Leading Through Solutions

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU

2023 POLICIES

2600 River Plaza Dr., Sacramento, California 95833 • www.cfbf.com

The policies in this booklet will direct the program of action of California Farm Bureau in its work in 2023.

Ideas and suggestions for the policies originated during discussions among Farm Bureau members at various meetings and gatherings. After consideration by a statewide committee, the policies were adopted by elected voting delegates of the member county Farm Bureaus at the 104th Annual Meeting of California Farm Bureau in December 2022.

For 104 years, the federation of 53 county Farm Bureaus has aided farmers and other rural Californians in many ways at local, state, and national levels. Priority programs include communicating with the urban public, rural health, safety, commodity programs, public utility matters, and agriculture in the classroom.

California Farm Bureau Fund to Protect the Family Farm (FarmPAC®) is the members' vehicle for political action, and FarmTeam® helps their voices to be heard on proposed legislation and regulations.

The federation is the state's largest farm organization, representing more than 28,600 members in 56 counties. The organization is a member of American Farm Bureau Federation, which boasts more than 5.7 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico.

Farm Bureau is action oriented and works to achieve its goals, as represented in the policies that follow, for the betterment of farmers, ranchers, and all of California.

California Farm Bureau®

Farm Bureau Policies 2023

General

No. 1
Definition of Agriculture

We support having a uniform definition of agriculture to include the production of all plants (horticulture), aquatic species (aquaculture), forestry (silviculture), animals and related production activities. (1997)

No. 2
Unity in Agriculture

Cooperation and coordination must exist among leaders of all agricultural associations to the fullest extent possible.

In developing solutions to commodity problems, every effort should be made to unify agriculture's strength. While individual commodity problems often require varied approaches for their solution, every approach carries with it the obligation to consider the effect of a particular action on the whole of agriculture. (Rev. 1984)

No. 3
Programs for Agriculture

The goal of Farm Bureau is to promote conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn a fair return in a manner which will preserve freedom and opportunity.

Agriculture is strategically important to the survival of the United States of America. Our nation's economy, environment and national security are dependent upon the viability of the agricultural industry. Thus, agriculture must be treated as a strategic resource by our nation and reflected as such in local, state and federal government policies.

Legislatively imposed programs at the state or national level which give government the power and authority to induce or reduce the production of any agricultural commodity pose a real threat to California growers.

Programs for agriculture should:

(1) Increase economic opportunity for farm people;

(2) Promote and invest in research in efficiencies in farming, new varieties, marketing and pest and disease management practices;

(3) Be consistent with the law of supply and demand;

(4) Allow USDA to create a Delegation of Authority so that USDA State Directors can implement programs with flexibility to apply farm programs locally;

(5) Stimulate market demand through domestic and international market development programs;

(6) Create incentives programs that encourage or recognize activities on working farms that enhance soil, habitat for species, air or water quality;

(7) Ensure our ability to feed, clothe, shelter and enhance the quality of life through agriculture for an increasing population;

(8) Encourage the consumption of U.S. grown and processed products in federal and state funded feeding and promotional programs;

(9) Enhance our ability to place commodities into a position for export in an unrestricted, competitive manner;

(10) Use a marketing loan concept;

(11) Include mechanisms, such as public hearings, which provide producers an opportunity for input into how programs will be implemented at the regulated level;

(12) We support continuation of the Public Law 480 program as a food aid and market development tool; and

(13) Promote and support the competitiveness of all commodities.

Programs should not:

(1) Lead to price fixing;

(2) Stimulate excessive production;

(3) Permit development of monopolies;

(4) Erode individual freedom;

(5) Freeze historical production patterns;

(6) Price our commodities out of their markets;

(7) Help one commodity at the expense of another;

(8) Increase farm production costs;

(9) Make farmers dependent on government payments;

(10) Create government-controlled commodity reserves;

(11) Require offsetting and cross compliance as a condition of eligibility for program benefits;

(12) Employ a one-year base period for establishing normal crop acreage;

(13) Employ any method of assigning an acreage base which unfairly benefits either the landlord or land renter;

(14) Pay farmers for not producing a crop; and

(15) Allow the planting of fruits and vegetables on farm program base acres for any covered commodity programs. (Rev. 2008)

No. 4
Right-to-Farm

We support responsible local and state right-to-farm ordinances designed to permit and protect the rights of apiculturists, farmers, forest landowners, ranchers and commercial fishermen to produce without undue or unreasonable restrictions, regulations or harassment from the public or private sectors. Attorney fees should be awarded to owners or operators of agricultural activities, operations, or facilities who successfully assert immunity against nuisance liability under Civil Code Section 3482.5, the state "Right-to-Farm" law. We also support amendment of local right-to-farm ordinances to require that any nuisance action against an agricultural producer by a private litigant first be submitted to non-binding arbitration by a panel of arbitrators consisting of the County Agricultural Commissioner, two agricultural producers, and two members representing the general public.

Prior to a property buyer's financial commitment, a seller must inform the purchaser(s) in writing and recorded by the county that normal agricultural activities on nearby properties may create dust, noise, odor, or other perceived impairments. These activities may also involve the use and transportation of implements of husbandry. In counties where open range laws exist, buyers should also be informed that they are responsible for fencing out livestock.

Local governments should issue notification publicizing the purposes and/or protections of right-to-farm ordinances.

Open-range ordinances should be used where appropriate to help maintain the viability of livestock operations that depend on grazing. We recognize that the preservation of open space is related to the viability of livestock operations, which depend on grazing land. If the liability to graze becomes prohibitive, livestock operations could likely be replaced by development. We support the responsible use of open-range ordinances and believe abuse of open-range policy should not be tolerated. (98/Rev. 2008)

No. 5
Disparagement

Federal and/or state legislation should be enacted to allow producers of agricultural commodities and the associations that represent them to seek legal recourse against persons and entities who financially damage them by disparaging them or their commodities or production practices without sound scientific basis. (1998)

No. 6
Government Restrictions on Farms

All restrictions should be eliminated that limit the size of farms or qualify ownership conditions unless such limitations are otherwise commonly applied to non-farm businesses. (Rev. 1984)

No. 7
Regulatory Reform

Whereas the American Farm Bureau Federation has established policy for federal regulatory review and reform, the California agricultural industry is also uniquely burdened with local, regional, and state regulatory mandates.

CFBF urges local, regional and state government agencies to review all existing state regulations under their respective previews in keeping with CFBF and AFBF policy guidelines, as generally outlined below.

Agencies should consider the economic impacts of all statutes, rules, regulations, and other significant governmental actions affecting agriculture.

Agencies should not impose regulatory mandates detrimental to the sustainability of the agricultural industry.

Agencies should be required to consider the cumulative impacts of all regulations proposed. Regulations should not conflict with each other.

Tools to measure the cumulative impact of regulations affecting production agriculture should be adopted prior to public comment.

An agency should be required to directly notify farm owners of any new or amended regulation or interpretation of a regulation adopted by it and wait a minimum of one year from the time of notification before implementing the new or amended regulation or interpretation.

Regulatory mandates need to be coordinated within the various state agencies in order to minimize the overall impact on agriculture, to streamline the rulemaking process and to improve public access and input.

We support and encourage the streamlining of regulatory reporting and permitting procedures, as well as oversight, streamlining deregulation and sunset provisions.

New or amended regulations should adhere to the following important principles:

(1) Property rights should be recognized as the foundation for resource production and thus protected;

(2) Regulations should be based upon adherence to the scientific method;

(3) A risk-assessment analysis should be conducted before a regulation is promulgated;

(4) The costs and benefits of public and private sector compliance with a proposed regulation must be estimated and justified before it is promulgated;

(5) Regulatory costs imposed on the private sectors must be minimized;

(6) Regulations should be reasonably flexible to allow them to fit varying conditions;

(7) Proposed regulations should be subject to independent analysis and public scrutiny;

(8) Alternatives to regulations, especially market-based incentives, should be considered before rulemaking is invoked;

(9) Regulations need to recognize the practicalities of conducting business; and

(10) A presumption of innocence that a regulation was violated should replace the current presumption of guilt.

The ability to intervene in regulatory actions against landowners, neighbors, or those directly affected by an alleged violation should be limited. (2016)

No. 8
Definition of "Rural"

We support defining "rural" at the census-tract level for resource allocation and standardizing eligibility determination for all Rural Development programs at a population limit of 50,000. (2019)

No. 9
Status of Previous Resolutions

It is our policy to keep our resolutions as current as possible without specifically restating all details of continuing policies every year. The resolutions, in whole or in part, adopted at preceding annual meetings are hereby reaffirmed, except insofar as they have been modified or supplemented by later resolutions, including those adopted at this, the 104th annual meeting.

* NOTE: (2023) indicates the year the policy was adopted.

(Rev. 2023) indicates the year the policy was revised.

(96/Rev. 2023) The first number indicates the year the policy originated. The second indicates the year it was revised.

*2023 policies adopted at the December 2022 annual meeting.

No. 10
Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG) Credits

We oppose any government-sponsored or mandated Environmental, Social, and Governance Credit or similarly tiered rating systems for agriculture. We are concerned that subjective criteria may create an unequitable agricultural environment, misaligning growers' interests and causing undue burden on small farms. (2023)

Commodities

No. 101
Cotton

We support:

(1) Instrument classing of cotton and urge the continued development, improvement and further refinement of cotton classing equipment and procedures;

(2) Producers continuing to have the option to have cotton high volume instrument (HVI) classed by module/trailer averaging or individual bale;

(3) The University of California Cotton Research Station at Shafter and urge continued funding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the University of California. We also encourage grower support of that station in the areas of agricultural production that require research projects to be implemented and maintained;

(4) The California Department of Food and Agriculture/Cotton Pest Control Board in its efforts to prevent the establishment of the pink bollworm and the boll weevil in the San Joaquin Valley. In addition, programs to eradicate both the pink bollworm and the boll weevil from currently infested areas in the U.S. and Mexico must receive full funding;

(5) Cotton Incorporated as a desirable means of maintaining a permanent research and marketing development program;

(6) The San Joaquin Valley Cotton Board as presently established and urge that the standards adopted by the board for testing be thorough, and that future cotton varieties released by the board maintain the high quality standard and be superior in some meaningful respect as determined by the board, and be generally recognized by the cotton industry to be an essential factor in producing cotton within the San Joaquin Valley Quality Cotton District;

(7) Additional research funding reflecting the shift in acreage from Upland to Pima cotton using sources such as the Supima Association to provide research funding for Pima cotton; and

(8) The reinstatement funding for research to prevent or reduce the continued spread of Fusarium Race 4. (Rev. 2013)

No. 102
Rice

Any farm program legislation should include the following provisions for rice:

(1) Full federal funding for crop insurance as adopted in the

Agricultural Act of 2014;

(2) Research for eradication and/or control of potentially devastating resistant and/or virulent weeds, pest, and pathogens;

(3) Adoption of economically feasible measures to mitigate these problems in the California rice industry; and

(4) Efforts to develop new uses for rice straw as an alternative to burning.

