposes of defining 'agricultural land' subject to the goal. (09), (11)

Land Use Planning Authority 3.020
1 We support state goals and guidelines combined with county zoning.
2 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.

LCDC Goals and Guidelines and administrative rules must be subject to legislative authority and must insure 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
1 We believe that each county should prepare a twenty-year land plan for sustaining its agricultural economy.
2 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
1 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 decisions that are appealed to LUBA.

Right to Farm 3.030
1 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)

Guard Dogs Under Right to Farm 3.031
1 Guard dogs that bark to protect property need to be protected under the Right to Farm laws.

Private Property Rights 3.033
1 Private ownership of real property is the foundation of our economic system. As such, it is in the 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 individuals, private groups, organizations, elected officials and government agencies.

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

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

We support decoupling the historic designation process at the state level with the “Goal 5” resource protection process such that designation of historic properties does not automatically entitle the resource to Goal 5 protections under Oregon’s land use laws. (19)

Mandated Public Access 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 to the landowner, his 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), (04)

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

We support liability exemptions for landowners who have authorized and/or unauthorized recreation occurring on their land including, but not 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, 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 public entities in order to assess the effect on the local tax base and on the interest of the landholders of the area.

Land acquisitions should be approved by the local governing body. 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 condemn privately owned property for the purpose of transferring ownership for private economic development that will have only minimal 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 servicing district, the public entity should continue to pay a share of the capital retirement and the operation and maintenance charges equivalent to that which the landowner would have paid had it remained in private ownership, or the public entity should pay a lump sum equal to the capitalized amount of obligation based on the terms of the district's charter.

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

Owners of property subject to damage from action by public entities, utilities or individuals, should be compensated.
Upon foreclosure of a farm or ranch, the foreclosed upon party should have the right to repurchase that property in its entirety, without loss of any portion thereof, such as wetland areas or subsurface rights.

We believe the power of condemnation by local municipalities, counties, and other government entities, whether it be land or personal property, should not extend beyond their own jurisdictional boundaries.

We oppose the purchase of resource lands outside of urban growth boundaries for public ownership.

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

### DLCD Staffing East of the Cascades

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

### LCDC Goals and Guidelines

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

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

### LCDC Commission

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

Because of the complexity of land use planning laws, we recommend 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 rules as they exist. (08)

### Restructure of LCDC

We support restructuring of LCDC so that it better represents all areas of the state and the agriculture industry. Such restructuring may include regionalization. (05)
High Value Farmland 3.200
1 The definition of High-value farmland in the ORS should be used in
2 conjunction with the provisions for farm dwellings, aggregate removal and
3 Lot of Record.
4 It is our position that there is no need for a definition of high-value
5 farmland for the purpose of general land use planning when the term
6 "agricultural land" is correctly defined (Policy No. 3.015). All land in an EFU
7 zone is equally important to the preservation of the agricultural community
8 which makes up the zone. (00)

Minimum Lot Sizes 3.410
9 Each county comprehensive plan should be required to establish
10 minimum lot sizes appropriate for various areas of that county that would
11 protect the agricultural environment and infrastructure needed for farmers
12 and ranchers.
13 For counties with or considering lower minimum lot sizes in an
14 exclusive farm use or mixed farm-forest zone, analysis for designating
15 lands for non-agricultural use should first consider the impact to existing
16 agricultural operations in the area. (00) (09)

Farm Dwellings 3.500
1 We support a menu approach using three options to determine when
2 an initial dwelling is provided in conjunction with farm use. Such dwellings
3 should be allowed on any tract or tracts of land under the same ownership
4 and deed restrictions should be imposed on the tract or tracts that were
5 used to qualify the initial farm dwelling. The dwelling applicant must be the
6 owner of the tract or tracts of land. The first option is an acreage test of
7 320 acres or more of zoned rangeland or 160 acres of other land. A second
8 option is a two-year gross annual income history test by the operator of
9 $80,000 on high value farmland or $40,000 on any other land. A third
10 option for non-high-value farmland only is a "potential gross sales test"
11 that evaluates the farm size and income of all farm operations that are
12 capable of grossing more than $10,000 annually, which have parcels
13 located wholly or partially within one mile of the tract of the dwelling
14 applicant.
15 We support a change in the dwelling criteria that would allow, at the
16 time of application, an initial farm dwelling if both the applicant and the
17 parcel can show a farm income history that meets or exceeds the
18 applicable farm dwelling income test.
19 We believe that before a non-farm dwelling can be sited in an EFU
20 zone with a Goal 3 exception zone change, the county must make sure
21 the applicant and county have tried to get the dwelling in conjunction with
22 the farm. (00), (01), (09)
Additional Farm Dwellings 3.510
1 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.
4 Additional dwellings in the same farm ownership, when located on a
5 noncontiguous parcel that is smaller than the minimum lot size and
6 provided in conjunction with farm use, should be manufactured dwellings.
7 These should be subject to annual review and removal when no longer
8 provided in conjunction with farm use. (00)
9 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
1 Seasonal, temporary or migrant farm labor housing should be a
2 permitted use in an EFU zone. (07)

Replacement Dwellings 3.545
1 When an existing dwelling in an EFU zone is removed, the owner of
2 the parcel should be eligible for a replacement dwelling permit without an
3 expiration date.
4 The holder of this permit should be allowed to replace the dwelling at
5 their discretion without meeting additional land use criteria. A lawfully
6 established dwelling should be defined simply as an existing building with
7 evidence that it was a lawful dwelling intended as a dwelling at the time of
8 its construction so long as property taxes for the dwelling are paid current.
9 (00), (07), (09)

Non Farm Dwellings 3.550
1 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
7 conjunction with farm use should be identified as a non-conforming use.
8 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), (10)

Lot-of-Record 3.575
1 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
provisions only apply to the person(s), or the legally authorized heirs of such persons, who continuously owned the parcel since January 1, 1985. We support a study of the impacts of applying lot-of-record provisions to 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**

3.600

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

2. 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:

3. Propagation or harvesting of a forest product; and


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

**Farm Use**

3.620

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

**Land Use Action Notification**

3.625

1. 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

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

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

3. Non-production based commercial activities should be accessory and auxiliary to the farm use on the subject farm and not the primary use. We
believe on-farm experiences encourage the public to support beneficial policy. We support farmers engaging with the public on farm in order to promote agriculture as a valuable part of our communities. (03), (09), (17)

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. Land Use Committee (16)

Non-Farm Activities 3.670
Because the limitation of non-farm activities is crucial to the integrity 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.
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 physically located.
Activities in private parks should be passive and consistent with a rural setting, including consistent with rural farm and forest operations. Parks may not be on high-value farmland without an exception unless they are within the urban growth boundary.
Weddings and other events on EFU land must be ancillary and accessory to existing farm use as defined in ORS 215.203 and not a commercial business separate from the farm activity. (00), (01), (06), (08), (09)
We support the state adopting conditions for siting and permitting short term vacation rentals in exclusive farm use zones that ensure such rentals are economically ancillary to the existing farm and that the farm owner is the farm operator and a full-time resident of said county. (17)
We oppose wildlife overlay zones in land use planning. When wildlife overlay zones are designated, a management plan that involves and is supported by the landowners, 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)

Landfills in EFU Zones 3.671
We oppose the siting of new or the expansion of existing landfills on high-value EFU land. (09)
**Non-Resource Lands Zoning** 3.674

1. We believe that a county should authorize new non-resource land zoning by having the determination approved by the county commissioners.
2. When a county rezones EFU lands that do not fall within the definition of “agricultural land” under LCDC Goal 3, counties shall establish non-resource zones for these areas, and allow other rural uses to occur. The process to use would include the county obtaining the expertise of a certified professional soil classifier registered and in good standing with the DLCD. That expert’s testimony and report to the DLCD becomes public record. (03), (09), (10)

**Utility Siting** 3.675

1. We favor locating thermonuclear power plants and other industrial developments in areas that will enhance irrigation developments and not take prime farm and forest land out of production.
2. Power transmission lines should be located to avoid losses of present or potential agricultural and timber production activities need to avoid valuable farm land. We support the principle of establishing utility corridors to minimize avoid the loss of agricultural and timber lands.
3. Underground utility facilities crossing or utilizing farmlands should be buried at a depth and in a manner that will not interfere with normally accepted agricultural practices in the area. All new buried pipelines and utilities in agricultural zones and on private land shall be placed no less than six feet below the surface of the ground. Such facilities include cables for communication and power transmission and pipelines for transmission of water, petroleum products, natural or manufactured gas, or other materials. All utility pipeline installations must be installed as negotiated with the land owner. (14)
4. 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 any repair, maintenance or restoration of their property. At the time of significant change of operation, the utility owner shall renegotiate a right-of-way agreement and easement and compensate the land owner or lease holder accordingly.
5. All agricultural tillage of less than 24 inches in depth should be exempt from the requirement to notify any buried pipeline or utility before work begins. (14)
6. All overhead utilities must be maintained at a height so as not to interfere with agricultural activities. (07)
7. We support changing the law to provide that if a land owner does not wish to have a utility on their property, then every effort would be made to avoid the property and/or put the utility line in an existing road right-of-way.
No landowner should be required to accept an easement for a utility unless no road right-of-way exists within a five-mile corridor. The area receiving the majority of the service should be the area that supplies the utility 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. The Oregon Department of Agriculture should be the agency that oversees the mitigation on agricultural land. The Oregon Department of Forestry should be the agency that oversees the mitigation on forest land. Every quarter mile section should be evaluated for location and availability to any existing road right-of-way. In addition, the utility should 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.
6. 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. (08), (09), (10), (Referred to AFBF, 2010)

Utility Access

We believe that access to public utilities for the agriculture industry for all agricultural purposes should be no less than equal to the services provided to other users. (09)
Solar Siting in EFU 3.678

1 We oppose siting of non-agricultural solar panel facilities on productive agricultural lands when alternative sites are available. We define productive agricultural lands as lands that are locally significant for the agricultural economy, have high productive value for that region, or have other qualities that make them valuable for that region. This analysis 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 should be allowed to exclude non-agricultural solar panel facilities in the EFU zone on productive agricultural lands. Counties should not authorize projects that could result in forfeiture of irrigation rights or loss of agricultural wetland exemptions. (18) We support bonding and a legal requirement to ensure that future solar sites when decommissioned are reclaimed back to farmland with comparable characteristics to the original farmland. Solar facilities should be required to perform weed control. (See Green Power at 12.305). (16) (19)

2 We oppose referring to solar facilities as “solar farms.” (19)

Agriculture Working Lands Conservation Easements 3.680

1 We support agriculture working lands conservation easements for the primary purpose of protecting farmland for continued agriculture use, while providing wildlife habitat and environmental benefits. Conservation easements shall not impact neighboring agriculture operations. If a conservation easement negatively impacts a neighboring agriculture operation, the neighboring agriculture operation should have an appropriate available remedy. (14)

Management of Public Lands 3.685

1 All public agencies that own, manage, or otherwise control real property must continuously actively manage its land to best achieve the purpose of the public land and to prevent negative impacts to surrounding private lands and landowners. Negative impacts include, but are not limited to the spread of noxious weeds, trespasses onto private property, increased wildlife burden, and other land use and resource conflicts. (14)

Policy 3.680, Agricultural Conservation Easements, was deleted in 2007

Removal of Acreage from Production 3.687

1 As producers of the highest quality agriculture products in the world, we oppose the permanent removal of acreage from agriculture production through any government or private program. (02)
Loss of Private Property  3.688
1 We support adoption of a governmental policy of no net loss of private
2 ownership of agricultural and forest lands in Oregon.
3 Any consideration for land ownership transfer from private to
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.
7 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
1 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
3 violate Goal 3 as expressed in ORS 215.243 (1) and (2), namely the
4 preservation and maintenance of farmland for farm use. (00)
5 We support State management of federal lands in their jurisdiction.
6 (13)
7 We oppose allowing foreign governments to own land within our
8 state." Rights of land ownership by foreign nations should be equal to the
9 right of ownership by US citizens in foreign nations to create a reciprocal
10 effect. (13)

Road Development  3.690
1 During the design phase on road development, consideration should
2 be given to impacts on existing agriculture practices. Road development
3 should encourage the continuance of farm use.
4 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
3 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)

Road Rights of Way  3.692
1 Before a government entity can get approval for a road improvement
2 project that would result in the right-of-way increasing in size, all property
3 owners with land bordering the project should be informed by the
4 government entity as to where all the existing property boundaries are and
5 how much more land would be acquired.
6 All disputes should be settled and a compensation rate agreed upon
7 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 population, the extra land acquired should be valued as if inside the Urban Growth Boundary.

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

Traffic Impacts Due to EFU Land Conversions 3.693
1 We support retaining LCDC Administrative Rules requiring the long-term assessment of the transportation impacts resulting from the establishment or enlargement of non-agricultural commercial businesses at the state and county level. The burden of any cost of infrastructure improvements should be paid for by the developer and not the general public. (11)

Surveyor's Access 3.695
1 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. Further, surveyors should compensate the landowner for any and all damages and time lost caused by their entry on private property. (08)

Deed Recording 3.696
1 We support requiring county planning departments and county recorders or city recorders to verify that a newly created parcel is legal and in compliance with the county comprehensive plan before the deed is recorded. (03), (07), (08)

Aggregate 3.700
1 We support requiring an “alternatives analysis and a needs analysis” as part of the aggregate permitting process when applying to mine high-value 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.
2 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.
3 We support prohibiting the mining of rock when it is under high-value farmland soils or if the mining activities meet or exceed the depth of surrounding irrigation or domestic water wells within the boundaries of an aquifer.
4 Before an application can be approved for a proposed aggregate removal operation that is located on high-value farmland, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Water Resources should be required to examine the application and both sign off that the proposed
mining/removal operation will not negatively impact agricultural operations and water rights on surrounding farms.

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

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

At a minimum, counties should have the authority to require that there be a demonstration that there are no reasonable alternatives to siting an 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 reclaimed back to farmland with comparable characteristics to the original farmland. (09)

We support long-range planning to identify appropriate places for 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 ranches.

Supersiting 3.790

We oppose the supersiting of any non-farm activity that would subtract from, or adversely affect, the surrounding agricultural industry and resource base.

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

Urban Growth Boundaries 3.800

We support the use of Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) as a means of dividing agriculture land from urban land. The purpose of designating land within UGBs under land use planning should be to provide space for all urban needs, including, but not limited to: housing, commercial and industrial, 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 from actively farmed land inside a UGB, without land owner consent.

We believe that UGB expansion is not an automatic right and that there are some situations where expansion has reached its limit because of the surrounding resource land. As such, we believe the 20-year buildable inventory requirement is inappropriate and should be repealed. Any boundary expansion on land protected under Goal 3 must not impair the agricultural environment and infrastructure needed to produce food
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 Oregon;
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.

Exceptions should include parcels that are smaller than the applicable minimum lot size and at least 75% of its perimeter is contiguous to:
1. An Urban Growth Boundary, or
2. Land designated as urban reserve, or
3. An exception area, or
4. Soils not listed in ORS 215.710 (definition of high-value farmland).