We oppose cuts to crop insurance that could limit its effectiveness as the primary risk management tool available to farmers. (Rev. 2016)

No. 103
Sugar

Within the sugar industry we support:

(1) A program to protect the interests of domestic sugar producers and recommend that any appropriate legislation should include a sugar title with provisions that ensure a strong and economically viable domestic sugar industry;

(2) Retention of the current loan rate as a minimum;

(3) Elimination of the marketing assessment fee(s) or loan forfeiture penalties;

(4) Increased research and development funding for biobased energy and biobased products utilizing sugar crops; and

(5) We support the passage of legislation and administrative action that prevents the circumvention of the U.S. sugar import quota. We support the reporting of sugar-containing products for this purpose. (2007)

No. 104
Dairy

In order to assure a safe, stable and dependable supply of milk, a degree of regulation in the industry is necessary. Such regulation should permit producers to receive a price that enables them to produce a safe, dependable supply of milk.

We support:

(1) California standards for solids-non-fat in fluid milk throughout the U.S.;

(2) Standards that lower bacterial and somatic cell counts in fluid milk;

(3) A pricing system that responds quickly to fluctuations in production costs, cost of living, and other factors that may influence the orderly marketing of milk in California;

(4) A pooling concept whereby producer marketing rights are controlled by the producer rather than the processor. The ownership by producers of marketing rights is a prerequisite to a stable supply of milk and stability within the family farm structure of the California dairy industry;

(5) The dairy industry establishing a program to better manage milk supplies nationwide;

(6) A risk management program that offers protection based on gross margins (milk price minus feed costs) that reflect costs consistent with areas of the country where milk is produced;

(7) The California Dairy Quality Assurance Program as long as it is industry-driven and voluntary. We urge all California dairy producers to enroll in the program;

(8) Requiring everyone producing milk in California for either raw or pasteurized products to meet all relevant state regulatory animal health, milk quality, food safety, permitting, and pool reporting requirements;

(9) Regulating state-by-state raw milk for human consumption and selling it only within the state that regulates it;

(10) A definition of milk that defines it as the lacteal secretions of a mammal; and

(11) State enforcement of the standards of identity for milk.

More emphasis should be placed on the development of new dairy products and the expansion of current dairy products into new markets. Bonding of market and manufacturing milk handlers should be at a level that adequately protects producers. (Rev. 2023)

No. 105
Forestry

Timber is a crop and the process of growing, harvesting and storing that crop shall be treated as an agricultural enterprise. Governmental agencies should work cooperatively to provide well-integrated emergency and long-term programs in reforestation, range reseeding, watershed stabilization, brush conversion, fire prevention and research programs. Keeping these commercial forests economically viable is essential.

The enforcement of the Forest Practice Act should be primarily the duty of the state, while providing for input from the local level.

The harvesting of timber and forest products in Timber Production Zones (TPZs) should not be restricted if good forestry practices are observed. If TPZs are restricted, the costs of wildlife management, including set-asides, state regulatory expense and research, should be incurred by the public.

We urge that sustainable harvest begin and continue as soon as possible in all our state and national forests.

We urge voluntary development of privately owned, sustained-yield forestry with state and federal governments assisting in essential supplemental service.

Parcels proposed for selective timber harvest whose principal use is not timber production, should have an avenue for consideration of its exemption from the requirement for a timber harvest plan.

We oppose departments and/or agencies, which are authorized and budgeted to perform Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) and Non-Industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP) review, charging fees for such items as environmental review, 1600 permits, and Water Quality Timber Harvest Waivers as the practices covered by these fees have already been reviewed and inspected in the THP/NTMP review process. Such fees are tantamount to paying twice for the same work.

We favor sound research and educational programs on:

(1) Forest and land management utilization, including conversion of cover where site and characteristics of soils lend themselves to supporting better forage species and conditions for water conservation and improved flow;

(2) Fire deterrent and protection, insect, disease and vertebrate pest control methods;

(3) Reforestation and revegetation for continuous high yield;

(4) Tree varieties for expanding development of commercial and farm forestry;

(5) Fire prevention by (a) removal or burning of forest debris, and (b) public information about fire safety;

(6) Forest management practices on small forest ownerships, as we oppose the Forest Legacy Program; and

(7) The correlation between forest management and streamflow. (Rev. 2012)

No. 106
Honey and Apiculture

We support:

(1) The continuation of a Commodity Credit Corporation honey loan program to provide stability for the domestic bee industry and to assure adequate pollination of all crops;

(2) The development of a standard of identity for honey in the U.S.;

(3) Programs that increase the availability and additional planting of non-noxious pollinator forage on private and government-owned or managed lands; and

(4) Allowing honey bees to be placed on government-owned or managed lands.

We urge Congress to continue and adequately fund and staff regionally located USDA-Agricultural Research Service honey bee research centers and the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture Competitive Grants Program. (Rev. 2019)

No. 107
Specialty Crops

Specialty crops are an integral part of California agriculture.

The term "specialty crops", as defined in the 2008 farm bill, means fruits and vegetables, tree nuts, dried fruits, horticulture (including turfgrass sod and herbal crops), and nursery crops (including floriculture).

We support:

(1) The inclusion of a specialty crops title in future farm bills;

(2) Additional research into harvest and cultural Practices;

(3) Expanded disease and pest research programs and improved pest exclusion programs; and

(4) Additional funding to promote market expansion of U.S.-produced specialty crops. (Rev. 2011)

No. 108
Commodity Credit Corporation Accounting

When the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases surplus commodities, or when such commodities are distributed through donation or other government aid programs, the Commodity Credit Corporation should conform to GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) and reflect the full cost of the inventory distributed in reporting the cost of the commodity price support program. The sale of the commodities should be credited back to that commodity program. (Rev. 1990)

No. 109
Domestic Wine Commerce

Wine should be made as available to adult consumers as any other agricultural product. States should not restrict wine distribution to specially licensed stores, tax wine sales so as to favor wine produced in the same state, nor include wine in tax proposals to increase government revenue. There should also be an end to discriminatory licensing procedures which impede sales by certain vintners and facilitate sales by others. The right to advertise wine and related products should be supported. (Rev. 2016)

No. 110
Aquaculture

The aquaculture industry supports the Aquaculture Coordinator position at the California Department of Fish and Wildlife with relevant agency assistance to improve the awareness of aquaculture within and outside of government; to seek regulatory relief at state, regional, county, and local levels; to provide information on permit and license requirements and regulations relating to each type of aquaculture; and to provide advice to aquaculture on project design and location to accommodate permit requirements. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) should designate a liaison to interface with the Aquaculture Coordinator and the aquaculture industry in the administration of CDFA-related programs affecting aquaculture.

Aquaculture is the controlled growing of fish, shellfish and plants in marine, brackish and fresh water and should be treated as an agricultural enterprise.

Local ordinances should be enacted recognizing that aquaculture is agriculture in all land use determinations. Furthermore, use permits should not be required for aquaculture operations unless such permits are required in precise zoning ordinances for other forms of agriculture.

Allowing compatible aquaculture operations to be located in agricultural, industrial, commercial and resource management zones should be included in the development of any land use or coastal program.

The lead agency for aquaculture should establish a liaison with local governments. The California Legislature should act to assure that agriculture, including aquaculture, receives priority consideration in conflicts over siting in the coastal zone, including areas being prescribed for scenic and recreational uses and in wetlands.

We encourage the use of brood stock legally obtained from the wild to develop new commercial opportunities for fish, shellfish, and aquatic plants.

We urge the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force to adopt farm-level aquatic invasive species (AIS) hazard analysis and critical control point (HACCP) programs as a means to prevent the spread of AIS. Environmental DNA (eDNA) and polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing should not be used as primary regulatory enforcement tools.

Consideration should be given to private aquaculture for contracts prior to building new public hatcheries or expanding existing facilities. Priority should be given to aquatic species quality and cost of production of those species. (Rev. 2014)

No. 111
Horticulture

Exotic pests pose a significant threat to the horticulture industry. Pest exclusions should be the first line of defense. When pests or diseases are detected during inspections at points of entry, or through infestation discoveries, eradication is the best option.

Nursery operations that ship or receive plant shipments require timely inspections to avoid sustaining plant losses. During periods of quarantines, the office of the county agricultural commissioner should provide daily inspection services at destinations and post inspection service hours.

Mitigation of infestations adds unnecessary financial and regulatory burdens to horticultural producers and state resources, while adding to the use of crop protection tools.

We support mandatory general fund dollars for any action that increases regulatory activities at the federal, state, or county levels. Federal funding should be increased annually to ensure adequate facilities and resources for inspection of plants, foliage, seeds, and cut flowers to detect and prevent the introduction of pests and diseases. Improvements to pest and disease detection, surveillance, eradication and exclusion infrastructure, facilities, and database technology must be a priority.

Funding for horticultural-specific research should be included in each reauthorization of the Farm Bill.

We will coordinate with affected states to establish workable, viable, and cost-effective Integrated Pest Risk Management Measures for the Importation of Plants for Planting into North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) Member Countries, and Best Management Practices (BMP's) plan to manage and protect the movement of plants and plant material. All management measures should include mechanisms that ensure funding is adequate at federal, state and local levels to implement all parts of this plan. Plans must be easy to administer and monitor, while achieving balance with the requirements of any federal order or foreign import requirements.

We will continue to work within the state educational system to promote vocational education in horticultural specific career paths. (Rev. 2010)

No. 112
"Equal-to" Meat Inspection Program

We support the establishment of the "equal-to" meat inspection program in California. (Rev. 1992)

No. 113
Quality Inspection Programs

We support efforts to assure compliance with minimum legal standards of maturity, quality, packaging and labeling for fruit, nuts, vegetables and honey. We believe that these standards benefit

consumers by assuring high quality, wholesome products and that these benefits should be reflected in State General Fund support for inspection activities.

Where individual commodity groups determine that it is in their best interest to supplement state funds, or develop self-financed inspection programs, we support these efforts.

CFBF should be actively engaged in the development of marketing orders and agreements to deal with food safety and industry guidance standards. We understand that the final decision to approve such an order will rest with affected producers. Farm Bureau should be involved in the structuring and educating process and the CFBF board should have the option to take a position on the proposed order or agreement.

We support the production and sale of fresh juices provided they are produced and processed under a voluntary Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point-based program. (Rev. 2005)

No. 114
Consumer Education

We strongly support the development and use of consumer education programs to raise awareness of the consumer's responsibility as it relates to issues such as food safety, pesticide use, water quality and other environmental issues.

We support an innovative consumer education campaign regarding California agriculture and the challenges it faces in the current business and regulatory environment.

This campaign should not be limited to traditional communication strategies but should incorporate all available communication technologies and strategies. CFBF should engage diverse groups of consumers and should partner with a wide range of organizations with links to consumers. (2009)

No. 115
Synthetic Food Production (SFP)

We acknowledge that processes to synthesize production of food through the use of complex scientific technology (such as by means of lab-grown protein) will likely continue to develop and yield products that are introduced into the marketplace. Given the many unknowns surrounding their reliability as a safe food source, we believe that science has an important role to properly evaluate these products for any potential adverse health consequences to humans and animals. We believe that the USDA should oversee this role.

It is recommended that:

(a) The regulation of SFP not lead to additional regulations for producers of agricultural products or commodities that do not partake in these synthetic processes.

(b) The processes by which they are created must have an all-encompassing name to which they all may be referred. This name must be a term that takes into account not only synthetic animal products but also synthetic plant products that seek to replicate those produced by plant agriculture.

Therefore, for use throughout our policies, we support defining this term as "Synthetic food production" so that it means the portion of any food production process in which:

(1) Food is cultured or grown from cells derived from or synthesizing an edible animal (such as meat, seafood, or poultry), eggs, the edible part of a plant, or the edible reproductive body of a plant (such as a fruit, nut, vegetable, grain, or fungus) through the use of technology in a controlled scientific setting (including a laboratory or factory); or

(2) Food is created at least in part by foods described in the previous paragraph (1).

We support:

(1) Mandatory, thorough, and routine in-depth scientific studies, testing, and monitoring of foods created through synthetic food production to ensure that they are safe;

(2) Rules and regulations that guide and oversee the process of scientific studies, testing, and monitoring of foods created through synthetic food production including both creation and distribution. The level of complexity and frequency of required participation by government and members of the supply chain be as stringent as that which has been historically imposed on the food safety of both naturally grown meat, poultry, egg, seafood, and juice production;

(3) That synthetic food production should be afforded no additional regulatory or administrative benefits over other naturally grown meat, poultry, dairy, egg, seafood, and juice production. We support rules and regulations on synthetic production of food;

(4) Requiring each party in the supply chain of food created through synthetic food production to maintain documentation of both how that food was made at each step of its production at the point of, and prior to, that party's possession of the food; and which parties were involved in each such step; subject to inspection by any subsequent party in that chain, including the government;

(5) Food created through synthetic food production adhering to antibiotic regulation, as is required in livestock production; and

(6) The regulatory body with primary jurisdiction over foods created through synthetic food production being designated as USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) or in the event that a government reorganization occurs with respect to food safety, the applicable food safety agency within the USDA. We acknowledge that FDA may play a role in determining the safety of these products, but the day-to-day primary regulation and oversight for the products should reside with USDA. (2020).

No. 116
Labeling of Agricultural Products

We support:

(1) Legislation requiring country-of-origin labeling on imported agricultural products at the final point of sale to the consumer. The country of origin should be clearly stated and large enough to be easily identified on blended and nonblended products, with the exception of the minor ingredients in those products.

(a) Only meat from animals that are born, raised and processed in the U.S. are eligible for the U.S. country-of-origin label.

(b) All imported animals that could be used for human consumption should be permanently identified regarding their country of origin prior to or upon entry into the United States.

(2) One hundred percent of a fresh or processed product that is labeled "California-grown" must be grown in California. This applies to the main commodity being sold, not minor ingredients, additives, or preservatives included with the fresh or processed product.

(a) A California-grown label for voluntary use by California producers. Wines derived from grapes labeled as American or U.S.A. appellations must contain 100% U.S. grapes.

(3) Regulations to prohibit product made according to proprietary formulas that include a base of grape wine with additives such as spices, fruit juices, sugar and water (formula wines) from being allowed to feature varietal names on their labels. We object to the prominent display of varietal, semi-generic or geographic names on 'formula wine' products because they are misleading to the consumer and threaten the integrity of U.S. varietal standards. (Rev. 2020).

No. 117
Labeling of Synthetic Food Products

We do not object to new food products entering the market; however, manufacturers of foods created through synthetic food production and others involved in the foods' supply chain should be allowed to label such foods with any available name; provided that no reference is made in that name or any advertising description to any food which is being simulated, and no advertisement description is used to imply traditional food origins.

We support:

(1) Requiring the product label to clearly disclose if any food product created through synthetic food production is commingled with meat or plant products not produced that way, including at what percentage and separate from any name or advertising description of the package; and

(2) Requiring all food products sold for consumption by humans or animals which are created through synthetic food production to display a conspicuous label (separate from any name or advertising description of the package) and at point-of-sale that thoroughly describes the process employed to create such foods. Such a label should cover all steps used to create the food until its point of final consumption.

We oppose:

(1) The use of commonly known and industry-recognized "meat," "dairy products" and "plant" terms in the name and advertisement of all foods created through synthetic food production;

(2) The use of commonly used nomenclature or specific "meat" terms such as beef, chicken, pork, turkey, lamb, veal and fish or specific cuts of meat such as roast, steak, ground, breast, chop, filet, etc. on the advertising portion of the product label of a food created through synthetic food production;

(3) The use of commonly used nomenclature or specific "plant" terms in product advertisement such as fruit, vegetable, nut, mushroom, grain, corn, wheat, barley, sorghum, plant, grass, stalk, or specific plant varieties on the advertising portion of the product label of a food created through synthetic food production;

(4) The use of commonly used nomenclature or specific "dairy" terms in product advertisement such as milk, cheese, yogurt, sour cream, kefir, cottage cheese, whey protein, or specific dairy varieties on the advertising portion of the product label of a food created through synthetic food production;

(5) The use of environmental, health and other claims, including in advertising and product labeling, about foods created through synthetic food production in the marketing of the product that is not verified by USDA as a regulatory agency and based on sound science. (2020).

No. 118
Animal Traceability

We favor the continued use of legally recognized traditional methods of permanent identification of livestock for individual ownership.

Any national animal identification system should be implemented on a species-by-species basis as an animal health need is demonstrated. Existing systems already providing for premises identification and animal movement tracking should be used to the extent feasible to meet the needs of a national animal identification system.

Any new method of livestock identification should be considered only if it is proven equally practical and effective as current methods and is a legally recognized form of proof of ownership in all states having livestock brand law.

We support the establishment and implementation of a national animal identification system capable of providing support for animal disease control and eradication, as well as enhancing food safety.

A cost-effective national system of livestock identification, with adequate cost share among government, industry and producers, should be implemented and administered by USDA. Any such program must protect producers from liability for acts of others after livestock leaves the producers' hands, including nuisance suits naming everyone who handled particular livestock.

We support the following guidelines for a livestock identification program:

(1) The program be as simple and inexpensive as possible for producers to implement;

(2) Cost sharing support from the federal government especially for development and implementation;

(3) Producer information shall be confidential and exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA);

(4) Information shall be made available only to the proper animal health authorities in the event of an animal disease incident. Any unauthorized use inconsistent with the FOIA shall constitute a felony;

(5) The identification of animals will not be required until movement from the original registered premises; and

(6) All imported animals should be permanently identified regarding their country of origin upon entry into the United States. The program should ensure the security of producer information and respect the privacy of producers by only collecting data necessary to establish a trace-back system.

We support the development of uniform standards for electronic identification.

We support the development and adoption of livestock identification technology that will enhance the implementation of value-based marketing. (Rev. 2011)

No. 119
Animal Care

We do not condone the mistreatment of animals.

Animals that become permanently incapacitated should be euthanized without delay, disposed of properly, and not used for human consumption.

The California Department of Food and Agriculture is the proper state agency to provide assistance to commodity organizations in sponsoring producer-directed informational materials and programs relating to optimal and sound animal care.

As animal welfare issues gain a higher profile, we recognize the critical need for a coordinated response to animal-welfare issues among agricultural/livestock organizations in California. We should be engaged in the process and assume a leadership role where appropriate.

Regulations should not unduly restrict the right of farmers, distributors, or retailers to hold and sell animals alive. Likewise, the right of individuals to purchase live animals to prepare for food consistent with their personal or cultural beliefs should not be restricted beyond reasonable safeguards relating to the health of the species statewide, humane handling, transportation and processing of animals, and ensuring food safety.

We support:

(1) Management practices for the humane care of livestock and poultry as developed through scientific research, industry-tested practices, or as set forth in the Animal Care Series: Beef Care Practices, Dairy Care Practices, Goat Care Practices, Sheep Care Practices, Swine Care Practices, Turkey Care Practices, Broiler Care Practices, and Egg-type Layer Flock Care Practices, produced by the University of California Cooperative Extension. These practices should be used as guidelines;

(2) An aggressive, comprehensive, educational program that presents facts of animal and poultry production to the media, producers, allied service industries, the general public and school children; and

(3) Requiring any entity or person seizing aquaculture species, horses, livestock, and/or poultry to first have the recommendation of a veterinarian licensed in the State of California whose professional activities involve the evaluation of the care and commercial production of the species subject to immediate seizure.

We oppose:

(1) The ultra-short docking of lambs based on scientific research indicating health hazards to sheep of extreme short tail docking;

(2) Attempts to impose restrictions on animal care and handling practices whereby the concerns over the well-being of animals are elevated to the same or similar status as the rights of humans; and

(3) Any legislation that would pay bounties to complainants. (Rev. 2012)

No. 120
Livestock Health

The principle of calfhood and mature cattle vaccination for the control and eradication of brucellosis should be supported.

Strain RB-51, live culture, should be used until facts reveal that the cattle and dairy industries will be protected from outbreaks following elimination of the vaccination programs.

The testing of exposed and inshipped beef and dairy cattle is an important part of the surveillance program. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) should make recommendations and proposals for testing that will lead to the eradication of the disease. The cattle industry and concerned organizations should be involved in changes of rules and regulations in the CDFA.