System Development Charges 3.801
1 See tax section 2.330. (18)

Periodic Review 3.805
1 In order to provide a reasonable level of land ownership certainty for agriculture producers near urban growth boundaries, no jurisdiction should 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 3.810
1 The population growth allocations among cities within a county should be under the county’s jurisdiction and not the individual cities. (03)

Metro and the RCVOG Urban Rural Reserves 3.820
1 The Rural/Urban Reserves process can only be supported using the 20-year land supply criteria as a minimum determining application tool and not using the consideration of vague factors that has been used.
4 We only recognize two classifications of lands: (1) urban lands and (2) rural lands. We do not recognize or support the term “undesignated lands” as a classification in the Rural/urban reserve process.
7 The urban rural reserves process allowed by the legislature for the Metro regional government, and Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties needs to have hearings by the legislature prior to being finalized by Metro to make sure that the agricultural and forestry lands have maximum protection.
These lands are agriculture’s and forestry’s industrial lands and need to be available for production with a 100 year supply. These lands are nature’s natural filters for the greenhouse gases that the urban areas expel and need to be recognized for this purpose as well as the economic benefits that they bring to Oregon’s economy. Cities that elect to have Urban Reserves shall be contained within the 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**

Counties should be required as a condition of approval for any single-family 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)

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

**General Transportation Statement 4.005**

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

**Financing Highways 4.010**

1. Highway use fund expenditures should be limited to the building and maintenance of highways and bridges, and should not be used for any other purpose.
2. State highway funds should not be spent on bicycle lane construction and or improvements or other bicycle accommodations.
3. We support having adult bicycle users pay for improvements and maintenance of bicycle lanes through the implementation of some form of fee or registration system.
4. Local jurisdictions should be prohibited from imposing bicycle lane improvement requirements on private enterprise without compensation.
5. If increased financing is required for the maintenance and repair of highways and bridges, we favor an increase in the highway use funds.
6. We recommend continual effort by county, state, and federal agencies for more efficient use of funds concerning maintenance and repair projects.
7. Road funding priorities must consider the infrastructure needed to support a viable commercial farm economy in EFU zones.
8. For the purpose of maintaining primary and secondary rural roads, we support allowing more flexibility in the use of Federal Highway Construction Funds at the state level when a state has completed 90% of its interstate highway system responsibility.
9. We support continual review of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan which would include the following:
   1. A review and analysis of the current gas tax allocation plan;
   2. The identification of need by conducting a road equity study as well as the unfunded needs of county market roads;
   3. The analysis of the economic impact of market roads;
   4. The identification of and analysis of how much gas tax is exported from, and returned to, rural communities; and
   5. A determination if any new revenue is required. (06), (09), (10)

**Highway Funding Decisions 4.011**

1. Regional highway funding decisions should be done at public hearings, which occur in the evening when the public can attend. (03)
Gas Tax 4.030
1 Any fuel tax increase should be accompanied by an increase in commercial vehicle fees to maintain parity with auto related taxes.

Vehicle Insurance Tax 4.040
1 We oppose a vehicle insurance tax. (06)

Weight Mile Tax 4.060
1 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.
2 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 corporation from imposing a petroleum use tax without approval of the voters within the municipality.

Three Axle Trucks 4.100
1 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
1 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 subject to a weight mile tax.

Vehicle Registration 4.140
1 We support a method of issuing farm plates that is designed so that these licenses can only be issued to qualifying farmers.
2 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.
3 The state shall allow government surplus vehicles and trucks to be eligible for farm plates. (17)
4 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.
5 We support legislation providing for the pre-purchase of an unlimited number of overweight trip permits.
6 We support the adoption of a reciprocal registration and licensing program between adjoining states, including apportioned farm plates. (05), (06)
Titling Fees 4.160
1. Titling fees should not exceed the cost of issuance and should not be used as a method of financing transportation facilities.

Driver’s License Classification 4.175
1. 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
1. 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 4.185
1. 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
1. 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
1. 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 4.220
1. Vehicle trip permits should be made available from the county clerk in those counties that do not have a permanent DMV agency office.
2. We support issuing unlimited trip permits for abnormal truck loads at local Department of Motor Vehicle offices.
3. 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.
4. We support the issuance of a functional wide load permit for the purpose of hauling large bales.
5. 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
1 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
1 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
1 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
1 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
1 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
4 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)

Public Roads Safety 4.300
1 We express our approval of reasonable laws related to highway safety for movement of implements of husbandry.
3 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.
7 We support highly visible dividing lines on rural roads.
8 We support adequate guard rails on state highways.
9 The Department of Motor Vehicles and Driver Education classes and 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 farming areas to notify the public of the need for caution.

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

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

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

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

We support a bumper height limitation on all non-commercial licensed vehicles that is no greater than the one for farm and commercial vehicles.

We express our approval of reasonable laws related to highway safety and support the establishment of best practices for movement of all types of farming equipment. We also support the use of all highway and rural roads for the movement of all types of farming equipment regardless of posted speed limits.

Rural Road Maintenance

1. The authorities improve maintenance of rural roads so local food can get to market.

Slow-Moving Vehicle Signs

1. We support the proper use of the slow-moving vehicle (SMV) signs.
2. We expect appropriate administering agencies to enforce the laws including assessment of fines regarding misuse of SMV signs. We support enforcement blitzes by law enforcement for the improper use of SMV signs.
3. Any use of SMV signs other than what the statute or rule provides, is a class C violation and enforced with fines.
4. 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.

Maximum Speed

1. 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.
2. 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.
Roadside Signs  4.314
1 Whenever the Oregon Department of Transportation and/or the
2 Tourism Information Council places roadside signs, an actual
3 determination should be made that those signs will not block the view of
4 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.
3 Prior to the end of the passing lane, a sign should indicate a mutual
4 responsibility to merge. (01)

School Zone Lights  4.316
1 All school zones should be controlled at each end a consistent color
2 of signing and lighting (that no other entity is allowed to use) for school
3 zone warnings. A warning sign should be attached to the light indicating
4 that the speed is 20 M.P.H. when the light is blinking.

Highway Signage for Roadside Stands  4.317
1 We support changing state laws so that farmers may place signs for
2 roadside stands on highway rights of way through a permit process. (02)

Caution Signs  4.318
1 We encourage state and county road departments to place caution
2 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
1 We support ODOT implementing standard amber light times that are
2 generously longer than ITE minimums and implement all red periods on
3 highways used for hauling agricultural goods. (17)

Studded Tires  4.320
1 We believe the use of studded tires should be legal when weather and
2 road conditions warrant their use. (00)

Drug Testing  4.330
1 Any driver who is involved in a motor vehicle accident in which another
2 person(s) is injured or killed should have a blood test within 3 hours to
3 determine if the driver was under the influence of drugs.

Safety Restraints  4.340
1 School buses carrying children to and from day care, migrant school
2 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)  
4 requiring seat restraints for children under the age of three.

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

Road Access  
1 We support legislative action that will require the Oregon Department  
2 of Transportation to take immediate action to ensure that Oregon's roads  
3 and intersections are improved and constructed in a manner that will allow  
4 farmers and ranchers to move their equipment from field to field in a  
5 manner that is safe for the producers and the traveling public. “No thru  
6 truck zones” do not apply to vehicles hauling ag products or farm  
7 equipment. (17)  
8 We support access to cross the road(s) that exist now or have existed  
9 since the area was designated as an EFU zone are grandfathered in and  
10 ODOT and/or the Federal Highway Authority that have major throughways  
11 or express ways running through the EFU zone or proposed to run through  
12 the EFU zone must design a system that allows for agriculture to have  
13 access to cross the road where existing access has existed and still exists  
14 and no road closures are allowed.  
15 We oppose road impediments such as islands in the turning lanes.  
16 Roundabouts need to be sized for commercial and agricultural traffic. (07),  
17 (09), (11), (17)

Agricultural Produce Signs  
1 We support expanding state roadway regulations to permit agricultural  
2 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  
1 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  
4 abandonment, the ownership of the land should revert to the landowner if  
5 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  
1 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
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 damages caused by trail users to their land, and making trail users liable for their torts. We support amendments to Oregon's recreational use 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 requirements associated with developing and maintaining a recreation trail.

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

We support legislation that will give adjoining landowners first right of refusal to purchase, at agricultural land prices, any railroad right-of-way adjacent to their property, if that railway is abandoned. We support an amendment to the Oregon Recreational Trails System Act to guarantee adjacent landowners unlimited access to and from their own property along and across the trail property was previously used by the land owner. (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 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.

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

**All Terrain Vehicles** 4.525

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

ATVs, when owned by a person conducting farm operations on land 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 regulations. (06)

**Transportation Emergency Powers** 4.575

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

**Dock Strikes** 4.585

1. We urge legislation to allow suits for compensation when a dock strike 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 is agreed upon and ratified. (17)

**Tow Trucks** 4.595

1. Law enforcement agencies should be notified by tow truck operators when the tow truck operators trespass. The law should provide:

   1. A penalty for enforcement;
   2. 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
   3. 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

1. 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 benefit. (09)
V. FORESTRY

General Forestry Statement 5.001
1 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
1 We support clear cutting as a forest management practice west of the
2 Cascades Crest.
3 We support necessary silvicultural practices according to sound
4 management principles, developed and used by foresters and
5 landowners.
6 We support legislation requiring the owner that was responsible for the
7 logging to be responsible for the reforestation.
8 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.
11 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.
18 We support Right to Practice Forestry laws.

National Forest Receipts 5.020
1 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
4 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.
8 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 5.030
1 The future health of the timber industry demands intensified management of small and medium sized timber parcels by the landowners.
2 We support education programs, incentive programs, capitalization rates and tax policies that encourage private landowners to achieve optimum production.
3 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.
4 We support monitoring of the USDA forest service initiative regarding coordination of public and private forest lands. (Referred to AFBF, 2012)

Oregon Department of Forestry Jurisdiction on Rangelands 5.040
1 We oppose the actions of the Oregon State Department of Forestry to expand their jurisdiction over the management of and activities on lands classified as rangelands including juniper dominated rangelands. (05)

Forest Practices Act 5.100
1 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.
2 We oppose FPA requirements that forest operators notify all residents within 500 feet of a pesticide spray project.
3 Crops grown under agronomic cultural practices should be considered an agricultural crop and not be subject to the Oregon Forest Practices Act.
4 We support amending the Forest Practices Act to reduce the time of reforestation to three years and to increase the minimum stocking rate to 200 trees per acre in western Oregon. (04), (05)

Fire Protection 5.200
1 Government should manage public lands regardless of how the land 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 firefighting resources within 8 hours. We support legislation that will allow local and state firefighting resources to be deployed on land managed by other agencies in a timely manner when federal agencies do not actively engage a wildfire that has a potential to damage private or state managed lands. (17)
2 We believe that the public owes a responsibility to contribute to fire suppression costs on private land. The state should fund a minimum of
50% of the fire protection costs and landowner in-kind contributions should be counted as part of the landowner's share of the costs.

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

We support national public land policies that prevent wildfires through fuel load reduction by thinning, selective harvesting and grazing.

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

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

Forest Protection 5.205
Forest and agricultural lands fire protection is funded by property tax assessments and forest protective association dues. We request the Bureau of Land Management continue their cooperative agreement with the Oregon Department of Forestry for the protection of BLM and O&C 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.
We oppose any restriction or limitation on exports of Oregon forest products unless negotiated by treaty.
VI. ENVIRONMENT

General Environment Statement 6.005
1 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
1 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
1 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
1 The responsibility for declining populations of flora and fauna
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
6 of all species requires action and sacrifice across the entire economic and
7 geographic spectrum of Oregon.

Government Accountability 6.030
1 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.
7 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
9 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.
15 All approved permits should be issued within two weeks of being
16 received. Conditions on such permits should be limited to only those that
are required to protect public health and safety from legitimate, science-based risks. Fees associated with approved permits, as they relate to agriculture and private property, should not be used as a revenue generation source. (05)

**Department of State Lands 6.100**
1 OFBF appreciates the efforts of the Division of State Lands to work cooperatively with the agriculture industry on “fill and removal”.
2 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**
1 We favor the multiple uses of public lands and publicly controlled or managed natural resources.

**Criminalization of Environmental Law 6.315**
1 Environmental laws should exempt persons who conduct farming, 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**
1 All lending institutions should discontinue the policy, during foreclosure, of retaining geothermal and other rights which were acquired lawfully by the previous landowner (title owner). Such rights should remain with, and not be severed from, the land.

**Public Lands 6.350**
1 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 6.400**
1 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**
1 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 services are provided but should not be charged merely for access to undeveloped areas.

Recreation Cooperation 6.415
1 We will cooperate with local, state or federal agencies and with recreation and wildlife groups to develop plans and procedures for better outdoor recreation opportunities, better utilization thereof and education in sportsman-like conduct.

Reclamation Law 6.420
1 We oppose any acreage limitation on any Bureau of Reclamation project.
2 The Bureau of Reclamation should not negotiate to divert water from irrigation to recreation use. (05)

Withdrawn Land Transfers 6.430
1 We are opposed to any jurisdictional transfer of withdrawn lands between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Land Management unless both agencies mutually agree.

Wilderness Areas 6.440
1 Multiple-use is the best utilization of our federal lands; therefore, no more Oregon land should be allocated as a wilderness designation area.
2 Those areas already designated as wilderness areas should be periodically re-evaluated.
3 We oppose the study or creation of new wilderness areas and expansion of present wilderness areas. When a new wilderness or national monument is created, we support the continuation of existing resource management practices and natural resource economic enterprises within the boundaries of that new designation in a manner that protects local communities (see also Antiquities Act 14.050). (19)
4 Lands designated for wilderness areas should be subject to local zoning ordinances.
5 We recommend that the Wilderness Areas Act be amended to control fire, noxious weeds, insects and diseases. Where there is a fire threat to adjacent multiple use areas, the maintenance of irrigation systems, should be continued. (05)

Stewardship 6.450
1 We support and encourage use of the Bureau of Land Management Stewardship Program.

Road Access Policy 6.455
1 The system followed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in establishing certain roads and rights of way for the alleged purpose of
access in certain agricultural areas of Oregon is not justified when considering:

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

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

We ask that the permit holder and the BLM have control of access when there is danger of fire, particularly in summer and late fall, or from 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 to:

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
5. Government agencies are encouraged to sell lands to the private 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, particularly in cases where public and private land holdings are intermingled (checker-boarded), thereby complicating the access and management of both. (09)

Land Ownership 6.466

The Oregon Farm Bureau disapproves the US Federal Government 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 climate and sequesters carbon.

Market-based incentives, tax credits, grants, and/or cost sharing programs are preferable to government mandates.
We support:

- 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.