We support:

(1) Indemnity payments for herds that are in the whole herd vaccination plan;

Protection of human health and the human food supply is of the highest priority. Consumer perceptions regarding meat safety issues can have a devastating effect on the U.S. beef industry. Farm Bureau supports continued research directed toward determining if bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) is transmitted to livestock through the feeding of ruminant by-products. We support a ban on the inclusion in ruminant feeds of any animal proteins shown to transmit BSE;

(2) The program developed by the cattle industry requiring that all bulls 18 months of age and over offered for sale, at auctions or at private treaty, be for slaughter only unless verified trichomonosis-free with written certification of a negative trichomonosis test within thirty days prior to sale;

(3) Enforcement and self-policing of CDFA's entry requirement for sheep regarding Brucella ovis and industry efforts to take a leadership role where appropriate; and

(4) The USDA Minor Use Animal Drug Program (National Research Support Project-7) that works in collaboration with FDA-Center for Veterinary Medicine and the pharmaceutical companies to facilitate approvals of veterinary products for minor food animal species and for minor use in major food animal species.

We will coordinate with CDFA to engage all relevant agencies to ensure uniform availability of the most effective biologics and pharmaceuticals for all species throughout the U.S. (Rev. 2019)

No. 121
Rendering Facilities and Collection Points

We support:

(1) The streamlining of the permitting process for rendering facilities and/or collection points to encourage livestock producers to use these facilities; and

(2) Legislation that provides economic and regulatory relief to rendering facilities and encourage further development and construction of rendering facilities and/or collection points.

We encourage research that adds value and marketability of rendering facility products. (2009)

No. 122
Crop Insurance

We support:

(1) The availability of crop yield, revenue, and margin insurance for all agricultural producers;

(2) Continuation of the private sector as the deliverer of crop insurance regulated by USDA's Risk Management Agency;

(3) Continuation of federal government financial support, but at percentages, levels, and amounts sufficient to cover the full cost of selling and servicing and to provide a reasonable return to private capital and management;

(4) Annual reviews to ensure proper premium ratings that are actuarially sound by crop and county;

(5) Continuation of every farmer, rancher, and grower being eligible for crop insurance, regardless of size or location of the operation; and

(6) Prevented planting provisions that include the insured's right to receive a prevented planting benefit due to lack of both surface and groundwater irrigation supply disruptions and deficiencies including equipment failure.

We oppose:

(1) Requiring irrigation after crop failure has occurred;

(2) USDA's Farm Service Agency managing crop insurance;

(3) Caps or limits being applied to crop insurance premium assistance;

(4) Means testing and payment limitations for crop insurance;

(5) Policyholders being charged a farm visit fee to verify that a cover crop that includes a fruit and/or vegetable was not harvested as a fruit or vegetable; and

(6) The announcement of surface and/or groundwater supply deficiencies or curtailments that have any bearing on prevented planting eligibilities. (96/Rev. 2019)

No. 123
Crop and Livestock Reporting Service

The reports provided by the Federal State Market News Service and California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service are important tools for many farmers and ranchers in California. When deemed necessary by the farmers served, these services should be continued and strengthened to provide producers with information on supply, demand, export demand, pricing and planting intentions in a timely and accurate manner.

USDA should provide timely and accurate reports of livestock market information. We support the continued mandatory reporting of price, quantity, premiums and discounts, and terms of sale for slaughter livestock from federally inspected packers who process more than a specified level of annual average slaughter. (Rev. 2004)

No. 124
Hay and Forage Standards

We urge the State of California and the USDA to develop consistent laboratory standards for all labs in the state of California for the purposes of testing alfalfa hay. Labs should report results in accordance with a standardized methodology and uniform analysis. (Rev. 2000)

No. 125
Weather Reporting

We support the maintenance and adequate funding of current weather analysis and information dissemination systems, and encourage federal, state, and private agencies to constantly work together to improve these systems. To assure continuity and improvement of specialized weather programs, coordination of user support and federal funds is encouraged. Efforts to advance weather forecasting technologies should be concentrated in areas which will benefit fruit frost protection, crop residue burning, fire management, integrated pest management, and cultural practices. (Rev. 1997)

No. 126
Agricultural Research

It is important for the entire agricultural and food industries to place a high priority on supporting agricultural research. Research should be supported by any entity interested in providing such services to the industry, including the University of California (Agricultural Experiment Stations, Cooperative Extension), the California State University colleges, the USDA Agricultural Research Service and private industry. A close cooperative relationship between agricultural researchers and the private production sector is crucial to a successful program.

California agriculture recognizes that its success on the global level is ensured through advances in technology and research. All California commodity sectors should provide unified support for agricultural research that overarches individual commodity priorities. The California agricultural industry recognizes the value of research into programs that keep us competitive in the global marketplace, including improved agronomic practices, mechanization, improved genetic and varietal advances, disease and pest control programs and value-added products. To this end, we encourage Congress and the USDA to develop and fund such programs. The federal farm bill should include grant funding for mechanization research and development.

Federal and state funding of research should be increased to assure a supply of basic research and to channel those findings into applied research. Although we urge commodity groups to contribute to agricultural research, their funding should be considered an addition to, not a substitute for, government funding of research.

Royalty fees (minus patenting expenses) that are collected by the University of California and California State Universities on the sale of patented technology and materials should be allocated evenly between the researcher and the research program in the commodity area. The money returned to the research program should be used on further research of the commodity that generated the royalty fees.

The discovery that an agricultural commodity has a beneficial property should not entitle the discoverer to a patent for the commodity's production. (68/Rev. 2018)

No. 127
Plant Variety Protection Act

We support the following amendments to the Plant Variety Protection Act:

(1) The farmers' right to sell seed of protected varieties from their own production without the agreement with the owner of the variety would be eliminated;

(2) The farmers' right to save purchased but unplanted protected seed would be retained; however, use of such saved seed would be limited to the farm(s) of the person who purchased the seed;

(3) It would be an infringement to clean, condition or treat protected seed for sale as seed without the consent of the owner of the variety, or it would be an infringement for a conditioner to dispense seed to any person other than the one from whom it was received; and

(4) It would be an infringement to buy protected seed for reproductive purposes without the consent of the owner of the patent on the seed. (93/Rev. 2017)

No. 128
Biotechnology

We support the ability, statewide, to use biotechnology to improve the quality and marketability of our products and to solve environmental and health concerns.

We shall engage in activities that support and protect the use of biotechnology and its development. We recognize that the use of biotechnology is an individual choice and a private property right, enabling individuals to be globally competitive, and it should be protected.

We support a national policy to encourage research and development of biotechnology. Regulations should encourage technological advancements and should be consistent at all levels of government. New regulations should be based on science.

We support the FDA's effort to allow voluntary labeling of products that have been tested to determine the absence of bioengineered ingredients using a certified procedure that meets uniform federal standards developed by the USDA.

We favor strong patent support to encourage these new technologies, and continued research and development of those new products. Research into and approval of new products should be based on safety and efficacy criteria.

We oppose any law or regulation requiring registration of farmers who use or sell products that have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration. We oppose individual cities and counties establishing separate policies on agricultural biotechnology.

Agricultural goods that are produced using biotechnology techniques or products should not be required to provide this information on the product label, unless a food is significantly different from its traditional counterpart, or where a specific constituent is altered (e.g., nutritionally or when affecting allergenicity). (91/Rev. 2017)

No. 129
Sustainable Agriculture

Agriculture provides society numerous benefits including, but not limited to, food security, a safe and healthy food supply, environmental benefits and community stability. It is important to remember that agriculture needs the flexibility to alter cropping patterns and practices to meet the demands of operating in an open marketplace where our competition comes from agriculturalists worldwide. When considering sustainable agriculture, there is only one constant and that is agriculture is only sustainable when it is profitable.

Sustainable agriculture should be an integrated system of plant and animal production practices having a site-specific application that will enhance the economic viability of agricultural operations and may over the long term:

A) Satisfy human food and fiber needs;

B) Make most efficient use of nonrenewable resources and agricultural resources and integrate, where appropriate, natural biological cycles and controls;

C) Promote environmental quality and the natural resource base upon which the agricultural economy depends; and

D) Enhance the quality of life for agriculturalists, and consequently, for agricultural employees and society as a whole.

Sustainable agriculture standards should recognize the benefits of accepted management practices that California agriculture currently employs such as Integrated Pest Management. Standards should be flexible enough to fit California's diverse climates, cropping patterns, land use standards, and regulatory requirements. Standards and regulations should not limit agricultural practices without strong scientific and economic justification.

Sustainable agriculture standards should be outcome based, developed by farmers and ranchers, and focus on adaptive management rather than a rigid set of practices.

We support:

(1) Scientific research and education that encourages all participants in the agricultural industry to produce, process and distribute food and fiber in a manner that is economically viable and enhances the quality of life for present and future generations; and

(2) Protection of confidential information. Proprietary data collected about grower practices and the sustainability value must be kept confidential with no threat of exposure to competitors. (Rev. 2016)

No. 130
Organic Farming

We support efforts to enhance marketing, research, and production opportunities for producers of organically grown commodities. Standards for the production, processing, handling, and labeling of these commodities should be adopted and strictly enforced.

CDFA should be the lead agency in any regulatory and enforcement activities relating to organic agriculture.

We believe market demand should drive increased organic acreage.

Unreasonable barriers to producer entry to this market should be prohibited. USDA National Organic Program standards and

enforcement should be implemented consistently so that all producers are treated fairly and equitably.

Those who benefit from the sale of organically produced commodities should pay for enforcement activities. (90/Rev. 2023)

No. 131
Organic Foods Standards

Clear and consistent national standards for the production and labeling of "organically grown" foods must be maintained for the benefit of producers and consumers. There should be effective enforcement of these standards. (1990)

No. 132
Disaster Assistance

We believe that disaster loans should be made to those who have suffered losses due to an unusual natural disaster or government restrictions.

We believe that disaster loans should be governed by the following principles:

(1) Any interest subsidy should be recaptured if the farm is sold voluntarily during the term of the loan;

(2) All lending institutions which provide agricultural funding should make every effort to reamortize or extend agricultural loans on an individual basis in order to assist producers affected by natural disasters to stay in business and operate through the current season;

(3) There should be a state appeals committee made up of present or past county committeemen and this committee should have the final say on appeals; and

(4) The declaration of a disaster should be made only by the secretary of agriculture, the governor, or the president on the advice of appropriate local officials.

Disaster Payments

Disaster programs should take into account present losses, the ability to produce the same or similar crops and ongoing losses when determining levels of disaster payments.

Crop losses due to governmental restrictions or pest infestations, should be included for disaster payments.

Disaster Programs

We support disaster assistance for catastrophic natural disasters that:

(1) Provides assistance for quantity and quality losses;

(2) Covers all affected segments of agriculture;

(3) Does not exclude declared types of natural disasters; and

(4) Provides timely delivery of assistance.

Disaster Declarations

We support disaster declarations to combat conditions that pose severe wildfire threat.

We support treating catastrophic wildfire as a natural disaster. (Rev. 2017)

No. 133
Warning Labels

We oppose warning labels on agricultural commodities and products until such time that studies can conclusively prove that the public is better informed by warning labels than by public education. (1988)

No. 134
Food Safety

The American food supply is among the safest in the world. We will monitor initiatives to improve and streamline food safety to ensure that policies and procedures are in place that build trust and reliability in U.S. agriculture.

Ensuring a safe, secure food supply is a critical concern when establishing domestic and international policy. We should continue to communicate accurate, timely information on food safety issues to the mainstream media and the general public. Our goal is to improve awareness and understanding of agriculture's commitment to providing a safe, high-quality food supply at a reasonable price to the public.

Food safety practices should help prevent microbial contamination of fresh produce. The practices must:

(1) Be based on science and risk;

(2) Provide flexibility to accommodate the great diversity of the fresh produce industry including those in geographically challenged areas;

(3) Be practical, reasonable, and economically feasible to implement;

(4) Take the form of voluntary guidelines rather than federal or state mandates;

(5) Be consistent with existing state and federal regulations, encourage harmonization of food safety standards, and minimize conflicts, overlap, and paperwork;

(6) Ensure auditing programs and standards such as Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP), and Good Handling Practices (GHP) are crop and operation specific;

(7) Be implemented in a manner that will not impair our ability to export produce;

(8) Provide adequate resources to carry out a standardized education program for the industry and consumers;

(9) Be tailored to the size, type, and capacity of the operation; and

(10) Include a provision that only covered agricultural products should count toward its gross sales threshold, when an operation is subject to the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA).

Any requirements that we seek in our other policies which pertain to foods created through synthetic food production should not be narrowed in scope, lessened, or negated due to any part of this food safety policy.

Any agency with food safety authority should coordinate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in the development and administration of food safety policies or the enforcement thereof. No food safety agency should have on-farm, on-premises, or on-vehicle food safety authorities for farms, food facilities, or persons transporting food unless a food safety-related cause is indicated by science.

No food safety agency should release business names to the public during or after an investigation, until a thorough investigation of the producer, harvester, shipper, or marketer has been conducted, and the entity to be named publicly has been informed such a publication is to be made. Entities who cannot sell goods into the public marketplace should never be named publicly unless it can be proven that they adulterated the food or product through negligence.

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

Recordkeeping requirements must be accompanied by assurance that information accessed by Federal or state agencies in regard to food safety protocols will remain confidential. Records provided to agencies should be protected from third-party access.

Following the initial publication of a proposed rule on food safety regulations, a food safety agency should allow a second public comment to allow stakeholder review of any revisions before the final rule is promulgated.

We encourage research and development of expedient and efficient processes to trace food contamination outbreaks. Food origin traceability should extend no further than the production level for which traceability is economically feasible and non-intrusive.

Producers of legal agricultural products who follow generally acceptable standards (such as voluntary guidelines) and have not intentionally adulterated a food should neither be held responsible or liable for health problems claimed to occur from the product's consumption or use nor be subject to adulteration prosecution. Producers of legal agricultural products should not be held responsible or liable for long-term health problems claimed to occur from the products' consumption or use.

Those making public health decisions that result in product recalls, product seizures, or destruction of perishable goods must be held accountable when such decisions prove erroneous or are unwarranted. Such entities must be required to compensate or indemnify individuals and companies for the full financial losses (including the market value of monetary losses, damages, legal fees, and out-of-pocket expenditures) that occur.

Federal law should include an indemnification program that is instituted to fully compensate farmers when the government issues an erroneous or unwarranted response action to an alleged food safety deficiency (such as by means of a warning or recall) that causes market losses. Funding for compensation or indemnification of public health decisions made by the government should be drawn from the responsible state or federal agency, or both.

Funding to assist in the implementation of food safety regulations should come from those mandating the regulations. States and local governments should not have to share in the financial burden of enforcing federal food safety regulations.

All food safety auditors must comply with the same rules. Training for all auditors should be consistent and uniform for both private and public auditors.

Certification program requirements should be reviewed by industry and science groups.

We support:

(1) The use of modern technology in the processing and the handling of food to assure food safety and to promote consumer confidence in the food supply;

(2) Protection of our food supply by requiring that imported food products be subjected to the same safety standards and testing as food products produced in the U.S.;

(3) Additional research on food safety technology;

(4) Voluntary quality assurance programs at the producer level;

(5) Designation of USDA as the lead agency in the development and administration of food safety guidelines and to serve as the sole federal agency responsible for food inspection and safety. Until then, USDA and FDA should work more collaboratively with FSMA guidelines to benefit producers;

(6) All government agencies following site-specific food safety and security protocols upon authorized entry and inspections of farm operations;

(7) The burden of proof to be on the complainant to prove negligence on an operation in compliance with applicable food safety regulations; and

(8) Inspectors for food safety and security programs being required to present valid identification and upon departure leave notification of who was present.

We oppose:

(1) Actions by agencies to raise the priority of and resources devoted to food safety that cause undue burden to domestic farmers and ranchers;

(2) Food safety regulation and legislation that assesses fees or fines to domestic farmers unless these fees are in the form of industry assessments under a marketing agreement or order; and

(3) The establishment of mandates compelling domestic farms to hire a third party to comply with federal or state food safety laws. (19/Rev. 2020)

No. 135
Food Quality

The American food supply is the safest, most abundant, and most affordable in the world. Agricultural chemicals and other technological advances play a major role in maintaining both the quality and quantity of our food supply.

We support:

(1) The consideration of both the risks and the benefits of pesticides in the evaluation of chemical products;

(2) The establishment and promotion of sound scientific research criteria which ensure the safety of food additives;

(3) Legislative and regulatory decisions concerning food irradiation (cold pasteurization) based on valid research;

(4) Utilization of USDA approved technologies, such as cold pasteurization and high-pressure processing to eliminate E. coli and other pathogens from our food supply;

(5) More research should be conducted by agricultural colleges into inspection methods to eliminate the risk of pathogens in food;

(6) Funding appropriate inspection services at a level permitting effective inspection of imported and domestic food products in such a way that is least burdensome to the producer;

(7) Legislation to require the FDA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to prepare, in advance of final rulemaking, agricultural cost/benefit statements on proposed regulations having a significant impact on agricultural producers;

(8) Cooperative efforts with food processors, chemical companies, government agencies, scientists and others who are responsible for the food supply of our nation to provide factual information on the safety of our food supply so that it neither divulges farming trade secrets nor aids in furnishing sensitive financial or annual production information to third parties in such a way that would facilitate opportunities for price discrimination or price fixing to the producer;

(9) Open communication with willing consumer groups;

(10) Measures to improve and streamline food inspection by having USDA serve as the sole federal agency responsible for food inspection and safety;

(11) Provisions to allow the transport and storage of fresh eggs based on current USDA standards of 45 degrees Fahrenheit or less, but oppose the mandatory pasteurization of fresh eggs;

(12) State efforts to ensure the quality and integrity of unpasteurized fruit juices. We oppose FDA regulation of these products;

(13) Promoting science-based, voluntary commodity quality assurance products;

(14) USDA and FDA removing E. coli as an adulterant; and

(15) The FDA to allow the extra-label use of cephalosporin antimicrobial drugs in animals when warranted.

We believe that equivalent and consistent standards should be set for beef, pork and poultry for school lunch programs.

We encourage the education of all food handlers on the proper preparation, cooking and serving of all food products and on sanitary practices as part of state licensing procedures. (Rev. 2020)

No. 136
Industrial Hemp

With the further development of state and federal regulations related to industrial hemp, it is important that Farm Bureau engage in this issue to protect agriculture as a whole.

Recognizing industrial hemp is an agricultural crop under state and federal law, we may advocate on issues related to the production, processing and sale of industrial hemp and the effect on other agricultural crops or producers.

As there is extreme variation from county to county in how industrial hemp is regulated, county Farm Bureaus shall retain local discretion

to address the development of policies regarding industrial hemp.

We encourage:

(1) CFBF staff to engage in process related to industrial hemp in a manner consistent with the principles of CFBF policies; and

(2) Parity be achieved between State and federal laws and regulations regarding industrial hemp. (19/Rev 2020)

Marketing and Bargaining

No. 201
Marketing Orders and Commissions

Marketing orders and commissions can be successful self-help tools for California producers. We recognize the right of producers to promote increased research, sales and consumption of the commodities they produce. We further recognize the right to assess both domestically produced and imported product for market promotion purposes.

Marketing orders and commissions should:

(1) Be market oriented;

(2) Adhere to competitive principles;

(3) Utilize the least amount of government regulation to assure uniform compliance; and

(4) Be implemented on a timely basis once approved by grower referendum.

We support producer control over checkoff programs. A referendum shall be held as provided for in each commodity program, but at intervals not to exceed ten years or upon petition of 10 percent of qualified producers.

In marketing order and commission referendum, the members of a nonprofit agricultural cooperative marketing association should be informed of the intended position of the cooperative before a bloc vote is exercised. Boards of directors of agricultural cooperatives should be allowed to vote for their members regarding marketing order and/or commission issues, provided each member is given the right to cast his or her own ballot in any referendum.

Financial disclosure should not be required of commission and marketing board members.

Federal Programs

Basic concepts and provisions of the Federal Marketing Act should conform with the California Marketing Act of 1937.

State Programs

We oppose any interpretation of the California Marketing Act of 1937 which recognizes the propriety of volume control programs which (1) utilize "historical bases" for assigning growers the volume of a commodity they can plant or market; (2) lead to programs of "assigned marketing rights"; and/or (3) exempt commercial production quantities from the regulations of the volume control program. Special self-help programs developed outside the California Marketing Act of 1937, such as commissions, should conform with the general organization and approval standards of the act. These programs should provide for audits which shall be made a part of an annual report to producers under the program, be paid for and controlled by those served, and provide for periodic review through referenda.