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.
VII. WATER

General Water Statement 7.005
1 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 7.010
1 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
4 and which need federal government supervision and financial support.
5 The State of Oregon should provide well-documented, historic data
6 that streams were in fact navigable on February 14, 1859 with respect to
7 the navigability studies now under way.
8 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.
17 We support increased recreational development of public lands for
18 navigable access. (05)

Navigable Determination 7.015
1 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
1 We oppose the further expansion of scenic rivers to other streams or
2 tributaries.
3 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
1 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
not support any alternative that goes contrary to our national policy that
sets multiple-use as the goal for management of public lands.

**Water Conservation**

7.200

1. We will support a state water conservation program that would define
2. conservation as the “wise and beneficial use of water.” A state water
3. conservation program should address all of the state’s water resources
4. and stress voluntary involvement to:
5.   1. Improve efficiencies of delivery and application;
6.   2. Improve efficiencies of in-stream use; and
7.   3. Store surplus flows for future in-stream and diverted uses. (01)

**Storage of Willamette Basin Reservoir Water**

7.220

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

**Measurement of Water Use**

7.225

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

**Reporting of Water Use**

7.230

1. We oppose the reporting of water use. (17) However, if the state is
2. going to require reporting, reporting should be no more than annual;
3. individual user data should be protected and only available to third parties
4. at an aggregated, basin wide scale; the reports should not be used as
5. evidence in a forfeiture proceeding; and the reporting should impose as
6. little administrative burden on the user as possible. Reporting should not
7. occur unless the department actually has the resources and infrastructure
8. to process the information required. (19)

**Riparian Management Zones**

7.250

1. We oppose non-voluntary regulatory riparian set-asides or other
2. imposed riparian restrictions on private agricultural land. If regulations and
3. improvements are proposed to protect riparian lands on private agricultural
4. property, then the following conditions should be met:
5.   1. These regulations should be incentive-based;
6.   2. All such regulations should be reasonable; and
7.   3. All costs of these regulations and improvements should be paid
8.     by the government agency. (05)
Water Laws

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)

Water Adjudication

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

1. 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;
2. 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;
3. 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;
4. 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
5. A requirement, if the adjudication of in-stream water rights or state or federal reserved rights deprives any farm or ranch of water, the government pays just compensation to the farmer or rancher for all economic loss due to the loss of water.

Water Rights

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.

We believe that water and water rights from both surface and underground sources must stay with the land, particularly when lands are 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 areas where ground water is available under EFU lands that no other use
should be allowed unless there is an adequate supply of water for all EFU lands located above the ground water source.

We request that the present Oregon water rights law be administered in accordance with established customs and adjudicated court decisions.

We hold irrigation water to be property rights appurtenant to the land and that irrigation water rights are owned by the landowner.

When water rights are applied for and developed by a landowner, the ownership rights to appropriate and make beneficial-use of that water right vests solely in that landowner.

We hold that Irrigation Districts are a critical component of Oregon’s agricultural infrastructure. Irrigation Districts must be managed for the benefit of all patrons.

Irrigation Districts shall operate based on direction provided by an elected board representing the district members.

Water rights held within a district should stay on land in that district. Notwithstanding operation of the Endangered Species Act, water that is unusable by an irrigation district for irrigation should be available for other landowners or districts with access to the same water source for irrigation purposes only.

Oregon Water Recourse Department (OWRD) basin plans for water availability should be required to restrict rural, residential, municipal or industrial development near or on land zoned exclusively for farm use where non-farm demands will adversely impact the adjoining agricultural operation or other existing uses.

We support the presumption that a water right application be considered in the public interest, if the use is authorized in the basin program and the water is available.

Water rights should be described in terms of recorded property deeds. An affidavit showing a five-year period of nonuse within any preceding seven-year period should accompany all petitions initiating cancellation procedures.

We support allowing any owner of any agricultural water right to receive a waiver of the five-year cancellation for nonuse if the owner has a sufficient reason for requesting the waiver.

We support repealing that portion of the water right law which says, "A water permit or water right may be canceled after five years of nonuse."

Valid reasons for the waiver include, but are not limited to the following: government programs such as the current 10-year Conservation Reserve Program; improvements in Management programs; changes in crop production programs; changes in ownership; weather cycles; land litigation and temporary long-term economic conditions.

A farmer should have the option to accept or reject use of sludge or treated water. The use of such water should not result the in loss of water rights. Water quality testing should be the responsibility of the supplier, with tests done by a testing agency.
State law should be amended to allow representation from the 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

Stock ponds and retention impoundments in use in an agriculture environment should be grandfathered under Oregon water rights.

The water right application backlog in the OWRD should be cleared within a 3 month period before the department conducts any present or future rule or policy making, hires any new employees, or has their budget approved by the next legislature.

Governmental agencies should not be exempt from water rights application fees.

We support a fee being charged to file an appeal for granting a water right application. The fee should be equivalent to all costs incurred by a water right applicant. Appellants if successful should have the fee returned.

If the appeal is lost, then those filing the appeal would lose their fee and be required to pay any costs incurred by the water right applicant due to the appeal. (02), (03), (04)

It is the responsibility of OWRD to actively enforce the shutoff of illegal water withdrawals and damming of streams on properties with no water rights. (15)

We do not believe there should be a fee to file appeals for instream water rights. When the state files for instream water rights in a basin or watershed, there should be one application. (18)

We oppose any mandatory or regulatory implementation of cooperative, voluntary water management plans or arrangements. (17)

**Water Right Applications**

1. 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 of application.

**Domestic Water Well Permits**

1. New exempt domestic wells should be regulated by the Water Resources Department.
Before drilling new exempt domestic wells in groundwater limited areas, a landowner should be required to obtain a permit from the Water Resources Department. (06), (08)

**Hydrological Connection**

- Oregon Water Resource Department must use accepted, peer-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 surface water source, the department must prove the connection and that the impact is within the same irrigation season. (14), (17)
- Restrictions imposed on areas determined to be hydrologically connected to surface water resources with no initial scientific basis should sunset within five years unless scientific documentation proves a hydrologic connection. (06)

**Maintenance of Streamflow Gauges**

- If the Oregon Water Resources Department is regulating agricultural water use based on streamflow, the Department must maintain streamflow gauges that are regularly calibrated, accurate, scientifically acceptable, and placed in a location that will actually capture the full flow of the stream being measured. (18)

**Stored Water Application Process**

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

**Irrigation District Elections**

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

**Water Transfer**

- We support the ability of farmers, ranchers, and irrigation districts to 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 other farmers, ranchers or irrigation districts. (18)
- If an irrigator or district uses less water than their water right allows 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 the water saved to another parcel, he should not lose the rights to that water.
We should broaden our policy on the transfer of water rights to 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.

2. Permit the leasing of a water right on a year to year basis to other farmers having access to the same water source. This transfer should be considered a "beneficial use" to the owner of the water 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 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 7.385**

We oppose the permanent sale of water rights to in stream use because junior water users cannot be protected from injury arising after the sale of water rights to in stream use. Leases, as opposed to sales, can be broken if injury is discovered at a later date.

We are not opposed to transfers in character of the use of water rights by lease for five years or less. This includes transfers of irrigation use to in stream use. The transfer must be conditioned to prevent injury to all existing water users. Water available for transfers to in stream use must be limited to actual consumptive use, and shaped to mimic/resemble customary use within the stream system during the irrigation season.

Leasing programs should allow temporary leases for other agricultural 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.

Water Development

We support the sale of bonds by the Oregon State Treasury for financing water development and land drainage projects. Funds should be used to provide facilities for supplemental water, recharging wells, development of semiarid lands and for domestic water supplies. Such developments will stabilize and enhance the agricultural economy and contribute to the wealth of Oregon and the nation.

We support programs for water development to reserve suitable upstream storage sites and for initiation of conservation to store water for flood control; recreation; domestic; industrial and agricultural uses; hydroelectric power; and to stabilize stream flow.

We seek necessary changes in laws and rules to expedite the building of small scale reservoirs of 500-acre feet or less for the purpose of retaining seasonal runoff to enhance stream flows, provide sources of water for fire suppression, irrigation, and for wildlife enhancement.

In emergency low water years, minimum stream flows should be suspended in favor of domestic and agricultural uses. OWRD should make provision for livestock watering during times of drought if that water can be delivered simply by opening a diversion until the livestock water pond has sufficient water. (14)

We support reasonable, cooperative and scientific studies of underground water supplies and the drilling and maintenance of recognized monitor wells. In classifying a "critical groundwater" or declaring a moratorium on groundwater development, these studies should include data gathered from properly constructed monitor wells funded and maintained by the Water Resources Department.

The state should provide funding for the information to adequately manage Oregon's water. Livestock watering should be an exempt use and be allowed in ditches, streams, and from groundwater as necessary to support livestock operations. (02), (12), (16)

Section 208 of the Clean Water Act

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 nonpoint source pollution. Agriculture must not be blamed as the sole source of Non-point Source (NPS) pollution.

Oregon's 208 Plan should not be more restrictive than the federal regulations.

The voluntary 208 program for Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) should be administered by the Division of Soil and Water Conservation instead of the Department of Environmental Quality. Funds should be provided for the program. If sufficient funds are not provided we recommend the removal of all ordinances concerning animal wastes.

**Water Quality**

We support efforts to protect and/or improve the quality of our state's surface and ground water, provided such point and non-point programs are:

1. Based on sound science.
2. Management based and plan oriented.
3. Incentive based with minimal regulation.
4. Encouraged voluntary action.
5. Required to coincide with and minimize the effect on all uses.
6. Attainable, site specific standards that are based on the ability of the water body or system, if functioning properly, to achieve those standards.
7. Designed to protect private property and the owner's ability to economically use their land for agricultural purposes.
8. Designed to consider natural and background characteristics of each individual natural water system.
9. 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.
10. 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
1 We oppose the expansion or the creation of landfills that will negatively
2 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
1 We oppose all water use fees. But if one is initiated, we recommend
2 that the fees be proportionately charged among all water users, including
3 all state and public agencies and recreational users of water for
4 consumptive and non-consumptive use.

Falling Water Charge 7.510
1 We oppose any Falling Water Rain Charge. (05)

Allocation of Water 7.525
1 We oppose any water allocations of any Bureau of Reclamation
2 projects for uses other than those for which the project was authorized.
3 We support legislation that will prevent residential or urban
4 development from restricting or reducing water available to commercial
5 agriculture holdings established by water rights.
6 We oppose the automatic granting of water rights for domestic and
7 recreational use for non-resource dwellings and other non-resource uses
8 in resource zones. The burden of proof should be with the applicant to
9 demonstrate that the additional water demands will not adversely affect
10 neighboring agricultural or forestry practices within the same watershed or
11 aquifer.
12 Municipalities should be prohibited from demanding increased in-
13 stream flows to dilute industrial and human wastes to meet minimum
14 pollution requirements. We oppose the transportation of water out of water
15 sheds for non-agricultural use if it adversely affects agriculture.
Groundwater Priority Allocation 7.550
1 The groundwater priority allocation should be the same as presently established on surface water allocation.
2 The Water Resources Commission should have the authority to enforce the critical groundwater statutes.
3 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
1 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. Water permit holders should also be given the results of the survey.

Release of Impounded Water 7.600
1 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
1 We oppose the diversion of water out of the Pacific Northwest region.
2 (05)

Soil and Water Conservation 7.700
1 Soil and water conservation districts should be granted the responsibility for reviewing and approving conservation and sedimentation control plans related to nonpoint sources of pollution and soil erosion.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts 7.701
1 Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the Natural Resource Conservation Service should use their resources to fund farm ponds and storage as a priority project. (09)

Municipal and Industrial Waste Water Reuse 7.720
1 We support the use of treated, reclaimed water for agricultural purposes when the water is treated to a level that will not lower or degrade the quality of the farmland on which it is applied. (06)

Fill and Removal Permit Requirements 7.750
1 No farm or farm operation should be assessed criminal penalties for violation of the fill and removal laws. Civil penalties should be limited to no more than $100 per day for an alleged violation.
2 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 operations, should not have to live in fear of state government enforcement of fill or removal laws. Farmers should be allowed to maintain historic waterways to continue water flow to irrigation sites. The local Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) representing the private landowners should be given the same authority as the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W) regarding the waiver of fill or removal permits or at least be given a mutual review process. We support the retention of all exemptions for agriculture contained in the 1999 Oregon fill and removal law (ORS 196.800 through 196.905). If the exemptions are not fully retained, in the Oregon fill and removal law, we will oppose the law as written.

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

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

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

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

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

Channel Management

We believe that the ban and restrictions on gravel removal and or 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 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 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

Drainage districts and irrigation districts support important functions for 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 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 specific agricultural practices in order for the district to maintain their drainage systems. (16) Districts should not have to accept liability for water quality or quantity issues arising from discharges of stormwater into district facilities from any source. Districts must be able to retain their Clean Water Act exemption for irrigation return flow and agricultural stormwater. (18)

Fish Screens 7.770

We believe that the financial burden of fish screens should be borne by the state rather than the producers. (05)

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 project’s 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:

"The maintenance of minimum perennial stream flows sufficient to support aquatic life and to minimize pollution shall be fostered and 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 that support for human life, livestock, crops, etc., should have priority over aquatic life and in-stream water rights.

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

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

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

**Water Withdrawal from the Columbia River 7.825**

We encourage the State of Oregon to beneficially withdraw the state’s 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 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 jurisdiction over wetlands administration.

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

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

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

We oppose any Wetland Reserve Program, which reduces agriculture production on a permanent basis. If lands are diverted into a Wetland Reserve Program, those lands must have insect, rodent, and weed control as part of the program. (02), (05)
Elk Creek Dam 7.900
1 We urge the continued federal funding for the completion of the Elk
2 Creek Dam in the Rogue basin.
3 We also support funding for the Mill Town dam on Elk Creek in the
4 Umpqua Basin. (04), (07), (11)

Catherine Creek Dam 7.910
1 We urge that the Catherine Creek Dam decision be appealed.
2 We favor working with the Confederated Tribes in developing an
3 upstream impoundment or other improvements on Catherine Creek that
4 would be beneficial to both Union County and the Confederated Tribes.

Dam Removal 7.920
1 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
3 agriculture. Specifically increase in electrical power rates where USDA
4 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.
8 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.
12 If a dam is to be removed, the public should not pay any destruction
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 recognizes the general benefit to agriculture. (07)

Agricultural Chemical Liability 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 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 8.020
Criteria used to establish or prohibit domestic and foreign use of an 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 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.
We support reasonable regulation of their use. We support an expanded 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 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 improved safety information on labels of agricultural 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 the environment.

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

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

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

We urge that chemicals cleared for use on edible food crops to control 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 and state registration are particularly important until federal registration are completed.

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

We will work with and encourage the agricultural chemical industry to present through its advertising a positive and professional image of 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 pesticides and herbicides and also in the development of practical equipment for farm applications.

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

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

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

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

We support the use of approved pesticides for timber production 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 and forestry. We support the American Farm Bureau Federation pesticide policy and the extension of that policy to Oregon State laws and 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 to be kept than are required by the federal government for noncommercial restricted use pesticide applicator for two years. These records should only be released to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, and only after a specific need their release has been demonstrated to exist. Reasons for the release of application records from the noncommercial applicator may include such things as illegal restricted use pesticide usage, pesticide contamination of groundwater or a documented complaint.