Any assessments levied for the functions of a marketing order, commission, or council should not be commingled with state general funds and used for purposes other than the uses authorized by the program participants. (Rev. 2004)

No. 202
Producer-Financed Programs

Even though current law allows the state to transfer funds temporarily from the Food and Agriculture Fund to the General Fund, the function of all programs operating under this special fund should never be impeded by such a loan. Prior to any transfer of funds, a repayment date should be specified. Interest earned from the Food and Agriculture Fund should not be utilized for General Fund purposes unless it is paid back with interest. No industry funded program should be required to undergo an evaluation or budget deduction for efficiency purposes enforced by the state government. (1993)

No. 203
Brand Advertising

The California and Federal Marketing Acts of 1937 should be amended to authorize an allowance to a handler of credit for advertising or promotion of a private brand or trade name for any agricultural commodity.

The acts should also be amended to allow for advertising dollars collected under an order regulating producers and/or handlers to be spent on brand advertising on a matching fund basis with handlers and processors.

These enabling provisions should be implemented by those affected. Full opportunity should be given to allow approval or disapproval, and the results should truly reflect the wishes of the producers or handlers affected by an order. Such advertising or promotion should be in accord with a plan adopted by the advisory board administering the marketing order. Safeguards should be provided to assure that generic advertising and promotion programs are not degraded.

No. 204
Producer's Rights

In the changing marketing patterns of many California-grown commodities, it is imperative that individual producers be guaranteed the right to develop and select specific marketing programs designed to meet the specific needs of their individual commodities. One of the basic objectives of Farm Bureau is to serve as a vehicle for organized action by individual farmers. In this most important role, it is incumbent upon Farm Bureau to provide sufficient factual information to enable farmers to make intelligent decisions on issues concerning their farming operations.

Producers have the right to propose enabling legislation modifying the provisions of both state and federal marketing acts.

Farm producers should have a means of recourse when buyers reject delivery, or alter terms of sale, claiming the product fails to meet agreed-to specifications. A system should be established allowing USDA to reinspect the product at the point of delivery to settle differences. (Rev. 2010)

No. 205
Producer's Liens

Processors should be prohibited from attaching addenda to contracts which waive the producer's lien against case goods held by the processor.

The producer's lien law should be amended to assure that the lien survives in bankruptcy proceedings and producers are treated as secured creditors. To meet this objective, a central filing system should be established so the lien is on record to provide notice to bona fide purchasers.

Market Enforcement

The Farm Product Trust Fund within the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Market Enforcement Branch (MEB) should be abolished. The trust fund fees should be redirected to the MEB to increase the enforcement and investigation abilities. Fines should be developed for disobeying market enforcement law that can be enforced swiftly and effectively. Fees shall be charged to licensees and producers for use of additional MEB services beyond initial renewal licensing. (Rev. 1997)

No. 206
Cooperatives

We support the principles of cooperatives enabling farmers to join together in agricultural cooperatives in order to compete fairly and effectively in the market place. (Rev. 2009)

No. 207
International Trade

We believe that trade must be based on principles of fairness. We believe all international trade agreements should be equitable and work to open new markets and expand current markets for U.S. agricultural products.

We support regulatory parity, monetary integrity and monetary stability as essential components for fair trade.

Domestic and imported products shall be produced under substantially similar standards. U.S. producers endure strict environmental and labor standards that create an unlevel playing field. We believe these inequities must be weighed when additional trade preferences to foreign countries are considered.

As a matter of U.S. national security, our government should give priority to food safety and security protection. The U.S. government must be cognizant of policy and/or actions that weaken U.S. agriculture's viability and sustainability to provide for an adequate food, fiber and timber supply.

Tariffs

U.S. should not further reduce agriculture tariff levels until importing countries lower tariffs to align with the United States. At such time, future tariff reductions should only be done in concert with the nation interested in lowering such tariffs.

Import sensitive commodities should receive a longer phase-out period for tariffs.

Trade agreements should include deadlines for countries to comply with tariff reductions. If deadlines are not met or other barriers are raised, U.S. tariffs should be adjusted to harmonize with the non-complying country's tariffs.

We urge a significant allocation of existing tariffs imposed on imported seafood and fishery products to be used for promotion and research benefitting U.S. farm-raised aquaculture.

Agricultural Imports

All imported agricultural products should be inspected at point of entry. They should also be subject to the same inspection, sanitary, and phytosanitary quality, labeling, and residue standards of domestic products. To better protect against the risk of pest and/or disease introduction from imports, we support an increase in funds for inspection services and facilities.

Investigation/Dispute Resolution

We support an expedited dispute settlement process that gives special consideration for perishable commodities. Producers of specialty and perishable commodities who can show prima facie evidence of injury should be provided financial assistance for legal and research expenses.

The U.S. must diligently pursue and enforce dispute resolution laws and decisions that address unfair practices by competing nations.

Sanctions

The U.S. government should not include U.S. agricultural products.

Agricultural Trade Negotiations

We support the inclusion of all agricultural products and policies during negotiations.

All impacted producers should be compensated for any losses resulting from sanctions and/or tariffs.

Trade agreements should not provide financial compensation to foreign producers in lieu of market access.

Congress and U.S. trade negotiators should increase efforts to eliminate false technical trade barriers, export subsidies, imbalanced domestic subsidies and the unregulated dumping of agricultural products. We urge special consideration be given to issues impacting import sensitive products.

Our government should insist upon strict implementation and enforcement of trade agreements. We encourage Congress to continually evaluate trade agreements analyzing impacts to agriculture with an emphasis on fair trade.

Agricultural products should not be allowed into the U.S. as a trade-off for military and political reasons or as a trade-off for manufactured or nonagricultural products to the detriment of American farmers and farm products.

Farm Bureau supports a permanent U.S. deputy ambassador for agriculture within the U.S. trade representative's office.

Intellectual and Proprietary Technology

In this free and fiercely competitive global market, U.S. government entities should be cognizant of the potentially negative implication of sharing intellectual property and research information with global trading partners that could result in amplified foreign competition to the financial disadvantage of American agriculture.

U.S. government entities, including the university system should use extreme caution if asked to share any research and technology developed for the advancement of American agriculture. Foreign countries should be encouraged to participate in funding of research projects on new technology and intellectual property.

Governments must work cooperatively and vigorously to ensure enforcement of intellectual property laws and protection of trademark rights. The U.S. government should aggressively defend U.S. brand products in foreign markets when trademarks or intellectual property laws are violated.

Foreign Aid

Foreign aid programs should not require donor nations to assist on a "cash only" basis. Participating nations should be permitted to make all or part of their contributions as commodities and/or other commitments. (00/Rev. 2020)

No. 208
Concentration in Food Processing, Distribution, Marketing and Retail Industries

Concentration among food processors, distributors, marketers and retailers works to the disadvantage of agricultural producers and growers. Anti-trust legislation and the Packers and Stockyards Act should be strictly enforced to ensure fair prices for agricultural products in state, national, and international markets.

We support legislation to:

(1) Create an agricultural unit within the U.S. Department of Justice to address concentration in the agricultural industry;

(2) Provide additional funding and guidance to ensure adequate enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act;

(3) Reduce the obstacles and develop programs to encourage vertical integration by producers;

(4) Prohibit the use of slotting fees;

(5) Overturn the Illinois Brick case ruling to allow farmers indirectly impacted by unfair marketing practices to be compensated for monopolistic practices; and

(6) Prohibit packer ownership of livestock for more than 7 to 14 days prior to harvest except for cooperatives or packers who process less than five percent of the total U.S. production for that commodity. In implementing this program, USDA should provide sufficient time to phase in these new requirements. (96/Rev. 2016)

No. 209
Federally Inspected Meat Processing Facilities

To encourage diversity of harvest and packing facilities, we support and encourage:

(1) Streamlining the permitting process for harvest and packing facilities;
(2) Livestock producers to utilize local harvest and packing facilities;
(3) Legislation that provides economic and regulatory relief to harvest and packing facilities;
(4) Further development and construction of harvest and packing facilities;
(5) Consistent and reliable availability of USDA inspectors for existing and new harvest and packing facilities; and
(6) Research that adds value and marketability of local harvest and packing facility products.

We encourage a cooperative approach to producer-packer relationships in order to ensure the viability of livestock producers. (Rev. 2016)

No. 210
Contract Marketing

The marketing of California agricultural products in advance of production through the use of marketing contracts or hedging should be encouraged.

No. 211
Direct Marketing

We support the concept of direct marketing, a process in which a producer sells directly to the consumer.

Producers should be the primary sponsors and promoters of direct marketing programs. Government should serve as a catalyst in developing direct marketing.

Outdoor Advertising

Local, state and federal governments should work with producers in allowing placement of signs on county, state and federal highways to facilitate the direct marketing of farm commodities. (Rev. 1986)

Predator, Pest and Pesticide

No. 251
Pesticide Management

Pesticides are important agricultural production tools. They are necessary for the production and delivery of a reliable, high-quality supply of safe, nourishing, and affordably priced food and agricultural commodities. Efforts directed toward eliminating or unreasonably restricting their use must be vigorously opposed.

The following philosophies should be recognized by future legislative and administrative action:

(1) Present restrictions, the seemingly endless paperwork required for pesticide applications and reduced farm profits are a burden and are a discouragement to producers. Current restrictions provide more than adequate protection;

(2) Pesticide regulations regarding on-farm and forestry usage should be promulgated by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and enforced only through the county agricultural commissioner;

(3) While we recognize the state's responsibility to ensure the health and safety of its citizens, we urge the state to accept federal registration of pesticides. Any failure to accept an EPA registration of a pesticide must be based on verified evidence that its use is unsafe. California agriculture must be permitted to compete on an even basis with other agricultural state or country producers for all markets;

(4) Restrictions deemed necessary by California to ensure a safe food supply for consumers must be met by every agricultural commodity brought into this state;

(5) The timeliness of pesticide use is critical to the production and protection of agricultural commodities. Delays in pesticide applications may result in drastic losses and additional costs, to both producers and consumers and increased pesticide usage;

(6) While the public welfare is the primary consideration, reasonable and practical environmental review is prudent and appropriate. Individual pesticide applications must usually be made on short notice, which makes impractical anything in excess of the present 24-hour notice-of-intent period—even in sensitive areas;

(7) We support reducing pesticide risks and dangers where they actually exist. Our technological ability to detect a minute amount of a chemical sometimes exceeds our ability to determine the risk. Public policy should be based on the risk presented, not the fact some amount was detected. Posting warning of pesticide danger should be required only while the danger exists;

(8) With respect to statewide notification of pesticide use, it should be done so in a manner that provides anonymity of the use and location applied, contain only necessary and appurtenant information for the public supported by risk-based determinations, and not prove disruptive to daily farm management. Direct notification to the public shall not be the responsibility of the user, nor shall any liability be incurred by, or penalties be issued to, users for failure to notify. We support legislation that would provide for enhanced criminal and civil liability, including punitive damages for trespassers who interfere with lawful pesticide application. Not only should the individual trespasser be held liable, but all groups and other individuals that organized the interference should also be held liable. We support tracking and identification of users accessing statewide notification systems, so that those using it for improper purposes can be held liable;

(9) Appropriate penalties should be promptly and consistently applied when pesticides are misused so as to cause public or environmental injury or unsafe levels of pesticide residue in harvested crops. There should also be appropriate penalties levied against anyone making unjustified claims as to the injurious effect of any substance used in agriculture;

(10) The procedure for pre-marketing clearances of new products should be expedited when public health/safety are not jeopardized;

(11) We urge that chemicals cleared for specialty crop application be additionally registered, with agreement of the manufacturer, for like applications on similar crops. Likewise, with agreement of the manufacturer, chemicals registered for application on edible foods be additionally registered for like applications on the same crop when grown for non-food uses and other non-food crops;

(12) Availability of minor crop use pesticide programs should be ensured through the use of expanded Interregional Research Project #4 (IR-4) activities, tax credits to registrants who maintain these uses and reduced third-party registration liability;

(13) Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and users of chemicals approved for commercial sale and use should be allowed reasonable time to sell or utilize their inventories when approval of a chemical is withdrawn. If reasonable time is not granted, they should be compensated for losses incurred as a result of lost value in crops, and/or food and crop inventories, or unusable or unsalable chemical inventories;

(14) Pesticide containers must be standardized for use in closed mixing systems;

(15) We encourage development and use of reusable and recyclable containers for pesticide handling;

(16) Research on integrated pest management (IPM) with emphasis on crop quality and lower unit production costs, as opposed to simply keeping insect populations down, should be supported. Useful information gained should be promptly disseminated to those who may be able to use it. Research should be supported by public funds when private support is impractical. An increased level of research is needed to develop the more sophisticated techniques and materials;

(17) There should be no retroactive liability for property owners, farmers, or their agents for chemical applications made in accordance with laws in effect at the time of application; and

(18) We support the research, development, and registration of multiple products and remedies for pest eradication and management for all commodities. (Rev. 2023)

No. 252
California Pesticide Program

(1) When considering the economic impacts for review of a Section 18, the Department of Pesticide Regulation should consider economics on a regional basis instead of on a statewide basis.

(2) The Department of Pesticide Regulation should continue to streamline the Section 18 process when utilizing federal residue tolerance levels.

(3) When registering new products in California, the Department of Pesticide Regulation should consider residue testing data from other states in its review process.

(4) Budgetary increases for the Department of Pesticide Regulation should not be contemplated unless supported by workflow analysis data and consultation with the agricultural community, including but not limited to farmers, ranchers, applicators, licensees, registrants, and dealers. (02/Rev. 2022)

No. 253
Pesticide Mill Assessment

A fair and uniform pesticide mill assessment should ensure a viable and efficient regulatory program that falls within the scope of the Department of Pesticide Regulation's statutes and regulations. Such a program should ensure that new crop protection tools are made available to California growers as soon as approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The pesticide mill assessment rate should not prohibit growers' access to or serve to eliminate availability of existing products, or disincentivize the introduction of new products into California. The program should also have the goal of reducing costs of state regulation, including the elimination of redundant registration requirements and enforcement articles. Revenues from the pesticide mill assessment should be prioritized for county agricultural commissioners.

We support the Department of Pesticide Regulation's ongoing review and reporting of its activities. (09/Rev. 2022)

No. 254
Food Quality Protection Act

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

(1) Ample time for data collection, including use pattern, application rates, and other relevant exposure information;

(2) Allow for minor crop uses;

(3) Top priority for streamlining the Section 18 registration process so products are quickly and readily available for emergency use;

(4) Incentives for registrants to register new products and reduced-risk products for minor crop food and non-food uses;

(5) The grower community must be consulted prior to the cancellation of chemicals used in agriculture. We are opposed to the cancellation of chemicals until economical and effective alternatives are available; and

(6) Actual use data should be used for re-registration in areas that have agricultural use reporting. Realistic use estimates should be employed where actual use data are unavailable.

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

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.

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 IPM programs when deciding to re-register a product for agricultural use.

Registration of additional materials to control a pest should not be denied on the basis that another chemical is already registered for that purpose.

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

Implementation of chemical regulations must rely on accurate and adequate scientific data which precisely quantify both the risk exposure levels and the benefits of agricultural products. New regulations must not be implemented until all available scientific information and use data are collected and evaluated. Any statutory deadlines deemed unreasonable must be changed.

We support legislative solutions to ensure availability of minor crop use pesticides. These solutions shall include, but not be limited to, expanded IR-4 activities, tax credits to registrants who maintain these uses, and reduced third party registration liability. (Rev. 2001)

No. 255
Disposal of Toxic Chemicals

We support the development of a program to pool small quantities of abandoned or unusable agricultural chemicals in order to achieve safe, economical disposal of these chemicals. (1990)

No. 256
Chemical Use

We believe in developing laws and regulations concerning chemical use, emphasis should be placed on:

(1) Encouraging the development and use of products for effective and economic pest control strategies;

(2) Development and use of chemical pest control strategies and cropping systems that minimize the use of pesticides and the buildup of pest resistance;

(3) Finding the relationship between the effects of chemicals on animals, bees, and their effects on humans;

(4) Ensuring that only safe methods are used in chemical manufacture, transportation, handling, use and waste disposal;

(5) Ensuring that the use of treated seeds be based upon the best available peer-reviewed science;

(6) Coordination between the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) to establish tolerance levels for all pesticides to eliminate data gaps;

(7) Continuing the education of pest control advisors and applicators in the safe and effective use of pesticides;

(8) Educating the public about the benefits of using chemicals in the production, delivery and preservation of foods, and the measures employed to insure workers and public safety;

(9) Encouraging substantial penalties and prompt enforcement for violation of safe use of chemicals;

(10) Requiring all commercial applicators of pesticides, including lawn care and landscape professionals and all public agencies to report all pesticide use to the proper agency; and

(11) Encouraging timely review of registration applications by EPA and DPR, including under EPA's Conventional Reduced Risk Pesticide Program.

We urge that chemicals registered for application on edible food crops be additionally registered, with agreement of the manufacturer, for like applications on that same crop when grown for non-food uses and on other non-food crops.

The general public should be subject to the same restrictions and requirements to which agriculture is subject. Agriculture should be able to use the products that agencies are allowed to use. Agencies should

be subject to the notification requirements that apply to agriculture.

We encourage regulatory agencies to consider availability of economically effective and alternative crop protection tools prior to an agency making a delisting decision or prohibiting usage of any particular pesticide. (86/Rev. 2018)

No. 257
Chemical Contaminants

Landowners, producers or their lenders shall not be held liable for the cost of chemical contaminant, such as perchlorate and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), cleanups caused by actions over which the producer, landowner or lender had no management oversight or control of decision-making.

We support:

(1) Funding for research into the health risks and strategies for mitigating risks associated with chemical contaminants in water and food; and

(2) Using the best available science and appropriate risk assessment for the establishment of health goals or regulatory standards and recommend that the science and risk assessment used are sound and current.

We oppose any legislation or administrative decision that releases federal, state and local governments (i.e., the Department of Defense) and their contractors and subcontractors from liability associated with pollution of water, land, livestock, crops or products by such chemical contaminants (2020).

No. 258
Laboratory Accreditation

Laboratories that independently test agricultural products for pesticide residues should be accredited by the California Department of Food and Agriculture to assure uniform testing procedures. (Rev. 2009)

No. 259
Bee Protection

We believe that as pesticide regulations are developed, they should minimize pesticide hazards to all castes of bees and their developmental stages, while still providing for the necessary application of pesticides.

We support the development and implementation of best management practices to protect the health and pollination activities of bees.

The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), in cooperation with county agricultural commissioners, should continue to maintain a statewide bee disease inspection program.

Exotic bee pests should remain part of CDFA's exotic pest detection efforts and be classified on pest detection lists with permanent detection status.

We recommend development of specific domestic (state and federal) quarantine protocols, for all life stages of the honey bee, to ensure the protection of U.S. honey bees from diseases, pests, and parasites that could be introduced into the country accompanying importation of foreign stocks. (Rev. 2016)

No. 260
Karnal Bunt

Karnal Bunt (KB) is a fungal disease which is known to infect wheat, triticale and durum wheat. It propagates and spreads by means of producing innumerable numbers of microscopic spores. The spores can easily be transported on air currents, in water or soil, or on any commodity, equipment, animal, bird or other object.

It is very difficult, if not virtually impossible, to sterilize any but the simplest of facilities or implements. It is absolutely impossible to prevent the entry of spores into a field, area or region. It is also impossible to determine that a lot of seed is completely free of KB spores.

KB is already known to exist in Mexico and some parts of the United States. Normal weather and other natural activities make certain that spores are being spread to other parts of the U.S.

The scientific community, including the American Phytopathological Society, contends that it is unlikely that the disease could be eradicated from the U.S. Even if it were successfully eradicated, it could hardly be prevented from re-entering by natural means. Fortunately, KB is no more of an agronomic problem than other grain diseases and poses no threat to human or animal health. It is also possible to minimize KB damage by the use of cultural practices, resistant varieties, seed treatments and pesticides.

In the interest of maintaining U.S. grain export markets, and of fairness to all domestic wheat producers, it is imperative that USDA and the wheat industry cooperate in an all-out effort to gain acceptance for designating KB as an ordinary plant pest/disease. The present zero tolerance on KB spores must be replaced with tolerances based on sound science and appropriate to each segment of the industry, for KB in wheat, wheat products and other commodities.

Wheat growing areas should not be subject to quarantine-like designations. Regulations on the movement and use of grain should not be based on its area of origin, but only on the condition of the grain. The condition of the grain should be determined with standardized tests, applied uniformly in all parts of the U.S.

A fair compensation program should be used to compensate the producers, seedsmen, handlers, and others in the wheat industry for the losses they have sustained as a result of official restrictions placed on their ability to market, move, handle and use their wheat, wheat products and property because of the discovery of KB in U.S. wheat. (1997)

No. 261
Weed Free Forage and Mulch

The Noxious Weed Free Forage and Mulch Program under development by state and federal agencies should address:

(1) Reasonable and flexible certification requirements. Guidelines regarding certification requests, inspections and field removal of forage must be compatible with the pace of forage production, marketing and the limited resources of county agricultural commissioners. The program must maintain flexibility to work in special situations such as drought, fire and other unique cases (i.e., Point Reyes National Seashore);

(2) A shared responsibility in weed management. Agriculturists, all government agencies, land holders, managers, railroads, public utilities and the public must all address various means of weed control for the program to be an integrated approach;

(3) Inspection and certification costs. Producers should not have to bear burdensome fees;

(4) Preferred method of identification should be a reproducible paper certificate. The certificate should contain, at a minimum, material description, county of origin, grower information and broker information;

(5) Increase awareness of weed spread. Education and outreach efforts should be directed at agriculturists, government agencies, and the public; and

(6) A means of evaluating the success or failure of the program every three years.