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

Any public “pesticide right to know” legislation would be inadequate without a complete accounting of all pesticides used by every individual household. Any legislation should also require a provision to insist that anyone who purchases or applies pesticides should meet the...
requirements established for agriculture by FIFRA, WPS, EPA and the State of Oregon. We also oppose any system which is funded by a tax or surcharge on pesticides, farmer or farming operations. Any such system should be funded from the General Fund so the cost is shared by all taxpayers. (09), (10)

Certification and Education 8.051

- We support improved training programs on the proper handling and 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 chemicals (drift and volatilization) to the core pesticide training program.
- Training should also include education regarding application timing to prevent damage to non-target plants. This training should be prepared and delivered by the Oregon State University Extension Service or a specific program approved by the Oregon Department of Agriculture to insure credibility.
- 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. (10)

Pesticide Sales and Use Reporting 8.052

- We support an alternate paper reporting system for reporting pesticide use.
- We will only support extension of the Pesticide Use Reporting System 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 restricted use pesticide applicator for two years. These records should only be released to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, and only after a specific need their release has been demonstrated to exist. Reasons for the release of application records from the noncommercial applicator may include such things as illegal restricted use pesticide usage, pesticide contamination of groundwater or a documented complaint.
- We believe the existing means of tracking the sales and use of agricultural pesticides in the state is adequate and we oppose any system which identifies individual growers or farming operations or makes available their pesticide use records to the public.
- Any public “pesticide right to know” legislation would be inadequate without a complete accounting of all pesticides used by every individual household. Any legislation should also require a provision to insist that anyone who purchases or applies pesticides should meet the
requirements established for agriculture by FIFRA, WPS, EPA and the State of Oregon. (10)

**Pesticide Labels 8.054**

1. 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.
2. We support improved safety information on labels of agricultural 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 the environment. (10)

**The Food Quality Protection Act 8.055**

1. All legislation that requires review of chemical exposure risks should incorporate the following elements:
2. 1. Ample time for data collection, including a use pattern, application rates, and other relevant exposure rates.
3. 2. An allowance for minor crop uses:
4. 3. A top priority for streamlining the Section 18 registration process so products are quickly and readily available for emergency use;
5. 4. Incentives for registrants to register new products and reduced risk products for minor crop, food and non-food uses; and
6. 5. A requirement that growers are consulted prior to the cancellation of chemicals used in agriculture.
7. USDA must be an active partner in the regulation of chemicals in agriculture.
8. USDA must be encouraged to continue working as an advocate for farmers by collecting and disseminating essential chemical use and residue information, especially for the minor crops, both food and non-food.
9. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and other advanced crop protection techniques help to reduce overall chemical use. IPM programs are weakened when chemicals that target specific pests are lost. The EPA and USDA should consider the impact on lost IPM use when deciding whether or not to reregister a product for agricultural use.
10. Research must be promoted that accurately identifies exposure risks to consumers of food and other horticultural products.
11. Implementation of any food quality regulations must rely on accurate and adequate scientific data which precisely quantifies the risk exposure levels and the benefits of agricultural products. New regulations should not be implemented until all available scientific information and use data are collected and evaluated. Any statutory deadlines deemed unreasonable should be changed.
12. We support legislative solutions to ensure the availability of minor crop use pesticides. These solutions should include, but not be limited to,
expanded IR-4 activities, tax credits to registrants who maintain these uses, and reduced third party registration liability.

**Purple Loosestrife Control Research** 8.060
1. We encourage the American Farm Bureau Federation to lobby for federal funding for the Cornell Research Team to continue importation and testing of biological control agents of Purple Loosestrife for release in the United States.
2. We encourage the Oregon State legislature to provide funding to continue biological and chemical control research and complete field surveys being conducted by the Oregon Department of Agriculture and Oregon State University.

**Chlorofluorocarbon Exemption** 8.070
1. Agriculture should be given an exemption to the 1996 phase-out of chlorofluorocarbons.
2. We encourage the retention and use of Freon or other feasible, economical types of coolants.

**Restricted Chemicals** 8.080
1. Provisions should be made for the use of restricted chemicals when no effective alternatives are available. Protection of food production and forestry resources should have priority over limited environmental consideration.
2. We support reasonable regulation of restricted chemicals, but restrictions should be based on residue and toxicity rather than for use on specific crops.

**Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration (RPAR)** 8.085
1. In order to establish an orderly manner of reassessing and re-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.
2. We urge that the burden of proof in support of, or in opposition to, use of agricultural chemicals be placed upon the scientific community and not upon individuals, as hearings continue for RPAR.
Food Quality 8.100

1 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 needs without the judicious use of agricultural chemicals and drugs. Any undue curtailment of the safe and appropriate usage of these products will result in lower quality and/or quantities of food and fiber at higher costs to consumers.

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

4 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.

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

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

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

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

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

Medical History and Pesticides 8.200

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

Industrial and Municipal Waste 8.300

1 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**
1. 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 or larger and that are triple rinsed on the farm should be returnable to the dealer of origin or other disposal and recycling sites that have a controlled 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**
1. 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.
2. 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**
1. 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**
1. The Underground Storage Tank (UST) State Insurance Fund should be funded by:
2. 1. Generators of hazardous waste materials;
3. 2. The oil over charge refund revenues, and
4. 3. Fees on underground storage tanks.
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 contractor.
IX. FISH & WILDLIFE

General Fish & Wildlife Statement 9.005
1 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
1 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
7 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 9.030
1 We believe that the State’s fish hatchery program is an important and
2 necessary tool in the process of recovering and protecting our region’s
3 salmon and steelhead. Sound hatchery management will have a more
4 positive than negative effect on our region’s fish.
5 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
7 recreational opportunities for Oregonians.
8 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.
11 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
1 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
1 A moratorium should be instituted on the transporting and
2 transplanting of big game animals until new guidelines can be established
from an impact study by representatives of the livestock industry, the U.S. Forestry Service, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Oregon Department of Agriculture. We support requiring health inspections on all game and non-game 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 meet the interstate health laws for domestic livestock and the introduction or reintroduction of game animals should not reduce the allotted Animal Unit Months (AUMs) for private livestock producers that use public lands.

**Domestic Sheep**

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

**Game Animal Numbers**

Population levels of large game animals, predators, and other wildlife 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 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 them. We support allocation of sufficient General Fund dollars to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife so that the department is not overly reliant on hunting and fishing fees to fund their management program. (15)

**Closure of Hunting Season**

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

**Hunting Tags**

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

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be required to plant or maintain adequate acreage of crops suitable for winter feed for wildlife on all National Wildlife Refuges.

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**

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)
6. Non-migrating/resident geese should be exempt from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. (10), (Referred to AFBF, 2010)
7. 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)

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

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

Oregon and Federal Fish & Wildlife design a landowner preference tag program similar to the one for deer and/or elk that can be used by farmers and ranchers throughout the state.
Predator Management 9.200
1 Predator management must be an essential part of an overall wildlife
management program to maintain a reasonable compatibility with other
wildlife, to reduce livestock losses, and for the public interest, health and
welfare including control of rabies and other diseases that may be
transmitted to humans.
2 Property owners should be allowed to haze or take action to eliminate
predators before they cause damage.
3 The keeping of recognized breeds of Livestock Guardian Dogs that
are used specifically for predator management is an acceptable farm
practice. Livestock Guardian dogs should be officially included in statute
as a farm animal.
4 We support the use of leg holding traps, snares and livestock-
protection collars as a necessary means of predator and rodent control.
5 We support the supervised use of chemical toxicant as part of a
management program and request that research be conducted to find
additional new methods for control. Financing for research should include
appropriations from the federal government, state general fund, game fund
and counties.
6 We support an amendment to the rodent control law to authorize
county governments to establish rodent or predator control districts. (05)
7 It is at the animal owner’s discretion if they want to have any additional
health care exams or treatments when they only want to have vaccinations
given to their animals. (15)

Cougar Hunting 9.205
1 We support the use of dogs to assist in controlling cougar numbers
where a perceived threat to livestock or humans occurs. (03)

Animal Damage Control 9.210
1 Landowners possess constitutionally protected rights to prevent
damage to private land from wildlife belonging to the state or federal
government. We recognize that certain management programs are being
conducted to reduce wildlife depredation to private land. We request
legislation requiring the respective authority entrusted with the control of
wildlife, including endangered and migratory species, that ensures
implementation of effective methods to prevent damage. Non-lethal
control measures, including, but not limited to, hazing, fencing, or planting
lure crops, while often available to landowners are the primary
responsibility of the respective agency to implement at their own cost.
When damage cannot be avoided, the respective agency must provide
depredation or damage permits directly to the landowner in numbers
necessary to remedy damage and that are to be used at the landowner’s
discretion. We request removal of the legal limitations that prohibit
landowners from taking more than one elk per year.
We encourage and support efforts to meet with the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission for control and management of wildlife. Upon request, any landowner should be supplied with a complete list of hunters available to assist landowners with wildlife control efforts through the damage program. When property damage occurs that cannot be addressed through control efforts on private land, ODF&W is encouraged to use their authority to conduct emergency hunts within an identified boundary suitable to address the damage, including public land if necessary. All permits issued under an emergency hunt, including those provided to a landowner, should be available for use anywhere within the hunt boundary irrespective of ownership but on private lands only with the permission of the landowner.

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

The U.S. Department of Agriculture should maintain control of the Animal Damage Control (ADC) Program. When publicly funded, USDA Wildlife Services equipment (traps, snares, large bear/cougar traps etc.) are properly set to remove dangerous/damage causing animals and are vandalized, damaged or destroyed, the state shall prosecute those responsible or act to protect both public and private interests. (15), (17)

Wildlife Overlay Zones 9.211
We oppose wildlife overlay zones in land use planning. When wildlife overlay zones are designated, a management plan that involves and is supported by the landowners, 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)

Landowner Preference Tags 9.220
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 landowners should be allowed to designate preferred non-family persons to obtain landowner preference tags to be used on landowner’s property.
We request legislation that would allow a LOP tag to be used in any open season while adhering to the bag limitations and other restrictions of each particular season.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) should be required to return to the traditional rule of requiring a minimum of 40 acres for landowner preference tags throughout the state and to refrain from making rules which violate the constitutional right of a portion of the 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 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 9.250**

We support legislation to require the registration of all canine with wolf blood, either raised in Oregon or brought into the state, and to require such animals to be tattooed for permanent identification.

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

**Gray 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 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 livestock owners for economic losses from wolves and should allow 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 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)

**Trap Lines**

- All traps and snares set or used for the taking of furbearing mammals or non-game mammals unprotected by law or the Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations shall be inspected not less than every 48 hours, and all trapped animals removed. This regulation should not apply to the taking of predatory animals.

**Special Designation**

- 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**

- 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**

- 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**

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

We support the protection of any sea going threatened or endangered fish species by enforcing a 200-mile limit on any foreign fishing vessel. 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";
2. 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;
8. 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;

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 non-
discretionary 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
protection of endangered species when such restrictions jeopardize
agricultural production.

Until effective and economically affordable alternative chemicals or
methods of control are approved and are available for use; label
restrictions under the proposed plan are premature and should be
withdrawn.
We oppose the introduction or reintroduction of endangered species, wolves and bears on public and private lands or the spread of these animals outside of experimental population areas. We encourage counties to develop ordinances that would prohibit such activities. In addition, animals and their subsequent offspring from experimental programs should not be classified as endangered when they escape the experimental area. We support laws that would make it legal to take said species that have wandered onto private lands.

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

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

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

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

**Removal of Species from Threatened and/or Endangered List**

We petition the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife and the Oregon 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 from either or both the federal or state threatened or endangered species list when it is scientifically warranted.

**Marine Mammal Protection Act**

We support amending the Marine Mammal Protection Act to allow easier use of lethal control measures on seals and sea lions deemed detrimental to protected fish species. Marine Mammal Protection Act should not apply to fresh water in the Western states.

**Grazing Fee Formula**

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 as an appropriate option for the benefit of the grazing industry. Any 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 of economics and scientific principles for federal lands. We oppose an administrative approach to reform federal land management without congressional approval. We support the continuation of permit holder advisory groups with the possible addition of two local members from the general public in the affected areas.

**Grazing Permit Applications**  9.510

A federal or state land management agency should respond with an 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 should be held financially liable.

**Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative**  9.520

We endorse the national Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative for private grazing lands and recommend that the American Farm Bureau 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 range productivity.

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

**Weed and Brush Control**  9.600

We support aggressive legislation and management that will result in 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 as determined by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Before the state, a county, and/or a municipality purchases any additional land, money must be budgeted and designated to maintain in 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 agriculture lands will be required to ensure that the land enrolled in the conservation program has noxious weed control program ensuring that weeds do not spread onto privately owned farm or ranch land.

We support rules that would require the use of only Oregon Department of Agriculture Certified Weed Free Forage on all state lands, including forests and parks.

An adequate percentage of gas tax be dedicated to road right of way noxious weed control. (15)

Wild Bird Seed

Wild bird seed should not contain noxious weed seeds, unless the seed is sterilized. Sterilization should be verified through germination testing by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

No Spray Signs

When a landowner places a "NO SPRAY" sign on a road or right of way, the landowner should be responsible for controlling the weeds and brush or for the damage they cause.

Crop Pollinators

We support and encourage the scientific community including Oregon State University search for solutions to Pollinator Population decline. We recognize the general benefit to agriculture of a healthy pollinator population. We encourage all farms to enhance pollinator habitat.

Fencing

We support legislation to require cooperative cost sharing on fencing 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.
Unapproved Techniques of Fish Habitat Restoration  9.710
1 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
1 We oppose the implementation of one size fits all fish passage requirements on farm infrastructure on minor waterways and agricultural drainage ditches. Specifically, we oppose ODFW's fish passage requirements for tide gates and culverts where there is no proven appreciable benefit to providing fish passage or where a non-fish passage tide gate originally exists. Where ODFW insists on fish passage, they should not specify engineering requirements and they should only require benefit from the passage that existed with the current structure, not a new standard of fish passage. Economic constraints should also be considered as part of the project evaluation. (19)
X. COMMODITIES

General Commodities Statement 10.005
1. The state commodity laws and rules must be built on a sound basis
   that recognizes the general benefit to agriculture and encourages
   individual enterprise. (07)

Fair Market Competition 10.006
1. We oppose any legislation and or regulations that impose any burden,
   financial or otherwise, on agriculture producers that is not required of all
   competitors, foreign or domestic, unless the cost of that burden is
   reimbursed.
2. In addition, we seek repeal of, or reimbursement for, all existing
   regulations that burdens agriculture producers, financial or otherwise, for
   costs not required of all competitors, foreign or domestic. (07)

Agricultural Research 10.010
1. 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
   these purposes.
2. We oppose closure or major change of any research station branch
   until people in the affected area have a chance to evaluate the
   performance of the station and express their opinion. Funds for research
   stations and their related work should have first priority.
3. We support the agricultural education and research program carried
   out by Oregon State University and support expansion and funding of
   those programs.
4. We request vigorous research to define and solve the problems of
   agriculture. Each county Farm Bureau should be prepared to present facts
   and figures to substantiate this need before the legislature, administrators
   and the general public.

Definition of Livestock 10.015
1. 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
   otherwise, within pens, cages and hutches. (19)

Animal Health and Plant Disease 10.020
1. We continue our support for accelerated livestock and plant disease
   research. Emphasis should be placed on related human disease problems
   and on methods to prevent the spread of livestock, poultry, and orchard
and crop diseases from farm to farm. Livestock, poultry, orchards and crops which are destroyed because of disease should receive full indemnification.

**Brucellosis Programs**

We support the findings of the National Brucellosis Technical Association in regard to strengthening a National Brucellosis Program.

**Use of Antibiotics**

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)

**Veterinary Services**

We support excluding the following practices from regulation as the practice of veterinary medicine and establishing certification programs for these practices: embryo transfers, pregnancy, sterility or fertility evaluations, equine dentistry, livestock chiropractic and massage, and other practices determined by ODA. (19)

**Animal Welfare**

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)

It is the livestock owner’s discretion if they want to have a vet treat damaged livestock. If the authorities cannot reach the owner of the livestock, then they may require a vet. (15)

We support defining “good animal husbandry” as normal accepted practices for the management, training, and use within the state, region, or community for the species, breed, physical condition and type of animal. In determining whether a practice is “good animal husbandry,” law enforcement is required to consult with veterinarians experienced with the type of animal that is subject of the action and any local or state industry groups that work with that industry sector. (17)
Service Animals at Farm Stands 10.055
22 Farm stands or any other entities selling food items to the public
23 should not be required to accommodate service animals other than
24 seeing-eye dogs. (14)

Theft of Farm Property 10.060
1 Prevention of crime, including theft, is a public responsibility. Law
2 enforcement agencies must give more recognition and increased
3 surveillance to increasing losses of farm property from theft. We urge that
4 complaints be more vigorously investigated.
5 The taking of any agricultural item of less than a $500 value from
6 privately held farm lands without permission should be prosecuted under
7 the shoplifting law, in addition to any possible criminal penalties.
8 We support legislation encouraging scrap dealers to keep transaction
9 records which include the identification of sellers, in order to facilitate law
10 enforcement efforts.

Illegal Killing of Domestic Livestock 10.070
1 The penalty for illegal killing of domestic livestock should be equal to
2 or greater than the penalty for illegal killing of wildlife. We urge stronger
3 measures to insure the enforcement of federal, state and local laws
4 concerning the theft, molestation, or illegal killing of any type of domestic
5 livestock and poultry. We further recommend that not less than the
6 minimum penalties be given in cases of conviction. We urge that statutes
7 providing penalties for livestock larceny be amended to include a higher
8 minimum as well as maximum fines and sentences. We urge stiffer
9 penalties for illegal killing of livestock.

Environmental Terrorism 10.075
1 We support full prosecution of persons involved in acts of terrorism
2 against the natural resource industry on public or private land.

Pest Control Districts 10.080
1 We urge the establishment of pest control districts (e.g., fruit fly, apple
2 maggot) in agricultural production areas, particularly when noncommercial
3 producers are near commercial operations.

Truth in Menu 10.090
1 We support adoption of a truth in menu law.

Irradiation 10.095
1 The use of irradiation should be allowed in the food processing
2 industry.

USDA Forecasting 10.100
1 We oppose the forecasting of all agricultural prices by the USDA.
Export Ban 10.110
1 We oppose any legislation that restricts the export of raw agricultural
2 and forest commodities from private lands.

Market Negotiations 10.120
1 Strong marketing programs should be implemented to strengthen
2 farmers' bargaining positions. Statute changes should be made to protect
3 growers' associations from unfair business practices.

Third Party Grading 10.130
1 We support "third party" grading for agricultural commodities when it
2 is requested by a majority of the producers delivering the commodity to a
3 buyer or processing facility. The option for producers to reject state
4 grading should be maintained.
5 We favor inspection of all potatoes and onions for human consumption
6 in interstate and intrastate commerce. We request that potatoes and
7 onions for fresh market be inspected at delivery for calculating payments
8 to growers.

Marketing Orders 10.150
1 We support enabling legislation to formulate guidelines to allow
2 commodity groups to establish state marketing orders.
3 For an agricultural commodity referendum to be valid, at least 50
4 percent of the registered producers should have voted with more than 50
5 percent casting an affirmative vote.
6 We support deletion of the acreage control part of marketing orders.
7 We do not support a federal tart cherry marketing order.

Agricultural Commodity Quotas 10.155
1 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
1 We favor the State of Oregon maintaining a Trade Counselor in
2 Northern Asia and a Trade Counselor in the Association of Southeast
3 Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries to promote Oregon products and
4 services.

Product Labeling 10.180
1 We aggressively support country-of-origin labeling for both domestic
2 and imported agricultural commodities and an education program that
3 helps consumers understand the difference in the quality and safety of
4 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

1. 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.
2. 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

1. 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.
2. We support requiring cross compliance in all government farm programs.
3. When the US Secretary of Agriculture, the USDA, or supporting agencies 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

1. 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

1. The purchase of Catastrophic Crop Insurance should be voluntary and not a requirement to receive crop deficiency payments.

**Department of Agriculture** 10.300

1. We recommend maintaining the Department of Agriculture as a principal agency of state government.
2. 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.
3. We support any action that would limit the legislature from overriding a crop production decision made by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.
Agriculture or crop production decision made by the Oregon State University Extension Service. (13)

**Grass Seed Use** 10.305
1 Federal & State agencies should continue to allow the use of non-native grass seed varieties. (06), (09)

**Product Liability** 10.310
1 Consumers should be held responsible for their actions and decisions, 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
1 We support the concept of Farmers Markets and other opportunities for farmers to increase the marketability and profitability of their crops.
2 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
1 We support efforts of all agricultural commodity producers to market their goods over the internet.

**Commodity Commissions** 10.340
1 We favor product promotion by commodity commissions and other organized commodity groups. We approve the use of grower assessments by commodity commissions for only the promotion, production and marketing research and protection of the commodity being assessed.
2 Commodity Commission money belongs to the growers and should only be used for the purposes for which it is collected.
3 We support the State of Oregon and the state universities recognizing that commodity commissions, cooperatives, and agricultural associations have legal rights to the intellectual properties that result from research funded largely by commodity commissions, cooperatives, or agricultural associations.
4 Commodity commission budgets and assessment rates should be developed and adopted prior to the growing season so a maximum number of producers would have opportunity to participate.
5 If assessment rates do not generate sufficient funds to meet the budget, the commission should adjust the budget accordingly.
6 We believe a commodity commission should be able to take action to raise the assessment cap for that commodity only after notification has been given to all of the producers currently being assessed.
A vote of the producers should determine increases in commodity assessments. The commission should send a ballot to all eligible producers and a majority vote, as defined by the commodity commission’s bylaws, should prevail. We oppose the use of Commodity Commission funds for political candidate contributions.

We oppose Commodity Commission legislation that increases the authority of any government agency with regard to the way commodity commissions operate or function. We support a provision that would allow individual producers, under specified provisions in the commission’s bylaws, to receive a refund of all assessments paid in the current calendar year. (02), (08), (10), (11)

Oregon Agricultural Income 10.350
We request that Oregon State University and the Department of Agriculture research and determine the total added value derived from all manufactured or processed agricultural commodities produced and sold in this state. This total should be publicized as the agricultural contribution to the Oregon economy.

Milk Usage Audit Law 10.400
Although the Milk Audit and Stabilization Law has been terminated, 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.

(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

It is desirable to retain small commercial meat packing facilities in rural communities.

We urge a return to a state meat inspection program under contract with the federal government. We recommend the use of lay inspectors under the supervision of licensed veterinarians, and that these lay inspectors also act as brand inspectors.

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 smaller 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 10.520
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 10.530
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 identification system provided:
1. 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;
2. It includes financial and technical support for animal disease control and eradication;
3. 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;
5. The program is economically feasible having an adequate cost-share among government, industry, and producers. Total cost of an individual animal’s identification and recording should not exceed $5;
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)
3 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)
4 We oppose labeling of meat not born, grown and processed in the United States with labels that lead consumers to believe the subject meat was born, raised and processed in the United States. (19)

**Brand Inspection** 10.540
1 We support continuation of the brand and ownership inspection programs to be administered by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.
2 The Brand Inspection Department should develop a concise coherent plan designed to establish fiscal stability of the program.
3 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
1 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
1 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.
2 Oregon law should give agricultural producers immediate protection for the amount they are owed for their products. That protection should extend until they are paid in full. Protection should be simple and inexpensive to maintain.
3 It should be clear that a commodity covered by the grain producer’s lien continues to be covered by that lien regardless of whether the commodity is a proprietary variety grown under contract or not and not as an agricultural services lien.
4 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)
5 This protection should apply to producers of all varieties and species of-seed. (16)

**Disaster Payments** 10.620
1 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
1 If central filing is implemented, information released must only pertain
2 to whether a lien is filed on a particular commodity and the name of the
3 lien holder. Information released should only be available to a lender or a
4 purchaser of the commodity.

Cannabis 10.660
1 More restrictive cannabis laws should not be expanded to adversely
2 impact other agriculture. (15)
3 Cannabis, including both Marijuana and Industrial Hemp, is
4 considered to be a legal agricultural crop under Oregon laws and as such
5 should be afforded equal protections under state and county Right to Farm
6 provisions. (16) The Oregon Farm Bureau advocates for the
7 reclassification of Marijuana as a Schedule II controlled substance. (19)
8 We support changing the definition of industrial hemp from .3%
9 delta-9 to a more standardized, 1% total THC. (19)
10 Hemp extracts, concentrates, and byproducts derived from legal hemp
11 should be afforded the same legal status and protections as the hemp they
12 originated from. (19) (Referred to AFBF 2019)

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 cross-pollination, 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
1 We support legislation that recognizes the NORAMSEED Rules as the
2 regulatory standard for the trade of seed for planting in Oregon.
3 Failure of a seed dealer to comply with these rules should result in the
4 loss of their Oregon Department of Agriculture’s Oregon Seed Dealer’s
5 License. (00)

Weed Control 10.712
1 All owners of land in resource production areas (exclusive farm use,
2 farm forest, etc) should be required to maintain a minimum standard of
3 weed control, including lands owned and managed by public agencies.
4 Enforcement of non-compliance should be enforced using regulatory
5 structure including existing nuisance laws. (17)

Technology in Agriculture 10.716
6 We support the development and utilization of new and existing
7 practices and technologies to benefit agriculture. These should include
8 but not be limited to biological, chemical, mechanical, genetic and organic.
9 We recognize the need for coexistence of diverse production practices and
10 methods and that all are important.
11 Biotechnology has been widely used for decades and is an important
12 component of production agriculture. New research for drought tolerance,
13 yield, disease control, insect tolerance and edible oil quality are but a few
14 examples of traits for a wide range of commodities including fruits and
15 vegetables and will be even more important in a world looking for more
16 food.
17 Biotechnology products should be approved for agricultural use only
18 after thorough research and deregulation. USDA should retain the
19 authority over this process.
20 We encourage all agriculture industries to distribute to all media
21 sources more understandable and visible information about the safety of
22 all approved agricultural products produced in Oregon and the United
23 States. (14)

Plant Breeding Programs 10.720
1 We favor a continued and expanded program of public plant breeding
2 at both the state and national level with the release of foundation seed of
3 the best new plant varieties to the general agricultural industry.
4 The USDA Research Service should reinstate their plant breeding
5 program and release their varieties on a schedule to prevent
6 monopolization of plant varieties.
Release of Public Seed Varieties 10.730
1 We seek a change in USDA policy to ensure releases of public seed
2 varieties and that allow for the development of a check off system at the
3 foundation project level for seed advertising and promotion.

Agricultural Burning 10.750
1 We support the continuation of necessary burning at the highest
2 acreage level possible. We are opposed to any legislation or the adoption
3 of any state agency administrative rule that would further restrict the
4 accepted farm practice of “agricultural burning.” However, if any agency
5 attempts to restrict any form of agricultural burning, an approved effective
6 alternative practice must be in place. (14)
7 We support stack burning for grass seed and cereal grain straw
disposal. Stack burning should be considered ag burning when done
9 during the approved agriculture burning times as determined by the local
10 fire marshal. All propane flaming should be considered an agricultural
11 burn. (14)
12 We also support allowing farmer’s permission to clean and clear land
13 for agricultural production without government interference.
14 Because weather conditions are extremely local, agricultural burning
15 must be managed at the local fire district level. A briefing should be held
16 between growers and the county or fire district prior to setting the dates so
17 that agriculture producers can share their expertise and concerns, rather
18 than setting arbitrary dates. Local fire chiefs should not be allowed to
19 prohibit agricultural burning unless extreme fire safety conditions exist in
20 the agricultural area. We support using the state criteria of humidity,
temperature and wind to determine when agricultural burning should be
22 allowed.
23 We oppose any additional regulation of agricultural burning that might
24 affect wilderness areas, when temporarily affected by smoke intrusions
25 caused by agricultural burning which is already regulated under the
26 direction of the DEQ and the industry’s own smoke management programs
27 or local smoke management districts.

Field Burning 10.755
1 We are opposed to extending the provisions of the Department of
2 Environmental Quality (DEQ) ag and field burning regulations to any
3 community which already has successful programs of its own.
4 We support legislation that would identify limited field burning as a tool
5 to manage weed, pest & disease issues (including invasive species) on all
6 agricultural land. Such legislation should give sole authority to the Oregon
7 Department of Agriculture to allocate the location and quantity of the
8 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, they should be under the same regulations applicable to private industry in that location. (13), (14)

**Field Burning Hotline**  
1. 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 burning. Calls made from the same phone number should also be identified. (08)

**Field Burning Liability**  
1. We support legislation declaring that field burning is not an ultra-hazardous activity and that negligence must be proven before "liability" can be imposed.

**Farming by Corporations**  
1. We support the implementation of policies to:
   2. Continue to study the effects of the entry of huge nonagricultural firms into farming.
   3. Avoid creating tax advantages which encourage such entry.
   4. Strengthen the ability of farmers to bargain with an integrator and other handlers.
   5. Strengthen the economic position of farmers by encouraging more effective group action in buying and selling.
   6. We support presentation of proposals for bargaining association legislation to the Legislative Committee on Trade and Economic Development.
   7. We support legislation requiring corporations to report their involvement in farming.

**Sustainability**  
1. Any definition of sustainability must balance economic, ecological and social benefits of agriculture and recognize agriculture’s ability to sustain 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 11.015

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 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.
4. Improve worker relations by expressing appreciation of a job well done.
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
inspections by agencies and during labor disputes or any organized labor activity.

We are opposed to any effort to allow criminal penalties or civil suits against employers for workplace safety violations which occur without criminal intent.

Family Leave

We oppose the development and or expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act for agricultural operations. We oppose legislation that would require employers to pay a family leave benefit for farm workers. Farmers operate on extremely thin margins and would be unduly burdened by a requirement to pay for family leave or track unpaid family leave for farm workers. (07), (16), (18)

Mandatory Paid Sick Leave

We oppose mandating paid sick leave for farm workers. There are 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 job where there is no direct food handling. Mandating farm operators to pay someone’s sick time wages and their replacement wages, places an undue hardship on the farm owner. (14)

We oppose the requirement to track, record and report hours of unpaid sick time that have been accrued and used. The allowance of unpaid sick time was provided to lessen the burden on employers, but requiring onerous tracking and adherence to all provisions of the paid sick time law, puts an unfair burden on farmers and ranchers. (16)

Mandatory Predictable Scheduling

We oppose mandating predictable schedules. Weather, livestock, and crop maturity are uncontrollable, and perishable crops must be picked in a timely manner. Farmers need a reliable and available workforce during the harvest period and require “all hands on deck.” Mandating predictable schedules does not recognize the unique needs of agriculture and burdens the farm owner. Agriculture should be exempt from any statewide or local policy that mandates predictable schedules. (15)

Mandatory Flexible Schedules

We oppose mandating flexible scheduling. Requirements for crop and 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. (15)
Labor Poster 11.030
1  We request state agencies to coordinate and consolidate, into one
2  poster size sheet, all of the posters that employers are required to display.
3  (07)

Head Start Services 11.040
1  We support expansion of the Migrant Head Start programs to include
2  families of seasonal agricultural workers who do not currently receive
3  Migrant Head Start Services solely because of their failure to meet migrant
4  eligibility requirements. (08)

Farm Labor Housing 11.050
1  We favor continuing the property tax exemption for nonprofit corporate
2  seasonal farm labor housing.
3  We favor the uniformity of regulations, enforcement and reporting
4  regarding farm labor housing standards. It must also be recognized by
5  regulatory agencies that farm labor housing often meets all legal
6  requirements at the beginning of the season, but wear and tear may take
7  it out of compliance from one day to another.
8  State health and sanitation standards should not be more restrictive
9  than federal standards.
10  It is our position that migrant labor housing is not a part of the work
11  place and thus should not be subject to regulation under the Oregon State
12  Employment Act (OSEA).
13  A labor camp should be defined to include only housing that is
14  occupied by migrant seasonal workers.
15  All temporary seasonal farm labor housing should be classified as
16  agricultural buildings, not dwellings, for the purposes of construction or
17  occupational permits.
18  State and County Building Codes should make provision for
19  reasonable standards for temporary seasonal migrant labor housing.
20  Items such as insulation for summer housing and handicap provisions
21  should not be required.
22  Enforcement activities and construction controls of farm labor camps
23  should be coordinated through one agency. The agency should also have
24  the responsibility for educational programs and technical assistance.
25  These programs should be implemented before any fines and penalties
26  are levied.
27  So long as the state inspects and approves electrical and plumbing
28  installations in order that they meet code in farm labor housing, Oregon
29  law should be amended to delete the requirement that licensed
30  electricians and plumbers must be used during the construction or
31  rehabilitation of farm labor housing. (07), (11)
Policy No. 11.080, Farm Labor Recruitment, was deleted in 2008

Seasonal Labor Force 11.100
1 We support an adequate supply of authorized temporary seasonal agricultural workers. We favor a temporary seasonal worker program that:
2 1. Insures the supply of authorized temporary seasonal agricultural workers;
3 2. Respects self-determination on the part of the worker; and
4 3. Has an advisory commission with representation from the employment sector of Northwest agricultural community;
5 4. 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)
6
7 It is our position that the State of Oregon Employment Department (state workforce agency) and other state agencies should assist and not inhibit Oregon agriculture efforts to acquire and use legal guest workers. Housing inspection for guest worker programs should only be administered through one state agency. (16)

I 9 Verification 11.120
1 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 11.150
1 Agriculture should not be required to be an enforcement arm of immigration policy. Known undocumented workers should be reported to those responsible for enforcing those laws. (07)

Workers’ Compensation Insurance 11.200
1 We support remedial legislation and administrative changes that will 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 Insurance Fund be made available to the public.
2 Employees should be responsible for fifty percent of the premium for their coverage under workers’ compensation insurance. The appropriate amount should be deducted from each paycheck and transmitted in the same manner as money withheld for Oregon income tax.
3 We request that standards developed under the Oregon Safe Employment Act be reasonable and practical. Employers should exercise their rights to participate in establishing or modifying these standards. The
state standards should be modified to include exemptions or changes made in the federal act or standards. An employee who refuses to follow his employer's instructions with respect to compliance with safety standards, and who thus jeopardizes himself or his fellow employees, should be subject to citation. In such cases, any penalty that might be imposed on the employer should be assessed against the negligent employee. Workers’ compensation risk should be based on the number of hours worked in each work classification, not the amount of wage in each work classification. Therefore, Workers’ Compensation premiums should be computed on a per-hour basis, much the same as the Workers’ Benefit Fund. The formula for determining the workers' compensation benefits of injured workers should reflect the historical wage level of the worker and 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 on the job injury accident to the employer. In order to help eliminate fraudulent claims, we recommend that 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 and federal disability programs rather than being paid by workers' compensation. An injured employee, after a doctor's work-release, should not be required to return to the same employer and the exact same job in order for wage loss compensation to be discontinued. We support ongoing education programs provided by workers' compensation service providers to minimize industrial accidents. We oppose a state monopoly in compensation insurance (state and self-insured coverage only). (05)

Workers' Compensation Rates

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

We support state and federal exemptions from regular occupational safety and health inspections of farming operations employing 10 or fewer employees, unless a labor camp is maintained by such an operation. We support the mandatory inspection of farming operations only in the event of a:
1. Serious and disabling accident;
2. Fatality; and/or
3. Valid complaint signed and revealed to the operator.
This inspection should be conducted only in the accident or complaint area of the farm.

If an OR-OSHA inspector finds a safety violation on a piece of equipment that is being operated as it was delivered from the factory, the employer should not be subject to a fine for the violation but should be required to fix the violation. OR-OSHA should also be required to notify the equipment manufacturer of the safety violation. The equipment manufacturer and OR-OSHA should work together to best solve the safety violation on the manufacturer's equipment. Employers should then be notified of the potential safety violation and how to correct the problem.

Hazard Communication Rules Applied to Employers 11.275

Application of hazard communication rules to agriculture must be limited to permanent employees and seasonal employees involved in pesticide application. Individual written programs detailing how an employer is going to comply with the law must not be required of 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 legal reentry standard for farm workers. Enforcement of the standard should be uniform and coordinated by one agency.

Unemployment Insurance 11.300

The salaries of family held agriculture corporation’s corporate officers and their family members should be exempt from unemployment tax assessments.

We recommend the farm gross quarterly threshold for the payroll tax limit be raised from $20,000.00 to $80,000.00 immediately and be indexed for inflation and for minimum wage. (07), (10), (11)

Unemployment Benefits 11.320

Unemployment benefits should only be for workers who are unemployed through no fault of the worker. (07)

Seasonal Unemployment Compensation 11.340

We oppose implementing the unemployment compensation program for seasonal agricultural workers and any notification requirements regarding program coverage.

We support efforts to restrict benefits to those who have no employment or assurance of returning to employment after a layoff and to require recipients to work in any available position. We support efforts to strengthen incentives for recipients to seek employment and reduce fraud in the program. (07)
Contractor Liability 11.400
1  We seek legislation providing that when the terms of a contract
delegates responsibilities to a labor contractor for providing all or any part
of the required field sanitation facilities for workers including any
responsibilities regarding hazard communication rules, I 9 forms and
housing facilities, the licensed labor contractor, not the producer, should
be held liable under the law for any penalty or lawsuit resulting from
noncompliance.
2  When a producer contracts with a licensed labor contractor for
seasonal employment, the licensed labor contractor should be held solely
liable under the law for any penalty or lawsuit resulting from
noncompliance with state wage and hour law and state sick time law. If a
joint employment relationship exists, we seek clarification that licensed
labor contractors are required to share wage and hour and paid sick time
records at the request of the secondary employer. (16)
3  We support legislation to exempt from state regulation associations
and co-op’s who act as farm labor contractors to recruit a workforce for
themselves or their members’ entirely through federally regulated guest
worker programs. (00)

Farm Labor Contractor Bonding 11.425
1  We support a maximum bond of $10,000 for labor contractors
employing 20 or fewer workers and a bond not to exceed $30,000 for labor
contractors without experience hiring more than 20 workers, and a bond
not to exceed $20,000 for labor contractors with five years of good
performance, if hiring more than 20 workers.
2  An individual who co-signs for the bond of a labor contractor should
not be held to be a joint employer because of the co-sign.

Harvest Picketing 11.500
1  We recommend that legislation be maintained which limits an
employee of a crop owner from picketing during the harvest of a perishable
crop.

Policy No. 11.520, Cannery Strikes, was deleted in 2003.

Secondary Boycott 11.530
1  We oppose the use of secondary boycotts. Every means possible
should be used to stop an illegal secondary boycott including criminal
penalties, fines and/or imprisonment.

Collective Bargaining 11.550
1  We support collective bargaining legislation that would establish
guidelines to protect workers and employers from unfair labor practices
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 support the right of employers to communicate freely with employees, without coercion or threats, what the effect of unionization would be in the workplace. (99), (04), (08)

Minimum Wage Indexing

“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

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

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

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

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 penalty for those employers who willfully underpay employees. (00)
**Prevailing Wage Rate**
1. We oppose the Davis Bacon Act and any other law that would establish a "prevailing wage rate" for labor including adverse effect wage rate in the agricultural work force. (18)

**Health Insurance**
1. We oppose proposals that require employers to provide mandatory health insurance coverage for employees.
2. We support health savings accounts. (06), (10), (11), (Referred to AFBF, 2009)

**Christmas Trees**
1. The growing, tending and cutting of Christmas trees should be defined as an agricultural activity under the Fair Labor Standards Act. (08)

**Overtime**
1. We support including the nursery industry in the definition of agriculture for purposes of labor laws and overtime. (07)

**Right-to-Work**
1. 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.
2. We support right to work legislation that would eliminate closed union shops. (02)

**Farmer's Right to Manage**
1. We support the farmer's right to produce, harvest, process and distribute their commodity in the manner most economically advantageous to their particular operation.

**At-Will Employment**
1. It should be the policy of the State of Oregon to provide for the right of an agricultural employer to both hire and discharge employees as it suits the overall needs of the farm operation.
2. An at-will employment policy should recognize the right of an employee to discuss working conditions without fear of reprisal.

**Political Contributions**
1. 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**
1. 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.

We support repealing the federal labor laws which restrict the opportunity for our nation's youth to be employed in agricultural related work. (05)

Legal Aid Services

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

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 violations and lack of cooperation with DOL. In such cases, the federal government must not contact the grower’s customers unless the department has already secured the necessary court orders. (Referred to AFBF, 2012), (12)
XII. ENERGY

Fuel and Energy 12.300
1 Production, harvesting, processing and distribution of food should be granted primary priorities for use of fuel and power.
2 Research should be accelerated for the development and conservation of all available sources of energy.
3 We support a renewable economically viable energy policy.
4 Fuel standards need to be economically feasible to agriculture. and timber.
5 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 bio-fuels 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.
6 We support the repeal of the state biofuel mandate requirement. (08), (10)

Green Power 12.305
1 We define green power as any source of power that uses a renewable and safe energy sources such as small and large water facilities, wave or tidal energies, solar, bio-fuels, geothermal and wind.
2 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.
3 We oppose the taxing of energy that is used on the farm or business that has produced it. (08), (10), (11)

Electrical Costs 12.310
1 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
1 We support establishing a “Net Metering” system. Such a system should provide that when a producer creates electricity on site the producer should only be charged for the power used from the electric company. If enough power is produced that the meter runs backwards the electric company should pay the producer for the excess power at the
same rate that the power company charges for electricity, less the delivery 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 metering of multiple meters owned by the same customer rather than strictly per meter. (15)

Electric Utility Deregulation 12.320
1 Prior to changing Oregon laws, we urge the legislature to study the 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
1 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
1 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
1 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 benefit. (09), (10)

Testing of Motor Fuel 12.410
1 We support the state testing of motor fuel at the final point of sale for accurate quantity, quality and contamination. (05), (10)
XIII. PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Agriculture Policy for Oregon 13.005
1 An agricultural policy for the State of Oregon needs to be adopted that would:
2 1. Acknowledge the importance of agriculture to the state’s economy and to the wellbeing of all of its residents;
3 2. Promote agriculture in positive actions that result in a vibrant and healthy agriculture in Oregon; and
4 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
1 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
1 Farmers and agricultural organizations must become more aggressive and involved in community, state, and national affairs.

Freedom to Farm 13.030
1 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:
2 1. Land use;
3 2. Agricultural chemicals;
4 3. Food processing;
5 4. Packaging;
6 5. Marketing;
7 6. Noise, dust, air pollution;
8 7. Water use; and
9 8. Biotechnology. (14)
10 Farmers should retain the right to use accepted agricultural practices. We oppose any legislation or regulations that restrict or mandate farm practices. Accepted farming practices should be exempt from state laws and regulations, local ordinances and suits related to dust, odor, noise, etc. and other conditions not appreciated by the public. The right to farm laws should be strengthened to require that a plaintiff has the burden of proving that the farming practice endangers public health or safety.
Unsuccessful plaintiffs should be responsible for the attorney fees, court 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 farmer program. The State of Oregon should encourage retiring farmers through tax incentives to rent or sell their land to beginning farmers. Farm 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 Oregon which have the ability to use the abundance of raw agricultural products that are produced here.

Policy No. 12.060, Exposition Center, was deleted in 2005

Policy No. 12.100, Citizenship, was deleted in 2008

Jury Duty 13.110
1 We support adequate juror compensation that would enable all adults to participate in this very important service to their fellow citizens.
2 Key personnel should have the option to delay jury duty until the next available session.

1 We favor maintenance of the statutes which require county courts and boards of county commissioners to publish monthly proceedings and expenditures.

Government Surplus Properties 13.117
1 We propose altering the existing practice of disposal of federal real property that has been declared surplus to federal needs. No new government entities, such as Native American Tribes, should take precedence over other government entities in bidding for surplus federal real property. This prohibition extends to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from acquiring surplus federal real property on behalf of any Native American Tribe. (03)

Policy No. 12.120, Federal State and County Projects, was deleted in 2005

Qualifications for Public Office 13.125
1 We believe the voters should decide whether or not a candidate is qualified for public office. We oppose establishment of any new qualifications not already prescribed by law.
2 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
The state should develop a system that enables persons to submit voter pamphlet information at each county clerk’s office or online instead of in Salem at the Secretary of State’s Office. (04), (05)

Oregon Constitution 13.130
Article II, Section 16 of the Oregon Constitution should be amended to require a majority vote for the election of all public officials.

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 three-
member arbitration board which would accept one final offer from the disputing parties. More attention needs to be given to providing efficient delivery of government services including education. Productivity and performance need to be considerations for salary increases. (04)

**Voter Registration** 13.150
1. We support the state election laws which require voters to be registered at least thirty days prior to election. (05)

**Religious Life** 13.200
1. 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.
2. 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
1. We urge continued interest and education of our membership in health and disease control programs.
2. We support incentives to encourage rural hospitals, emergency medical services and clinics.
3. We oppose employer mandated health insurance. (09)

**Policy No. 12.410, Aids Testing, was deleted in 2004**

**Foods and Nutrition** 13.420
1. We recommend continued nutritional improvement of school lunch programs.
2. We recommend that county Farm Bureaus promote the use of domestic and locally produced farm products on school premises.
3. Dietary goals should be based upon documented scientific proof.
4. We oppose any committee, agency or persons dictating the foods that should or should not be eaten. We deplore the spending of the taxpayers' money for controlling or attempting to control the diets of the American people in any way. (04), (08)
Social Services

1. 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 citizenship and testing for illegal substances for social service recipients.
2. We support community representation on public social service boards.

Emergency Medical Service

1. We support state-wide emergency medical and trauma services.

Volunteer Emergency Personnel

1. 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

1. Oregon should adopt training standards appropriate to the needs of rural fire districts and their volunteers. (03)

Confidential Financial Records

1. 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.
2. We support legislation to make the unauthorized release of confidential and privileged information between borrower and lender a criminal offense.

Personal Property Rights

1. 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.
2. We urge legislation protecting the private property interests of farmers and ranchers, for their livestock, including those who choose to raise nontraditional species. (03), (06)

Trespassing

1. We recognize that the vast majority of citizens are responsible people who recognize and respect rights of others and the need for protection of their property.
We urge cooperation with organizations of sportsmen and other 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 should be subject to the penalty for trespassing in the criminal code.

A landowner is subject to loss of time and considerable cost when a suit or injury is initiated by a trespasser. We support legislation to require the plaintiff to pay legal and other costs incurred by the landowner.

We support legislation relieving property owners of liability for injury or death sustained by a trespasser regardless of age.

We recognize the need for property owners to have a cost efficient and long-lasting way to post property for no trespassing.

We support the statewide use of painting the tops of fence posts as a legal means of posting one’s property for “No Trespassing.”

Drone Technology

We embrace drone technology for production agriculture. We support laws that protect private property owners from the trespass of drones.

Right to Farm

Accepted farming practices utilized in the production of food and fiber should be protected by “Right to Farm” provisions in the Oregon statutes.

Nuisances

Persons or jurisdictions initiating an unsuccessful nuisance suit should be liable for the loss of any economic value pre-existing business and facilities of the defendant.

Legal Action

We must use the courts to test unreasonable laws or regulations. This should be the last resort after all other approaches have been explored and exhausted.

We support a policy that requires any filing party of a government suit to post a bond to cover the legal costs of the prevailing party.

Probate Fee

Special priority should be given to the revision of probate fees so they are commensurate with the amount of legal work required.

Small Claims Court Judgments

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 13.535
We support legislation to limit excessive liability judgments. Judgments should be based more closely on the actual economic loss incurred.

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,"
4. 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,
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 13.536
Citizens currently are granted immunity in testifying during the legislative process. We support legislation which would grant citizens similar immunity when testifying at the state or local level. (00)

Third Party Lawsuits-Harassment 13.537
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 property damage resulting from the display or exhibition of livestock or poultry at the county or state fair provided that the immune parties 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
1 We support the concept that all mineral, water and timber rights, easements, zoning constraints and deed restrictions be included in a land sale contract.

Takings of Property 13.560
1 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.
2 Therefore, government should provide due process and compensation to the exact degree that an owner/operator’s right to use the property has been diminished by government action. All claims for loss of value should be filed within two years on new actions. Partial takings of property should be prohibited unless compensation is made for reduction in the value of the total property.
3 We are opposed to removing the applicability of land use laws as an alternative to financial compensation for loss of property value due to any action by government.
4 Further, government should acquire property or easements through negotiated mutual agreement. The loss of undeveloped property value should be calculated by comparing the value of the property one year before the zoning law was enacted compared to the value one year after the new zoning law was put into effect and the lost value should be indexed for inflation. (00), (04), (07)

Compensation 13.570
1 When a governmental action results in an economic decrease to the owner because it restricts or adversely affects a farming or forest practice and upon providing proof of the economic decrease, the owner shall be compensated by the public entity both for the amount of the economic decrease and the cost of professional assistance paid by the owner to establish the economic decrease including attorney fees and court costs. (04)

Compensation for Losses 13.575
1 When an action by government results in an economic loss to the agriculture producer, by limiting or prohibiting the use of real and personal property, including but not limited to, chemicals, water or equipment, the producer should be able to file a claim and be compensated by the regulating government entity.
2 We are opposed to any government action that results in an economic loss that does not provide appropriate compensation. (06)
Compensation Revenue Sources 13.577
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:
2 1. State income tax credit for state actions;
3 2. County or city property tax credit for local government actions.
4 A county compensation fund should be established for future compensation claims and revenue continuously appropriated from the following list of options:
5 1. Farm and forest use assessment tax penalties when land use is changed to a non-farm or non-forest use;
6 2. A real estate transfer tax on Measure 37 or Measure 49 claims when the land is sold.
7 Installment payments for the loss of property value should be made when the state or local government entity has adequate funding. (07), (08)

Condemnation 13.580
1 Any government or utility with condemnation authority should be prohibited from exercising that authority on land zoned for farm or forest use without the approval of the county governing body.
2 If condemnation authority is exercised on land zoned for farm or forest use, the land should be valued as though it were inside an urban growth boundary and zoned for the intended use.
3 Any public agency or utility that has condemnation powers should be required to pay all legal costs to the private property owner whose property the agency has plans to take for a public use. The agency’s or utility’s liability should begin with the first notice to the property owner and continue until the final conclusion. (01), (08)

Historic Preservation of the Oregon Trail 13.585
1 Historic preservation should not conflict with existing and or accepted farming practices. (07)

Parole Eligibility 13.600
1 We urge that parole requirements for repeat offenders be strengthened to a degree which will insure more protection of lives and property from the depredations of habitual criminals.

Policy No. 12.610, Juvenile Delinquency, was deleted in 2005

Capital Punishment 13.620
1 We support capital punishment for specified crimes.
Illegal Drugs 13.625
1 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)
4 Additional funds should be appropriated for the education and
5 treatment of our youth. A reward program for informants should be
6 instituted.
7 We support the right of private employers and government agencies
8 to test employees for drug use. Prospective employees should be
9 informed that drug tests will be given.
10 We support Law enforcement shall be notified right to know that a
11 marijuana operation is legally sanctioned a mechanism to determine if a
12 marijuana growing operation is actually sanctioned as a medical grow.
13 Necessary information should be subject to the public disclosure laws
14 available seven days a week, 24 hours a day, to local police agencies so
15 they can determine if a grow operation is legal. (06), (10)

Crime Prevention 13.630
1 We support legislation that will declare the removal or alteration of
2 serial numbers from personal property and owner identification numbers
3 an illegal act.
4 We support the establishment and continuation of crime prevention
5 programs throughout the state.

Policy No. 12.635, Insanity Plea, was deleted in 2005

REDDI Program 13.640
1 We support the "Report Every Drunk Driver Immediately" (REDDI)
2 program.

Policy No. 12.700, 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
1 We support legislation prohibiting state and local agencies financed
2 by tax money from engaging a lobbyist for hire. The agency's involvement
3 should be limited to only testimony invited by or information requested by
4 a legislator.
5 State agencies should be limited to one representative. Their
6 testimony should be limited to the factual effects of the proposed
7 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 elected officials of any jurisdiction of the state.

**Administrative Agencies 13.720**

1. The legislature should not delegate legislative authority to administrative agencies, or in cases of emergencies, the appropriate interim committee.
2. At least a majority of the regulatory body committee members should be present throughout the legislative hearings.
3. 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.
4. Any state agency charged with enforcing federal laws should not adopt rules more restrictive than the federal rules or apply the rules in a more restrictive manner than the rules are when enforced by the federal government.
5. Statutory language should be adopted which defines the purpose of each current agency and any new agency when it is created.
6. State agencies should be permitted to enact administrative rules only to the extent that such rules are necessary to accomplish the purpose for which the agency was formed and only to the extent that such rules do not diminish or detract from the vested private property rights of citizens.
7. All previously enacted administrative rules which exceed the legislatively defined purpose of the agency should be declared null and void.
8. 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.
9. Any proposed rule should require legislative approval prior to implementation.
10. All government agencies or their employees, while working in their professional capacity, should be held to the same standard as individuals or businesses in complying with the laws of the land.
11. Government regulatory agencies should not be allowed to levy fines upon issuance of a citation for noncompliance of regulations.
12. Civil penalties collected by any regulatory agency should go into the general fund.

**Agency Liability 13.725**

1. When an agency charges a landowner with a violation of an agency regulation, and forces the landowner to stop an activity, and in an ensuing investigation and/or court proceeding the land owner is found to be innocent of the charge, the agency should be held responsible for
reimbursing any revenue losses and legal fees suffered by the landowner due to the cessation of the activity. (00)

**Government Growth**

1. We oppose the establishment of additional departments and divisions in state government unless it can be proven that such an addition will reduce the cost of goals or services to the public and the new department or division will be subject to the "Sunset Law."
2. 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**

1. 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**

1. 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**

1. No law or legislation should be passed by Congress or the State Legislature unless it is also funded by that body.

**State Boards and Commissions**

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. We support a uniform system for state agency (commission and director) appointments.
4. All state agency commission members not elected should be appointed by the Governor in a timely manner, approved by the Senate, and should not be changed by the Governor.
5. Any director of an agency governed by a state agency commission should be appointed by that state agency commission.
6. 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
1  We support continuation, by public agencies, of the existing practice
2  of publishing legal notices in newspapers. (10)

Limiting Legislative Sessions 13.780
1  We support limiting regular sessions of the legislature to a maximum
2  120-day session every other year. The Oregon legislature should pass a
3  budget in 75 days after the opening of session. If this is not accomplished,
4  the session should close, the Governor should call a special session and
5  only budget bills should be allowed to be introduced.
6  We support making the short biennial legislative session for
7  funding/budgets and the long biennial legislative session for policy issues.
8  (19)
9  We support requiring the names of the legislative sponsor(s) of bill(s)
10  be printed on the bill(s). (19)
11  We oppose providing free postage for voters. The voter should be
12  responsible to put a stamp on the return envelope for mailing their ballot
13  in to the County Clerk for any election held in Oregon. (19)

Legislative Emergency Clause 13.785
1  Any legislation with emergency clauses should be approved by a
2  super majority of both houses and shall not disallow a referral by the
3  people in the form of an Initiative. (15)
4  The Legislative Emergency Clause shall be used exclusively during
5  Special sessions of the Legislature for the purpose of balancing the budget
6  or for responding to natural disasters. (16)

Acquisition of Public Lands for Tribal Reservations 13.790
1  We oppose any acquisition of public lands by Native American Tribes
2  for either creating new or enlarging existing reservations. (03)

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
1  Be it resolved that just like the Oregon ballot initiative, all bills must be
2  limited to one issue.
XIV. NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Gun Control  
We are strongly opposed to any additional gun and ammunition control legislation and / or tax. Any entity, be it governmental or private, that restricts private citizens from their Second Amendment right to self-defense, shall be held liable for the safety and well-being of anyone on their premises. (15) We recommend that swift, prompt and adequate punishment be administered to persons unlawfully using firearms. (08) (Referred to AFBF, 08)

Individual Rights  
Any individual should have the right to take such action as is necessary to protect his life and property.

Federal Government Responsibility  
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. We oppose the removal of existing subsidies until they can be replaced with reimbursements to domestic producers for the costs of 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  
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**  
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**  
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 archaeological 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**  
We support 1) the coordination and cooperation between BLM, Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Services and other federal agencies with states, counties, and other local governments in making land management plans and decisions; 2) providing assistance 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 benefit the natural resources community, and 4) ensuring that local district offices have the ability to make decisions about land management and engage with local communities in the development of plans. Decision making should not be top down. Oregon Farm Bureau vigorously opposes any changes to existing statutes or rules that reduce the ability of the BLM, Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife, National Marine Fisheries Services and other federal agencies to coordinate with states, counties, and other local governments in making land management plans and decisions. (Referred to AFBF 2016) (16)
Executive Orders 14.055
1 We support the passage of federal legislation that would limit the
effective life of executive orders to two full years unless ratified by
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
creation of incentives to “sue and settle,” including limitations related to
the value of the assets of non-profit organizations who seek attorney fees
under the act, a cap on the amount of fees and hourly rate an entity may
receive, and parity between non-profit organizations and individuals under
EAJA. We also support the creation of legislation that requires those
seeking attorneys’ fees to win on each claim prior to eligibility for EAJA
funds for any lawsuit. We also support the creation of legislation that
requires individuals or groups to post a bond if their lawsuit will have an
effect on producers. We support continuing to keep pressure on agencies
and the DOJ regarding misuse of EAJA. (16) (Referred to AFBF 16)

Regulatory Reform 14.100
1 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
1 We emphatically support the Electoral College for presidential
elections.
2 Electors should be required to vote for the candidates on the ballots
to which they were committed.
3 We are opposed to making the popular vote the only determination of
electing the President of the United States. (01)
4 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
1 We oppose congressional salary raises until such time as Congress
balances the federal budget.
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
1 The federal government should guarantee the bonds issued by the
2 Federal Credit Administration, and if necessary, increase the limit on the
3 volume of their issuance in order to reducing the interest rate.
4 We support the concept of debt restructuring if debt is restructured
5 only for farmers who run a viable economic operation. Debt should be
6 restructured so that farmers who qualify can pay off their debt.
7 We support restructuring short term and intermediate term debt into
8 long term debt to give qualified borrowers additional time to repay principal
9 and reduce their annual debt and service obligation.

Management of Lands Under Foreclosure 14.320
1 When a government agency forecloses on farms or ranches, it should
2 take responsibility to maintain the agricultural integrity of those lands and
3 facilities. We believe the best way to do this is to rent, lease, or sell the
4 land to other farmers or ranchers.

Farm Service Agency (FSA) Foreclosures 14.330
1 Land foreclosed on, by FSA, should be sold to private interests without
2 special consideration for ethnic origin, age, gender or religion and should
3 not be held by or converted to government use.
Farm Service Agency (FSA) and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Office Co-Location 14.340
1  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)

State of Columbia 14.400
1  We oppose the creation of a State of Columbia from the District of Columbia.

Foreign Investment 14.500
1  Except for ownership by resident aliens, we oppose the foreign ownership of U.S. lands. (04)

Policy No. 13.525, Indian Policies, was deleted in 2005

English the Official National Language 14.550
1  English should be the sole official language of the United States of America, for its states; commonwealths; territories; for all documents, public and private; in all courts of law; in all teaching; and in all business dealings and transactions.

Anti-Trust 14.600
1  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
1  We shall work to include the same tax advantages for producer-purchased companies transitioned into co-ops as are presently available for employee-purchased companies. (05)

Trade Negotiations 14.700
1  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.
2  Reverse tariffs impose costs on U.S. producers that are not equally imposed on other countries.
3  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.
4  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;
2. Require all products imported into the U.S. to meet the same standards;
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 14.705
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)

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. (05)

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. Government units that own public rights-of-way land should undertake proactive control programs to destroy and prevent the spread of those plants that are classified as invasive species onto adjacent farm, ranch, or forest lands. (00), (04)

Secure Rural Schools

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

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

We support the repeal of the requirement for reporting of new hires. (07)

Social Security Payments for Refugees

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

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

Except during recessions, the federal budget should be balanced. Every effort should be made to use spending cuts to eliminate a deficit. (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** 14.930
1. We support keeping traditional farm bill programs with the nutrition title in one legislative package. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16)

**Farm Bill Specialty Crop Allocation** 14.940
1. We support collaborating with USDA on how funding can be better spread among numerous entities and an appeal process by which an entity can navigate in cases of one sided grants being awarded. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16)

**Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program** 14.950
1. We support incorporating all types of fruits and vegetables (fresh, frozen, canned and dried) into the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (FFVP) providing an affordable option for increasing the variety available year-round for low income school children and more market opportunity 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 be used for Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) implementation. This congressional mandate must be funded through the Health and Human Services (HHS) Federal Drug Administration budget. (Referred to AFBF, 2016) (16)
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<td>10.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Unit Months Allocation Ratio and Game Numbers</td>
<td>9.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare</td>
<td>10.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities Act</td>
<td>14.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Trust</td>
<td>14.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals on Assessment of Appraisals</td>
<td>2.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Byproducts to Agricultural &amp; Forestry Land</td>
<td>3.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Will Employment</td>
<td>11.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Federal Budget</td>
<td>14.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Check-Off</td>
<td>10.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Farmer Assistance</td>
<td>13.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Multi Use Paths in Farm or Forest Zones</td>
<td>3.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding of Produce Wholesalers</td>
<td>10.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Bill Law</td>
<td>8.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Inspection</td>
<td>10.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brucellosis Programs</td>
<td>10.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets-Local Governments</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets-State</td>
<td>2.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Purchase of Fuel for Agricultural Buyers</td>
<td>4.610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cannabis 10.660
Capital Gains Tax 2.520
Capital Punishment 13.620
Career and Technical Education 1.300
Catastrophic Crop Insurance 10.220
Catherine Creek Dam 7.910
Caution Signs 4.318
Central Filling of Commodity Liens 10.650
Certification and Education 8.051
Certification of Field Crops 10.700
Channel Management 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 9.120
Collective Bargaining 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 13.575
Compensation Revenue Sources 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
Contractor Liability 11.400
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 10.706
Dairy Products Minimum Standard 10.420
Dam Removal 7.920
Deed Recording 3.696
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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 1.600
Educational Vouchers 1.455
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
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
Farm Bill Building Assessed Values 2.255
Farm Bill Export Programs 14.705
Farm Bill Nutrition 14.930
Farm Bill Specialty Crop Allocation 14.940
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bill Specialty Crop Dollars and FSMA</td>
<td>14.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau Philosophy</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Contract Carrier Provisions</td>
<td>4.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Credit</td>
<td>14.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Dwellings</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Labor Contractor Bonding</td>
<td>11.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Labor Housing</td>
<td>3.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Related Uses in EFU Zones</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Service Agency and Natural Resource</td>
<td>14.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Service Agency Foreclosures</td>
<td>14.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Use Assessment Criteria Land</td>
<td>2.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Use Assessment Principles</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Use</td>
<td>3.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Worker Meal and Rest Periods</td>
<td>11.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Right to Manage</td>
<td>11.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Markets</td>
<td>10.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming by Corporations</td>
<td>10.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Oversight Authority</td>
<td>3.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA Standards</td>
<td>10.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Capital Gains Tax</td>
<td>2.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Farm Programs</td>
<td>10.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government Responsibility</td>
<td>14.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Land Planning Coordination</td>
<td>14.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve</td>
<td>14.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section 319 Fund Advisory Committee</td>
<td>8.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Increases</td>
<td>2.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>9.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feral Pigs</td>
<td>9.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Burning Hotline</td>
<td>10.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Burning Liability</td>
<td>10.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Burning</td>
<td>10.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and Removal Permit Requirements</td>
<td>7.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Highways</td>
<td>4.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>5.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Hatcheries</td>
<td>9.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Passage</td>
<td>9.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Screens</td>
<td>7.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bill</td>
<td>14.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Quality</td>
<td>8.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods and Nutrition</td>
<td>13.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Investment</td>
<td>14.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Practices Act</td>
<td>5.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Service Timber Harvest Policy</td>
<td>5.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Programs</td>
<td>5.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>5.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 9.510
Green Power 12.305
Groundwater Priority Allocation 7.550
Guard Dogs Under Right To Farm 3.031
Gun Control 14.010
Hand Held Communication Devices 4.190
Harvest Picketing 11.500
Hazard Communication Rules Applied to Employers 11.274
Head Start Services 11.040
Health Insurance 11.630
High Value Farmland 3.200
Highway Funding Decisions 4.011
Highway Signage for Roadside Stands 4.317
Highway Signs 4.315
Historic Preservation of the Oregon Trail 13.585
Historic/Cultural Designations 3.034
Homestead Exemptions 2.210
Horse and Burro Management 9.350
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horse Import Permit</td>
<td>10.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Service Exemption</td>
<td>4.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Service</td>
<td>4.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting and Fishing License Cost</td>
<td>9.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Tags</td>
<td>9.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrological Connection</td>
<td>7.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 9 Verification</td>
<td>11.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Livestock</td>
<td>10.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Drugs</td>
<td>13.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Immigration</td>
<td>11.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Killing of Domestic Livestock</td>
<td>10.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Ag Products</td>
<td>10.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexing</td>
<td>2.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Municipal Waste</td>
<td>8.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance Taxes</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative Process</td>
<td>13.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Make a Profit</td>
<td>2.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Access</td>
<td>13.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Commodity Marketing</td>
<td>10.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commerce</td>
<td>4.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species</td>
<td>14.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irradiation</td>
<td>10.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation District Elections</td>
<td>7.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Reform</td>
<td>13.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Duty</td>
<td>13.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Laws and Regulations</td>
<td>11.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Poster</td>
<td>11.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Regulations</td>
<td>11.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Action Notification</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning Authority</td>
<td>3.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>3.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Impact on Water Quality</td>
<td>7.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner Preference Tags</td>
<td>9.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDC Commission</td>
<td>3.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDC Goals and Guidelines</td>
<td>3.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaky or Sifting Loads</td>
<td>4.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing of Water Rights</td>
<td>7.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>13.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid Services</td>
<td>11.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Emergency Clause</td>
<td>13.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability at County or State Fair</td>
<td>13.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Exemption for Public Access</td>
<td>3.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Suits</td>
<td>13.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting Legislative Sessions</td>
<td>13.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)</td>
<td>12.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Livestock Auction Markets    10.520
Local District Property Taxes    2.275
Local Government Gas Tax    4.075
Local Involvement    1.400
Loose Livestock    10.545
Loss of Private Property    3.688
Lot-of-Record    3.575
LUBA Appeals    3.025
Maintenance of Streamflow Gauges    7.340
Management of Lands Under Foreclosure    14.320
Management of Public Lands    3.685
Mandated Public Access    3.040
Mandatory Flexible Schedules    11.026
Mandatory Paid Sick Leave    11.022
Mandatory Predictable Scheduling    11.025
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
Milk Usage Audit Law    10.400
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    7.720
National Forest Receipts    5.020
National Weather Service    14.230
Natural Resources Revenues    6.400
Navigable Determination    7.015
Navigable Rivers    7.010
New Hires    14.730
No Spray Signs    9.610
Non Farm Dwellings    3.550
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Farm Activities</td>
<td>3.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resource Lands Zoning</td>
<td>3.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification Requirements</td>
<td>7.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisances</td>
<td>13.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Seed Crops</td>
<td>10.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Agricultural Income</td>
<td>10.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Constitution</td>
<td>13.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife (ODF&amp;W)</td>
<td>9.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Forestry Jurisdiction on Rangelands</td>
<td>5.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Public Employees in Legislature</td>
<td>13.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR-OSHA</td>
<td>11.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>11.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest Water</td>
<td>7.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Eligibility</td>
<td>13.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to Growers</td>
<td>10.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak and Ecological Flows</td>
<td>7.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Review</td>
<td>3.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property Rights</td>
<td>13.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Control Districts</td>
<td>10.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Labels</td>
<td>8.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Sales and Use Reporting</td>
<td>8.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>8.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Breeding Programs</td>
<td>10.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Contributions</td>
<td>11.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Control Tax Credits</td>
<td>2.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Allocation</td>
<td>3.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Bonds</td>
<td>2.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preamble to Land Use Policies</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predator Management</td>
<td>9.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Elections</td>
<td>14.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing Wage Rate</td>
<td>11.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Property Rights</td>
<td>13.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate Fee</td>
<td>13.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Purchase</td>
<td>14.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Labeling</td>
<td>10.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Liability</td>
<td>10.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Administration</td>
<td>2.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of the Term “Meat”</td>
<td>10.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Employee Strikes</td>
<td>13.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands</td>
<td>6.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Roads Safety</td>
<td>4.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility Commission (PUC) Truck Permits</td>
<td>4.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Land Exchange</td>
<td>6.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Legal Notices</td>
<td>13.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Loosestrife Control Research</td>
<td>8.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Farm Bureau</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications for Public Office</td>
<td>13.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Abandonment</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rails to Trails</td>
<td>4.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Improvement</td>
<td>9.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Milk Sales</td>
<td>10.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re Entry Standards for Pesticide Application</td>
<td>11.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL ID</td>
<td>14.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration (RPAR)</td>
<td>8.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation Law</td>
<td>6.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Cooperation</td>
<td>6.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>6.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling of Pesticide Containers</td>
<td>8.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDI Program</td>
<td>13.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of Drainage Districts and Irrigation Districts</td>
<td>7.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Reform</td>
<td>14.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Impounded Water</td>
<td>7.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Public Seed Varieties</td>
<td>10.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Life</td>
<td>13.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Acreage from Production</td>
<td>3.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Species from Threatened and/or Endangered List</td>
<td>9.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Dwellings</td>
<td>3.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of Water Use</td>
<td>7.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Local Government Programs</td>
<td>13.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Fund</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>6.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Chemicals</td>
<td>8.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructure of LCDC</td>
<td>3.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Farm</td>
<td>3.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Power Generation</td>
<td>12.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-to-Work</td>
<td>11.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Management Zones</td>
<td>7.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Access Policy</td>
<td>6.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Access</td>
<td>4.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Development</td>
<td>3.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rights of Way</td>
<td>3.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Signs</td>
<td>4.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Broadband</td>
<td>2.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community Stability Plans</td>
<td>3.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health</td>
<td>13.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Road Maintenance</td>
<td>4.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety Restraints 4.340
Sale or Lease of Public Lands 6.460
Sales Tax 2.100
Salvage Logging 5.210
Scenic Rivers 7.100
School District Reorganization 1.410
School District Transportation Fee 1.500
School Finance 2.950
School Zone Lights 4.316
Seasonal Labor Force 11.100
Seasonal Unemployment Compensation 11.340
Secondary Boycott 11.530
Section 208 of the Clean Water Act 7.475
Secure Rural Schools 14.720
Seed Trade Rules 10.710
Senate Apportionment 14.170
Service Animals at Farm Stands 10.055
Service Fees 13.740
Single Subjects for Congressional Legislation 13.900
SLAPP Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation 13.536
Slaughter Houses 10.515
Slow-Moving Vehicle Signs 4.305
Small Claims Court Judgments 13.525
Social Security Payments for Refugees 14.735
Social Security Taxes 2.700
Social Security Trust Fund 14.800
Social Services 13.430
Soil and Water Conservation Districts 7.701
Soil and Water Conservation 7.700
Solar Siting in EFU 3.678
Special Designation 9.300
State Board of Agriculture 13.705
State Boards and Commissions 13.770
State Forests 5.300
State Income Tax 2.500
State of Columbia 14.400
Statewide Labor Policy 11.015
Stewardship 6.450
Stop Lights 4.319
Storage of Willamette Basin Reservoir Water 7.220
Stored Water Application Process 7.350
Studded Tires 4.320
Student 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 2.220
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 Grading 10.130
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
Tow Trucks 4.595
Trade Agreements 14.710
Trade Negotiations 14.700
Trade with the ASEAN Countries 10.170
Traffic Impacts Due to EFU Land Conversions 3.693
Transportation Emergency Powers 4.575
Trap Lines 9.275
Trespassing 13.505
Truck Transponders 4.225
Truth in Menu 10.090
Truth in Real Estate Sales 13.550
Two Percent Kicker Program 2.530
U.S. DOL Due Process for Investigations 11.900
Unapproved Techniques of Fish Habitat Restoration 9.710
Underground Storage Tanks 8.410
Unemployment Benefits 11.320
Unemployment Insurance 11.300
Uniform Truck Loads 4.230
Urban Growth Boundaries 3.800
Urban Renewal Districts 2.955
USDA Forecasting 10.100
Use of Antibiotics 10.035
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>2.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Siting</td>
<td>3.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added Tax</td>
<td>2.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Insurance Tax</td>
<td>4.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>4.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trip Permits</td>
<td>4.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>10.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Emergency Personnel</td>
<td>13.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Fire Fighters</td>
<td>13.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>13.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Pamphlet Information</td>
<td>13.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Penalty Claims</td>
<td>11.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Adjudication</td>
<td>7.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation</td>
<td>7.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Development</td>
<td>7.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Laws</td>
<td>7.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>7.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Commission</td>
<td>7.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Right Applications</td>
<td>7.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rights</td>
<td>7.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Transfer</td>
<td>7.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use Fees</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Withdrawal from the Columbia River</td>
<td>7.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed and Brush Control</td>
<td>9.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Control</td>
<td>10.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Mile Tax</td>
<td>4.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands in EFU</td>
<td>3.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>7.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Bird Seed</td>
<td>9.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Areas</td>
<td>6.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Fecal Coli form Study</td>
<td>7.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Overlay Zones</td>
<td>9.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Refuges</td>
<td>9.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn Land Transfers</td>
<td>6.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Hybrid Registration</td>
<td>9.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Assessments</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>11.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Compensation Rates</td>
<td>11.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment</td>
<td>11.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>