No. 262
Predator and Pest Programs

Predator Control

We support the use of traps, aircraft and other means to protect livestock and crops from loss and damage. We oppose all further restrictions in animal damage control.

Any pest or predator eradication effort must be founded upon a sound technical basis.

Livestock Predator Control

We support the continuation of the cooperative predatory animal control programs with USDA as the lead agency.

We support legislation to:

(1) Maintain the authority of animal damage control in the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) under the Division of Animal Health and Food Safety Services;

(2) Authorize local agricultural interests to develop appropriate funding so agricultural interests can fund animal damage control;

(3) Authorize the formation of local and state committees for the expenditure of funds and development of policy;

(4) Allow interested parties such as Agricultural Commissioners, state and local health authorities, wildlife managers, federal agencies and other agencies to work cooperatively to strengthen the California Cooperative Animal Damage Control Program; and

(5) Include a sunset clause.

We support retaining cooperative federal-state funding of these programs. These programs are essential for public health protection, to protect the interests of agriculture and to assure that the balance of nature among much of our wildlife is not disrupted.

We support efforts to reinstate state funding for these programs. In addition, we support an increase in the federal funding of the USDA Wildlife Service program.

Continued research on predator control and suppression is essential. We urge that federal funding be provided for research on a method, such as radio telemetry, to make frequent checks on traps set for predators. We support research to identify the most effective predator suppression techniques.

Whenever a predator is relocated it should be permanently tagged, branded or otherwise identified, and as prescribed by law for game management or depredation purposes, the distance which the animal is relocated should be sufficient to prevent recurring damage. When a second problem occurs with a particular predator it should be dispatched.

The necessity for and methods of predator animal control cannot be judged for each area by using the average conditions over the whole state. Local determination must be made for each area, based on conditions existing in that area.

Predators listed under the federal and state Endangered Species Acts should be managed by the wildlife agencies to prevent impacts to agriculture, and if necessary, compensation should be considered. Farmers and ranchers should have non-lethal options to deter listed species from harming or harassing their livestock.

Mountain Lions and Wolves

USDA Wildlife Services and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife personnel should be allowed to issue a depredation permit to take a mountain lion or wolf after verifying a confirmed kill or where otherwise appropriate.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife in cooperation with landowners should prepare and publish a count of mountain lions and wolves and their kills and manage the population with the objective of ensuring human health and safety and minimizing losses to livestock operators.

Feral and Wild Hogs

We believe a farmer or rancher must be allowed to control crop or rangeland damage or disruption of his operation caused by a feral or wild hog without obtaining a depredation permit from any government agency.

Crop Pest and Disease Control and Eradication

We urge the CDFA to retain the primary responsibility for all agricultural pest and disease programs.

We strongly support programs, including severe penalties and improved detection methods, to prevent the illegal entry and establishment of agricultural pests into California. When a new pest that can cause damage to agricultural crops is discovered in the state, the pest should be eradicated. Eradication should be undertaken as swiftly as possible. Exclusion and eradication programs should also include a public information component.

Adequate funding should be provided for the National Plant Diagnostic Network to allow for continued high-quality and coordinated expert diagnostic services to growers and plant protection officials in the event of an introduction to the U.S. of an invasive or emerging plant pest, disease, or weed.

Pest and disease exclusion is an integral part of our total pest and disease control programs. Effective agricultural inspection stations which protect the entire state are essential to the success of the program. In order to meet the growing demands for maintaining a healthful and safe food supply and pest-free ornamentals, we urge the CDFA and USDA to enhance border inspections using best available technology and effectively trained personnel. This enhancement should include inspecting passenger as well as commercial vehicles.

We support the establishment of a program to compensate producers and states at a fair, local market value for costs incurred by them to quarantine, destroy, or otherwise dispose of plants, plant material or animals when such actions are subsequent to the discovery of a quarantine pest, or disease, when such a pest, or disease, was discovered after the producer had fulfilled the requirements of a pest, or disease, mitigation or prevention protocol that was established by the USDA or other federal authority.

Commodity quarantine treatment methods should be reviewed and researched to minimize crop damage.

Government initiated pest eradication programs should be paid for from general revenue funds. Efforts should be coordinated at all levels in order to minimize the costs of eradication programs.

USDA should have the primary responsibility for issuing depredation permits when necessary, to control migratory birds.

Effective methods to control crop depredation by birds and other vertebrate pests should be developed and encouraged to conserve our energy and food supplies.

Crop Health

Strong, cooperative efforts are needed to protect California's agricultural industry from potentially devastating pests and diseases. The state of California, through the CDFA should devote adequate funds to support programs and efforts to fight against invasive species and diseases that may impact agricultural commodities currently and in the future.

Indemnification

We support the indemnification of crop losses when it can be documented that the quarantine requirements or treatment methods are the basis for the loss. Whoever willfully uses material in violation of printed safety rules for that material, and the wrongful use results in crop quarantine, should be held initially responsible for indemnification of innocent victims of the quarantine.

Any person or agency willfully responsible for the dissemination of false information regarding the nature or extent of chemical contamination should be responsible for resulting damage. (Rev. 2016)

No. 263
Strengthening State and National Exclusion Programs

Funding should be provided for the operation of all state and national border inspection stations on a 24-hour and seven-days-a-week basis.

Pest and disease detection and inspection activities at U.S. points of entry should be removed from the Department of Homeland Security and returned to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).

We support the removal of spending limitations caused by the present APHIS appropriations act. This will enable APHIS to conduct the strongest possible exclusion program at our national

borders, airports and seaports. In addition, we urge the U.S. Postal Service to increase its cooperation with APHIS by conducting increased First-Class Mail inspections at high-risk entry points.

We urge that Congress and APHIS work to increase penalties against casual and commercial smuggling of agricultural products. Fines should be kept within the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) system to be used for strengthening the program.

It should be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to send via mail or package delivery service any package containing seed, plant, or plant products without plainly marking the package with the following information:

(1) Contains seed or plant material;

(2) May be opened for agricultural inspection;

(3) Shipper's telephone number; and

(4) Receiver's telephone number.

Penalties for private and commercial smuggling of agricultural products should be severe enough to prevent smuggling. Failure to properly mark packages containing seeds, plants, or plant material should be subject to a fine of not less than $1,000.

Any exclusion program should include a public education component.

We encourage the USDA to monitor state programs to ensure that each state applies sound science to any protocol deviation from USDA standards. (Rev. 2017)

No. 264
Rodenticides

We support the continued registration of compounds that are critical tools necessary to control rodents that threaten agriculture and the public health.

We also support the use of public funds to conduct the studies and provide the data required by the EPA. If private funds are needed, we support an equitable industry-wide assessment. (Rev. 2000)

No. 265
Game Management

We urge coordinated management and control of migratory waterfowl and wild game by state and federal authorities toward the prevention of excessive game depredation to agricultural crops and toward a harvest of wildlife, commensurate with seasonal numbers, availability of food and capacity of refuge areas.

We support the CALTIP program of the Department of Fish and Wildlife as a means to encourage the public to alert the Department of Fish and Wildlife on illegal hunting and fishing activities by calling an 800 number.

Game management properties, either state or federal, should be fully developed and utilized before additional privately owned land is acquired for such purposes. The need for such acquisition should be fully demonstrated and acquisitions should be limited to land best adapted to the purpose.

Waterfowl

To provide maximum protection to agriculture from crop damage by migratory waterfowl, as well as an optimum harvest of birds, we urge the determination of a maximum number of birds to be maintained, and a zoning plan for the waterfowl flyway in California that would provide hunting seasons based on a realistic recognition of the harvest of agricultural crops in the state and the traditional migration of the waterfowl.

Supplementary feeding of waterfowl by or as authorized by the appropriate state or federal agency should be permitted to prevent crop damage whenever unusual crop or harvesting or other conditions warrant.

Deer and Elk Management

In deer and elk management, we urge approval of any necessary legislation and the adoption of measures or programs by the state Fish and Game Commission and the department which will provide a realistic harvesting of deer and elk, both bucks and does, consistent with sound game management practices, and which provide for private landowners to determine who is permitted to hunt on their respective lands. The determination by the Fish and Game Commission of deer and elk to be harvested and the method to be used should not be subject to veto by county boards of supervisors. We further urge increased informational and educational programs by agencies and organizations concerned with encouraging sound game management programs.

Producers in the area of study should be included in the membership of advisory committees working with state or federal authorities in the development of programs or projects relating to wildlife management.

Depredation Compensation and Management

We support monetary compensation for crop or livestock damage or loss caused by managed and regulated wildlife, and wildlife that agricultural operators are unable to legally control with the use of anti-depredation methods.

When an animal is taken under a depredation permit in a remote area, the local warden should have some discretion over disposal of the carcass.

We support the control of wild turkey populations through the use of depredation permits. (Rev. 2014)

No. 266
Wolf Management

California Department of Fish and Wildlife should promptly develop, in coordination with producers, property owners and other stakeholders, a wolf management plan that balances the needs of public safety, private property and the environment.

No. 267
Livestock Depredation by Dogs

State legislation should be enacted to permit local animal control or humane society officers to impound and destroy dogs that pursue, wound, worry or kill livestock or poultry.

We support the sponsorship of legislation to amend the California Food and Agricultural Code to include the recovery of attorney fees for the loss of livestock caused by dogs. (Rev. 2000)

Water

No. 301
Water Resource Development

We support, as a high priority, all cost-effective means of maintaining and improving existing water storage and conveyance infrastructure in California.

We support all cost-efficient means of increasing California's water supply, including the construction of additional surface storage facilities, groundwater recharge projects, and water conveyance improvements.

Any water development project should facilitate the development and protection of agricultural land. Where water development is hindered by lack of funding, we support cost sharing. Water development projects should be cost effective and provide affordable water supplies for agricultural users in all regions of California.

There is a need for continuing orderly development of California's water resources to meet the growing needs for water in future years, as our population grows and our economy continues to expand. Immediate action to create short-term solutions is needed to facilitate restoration of water supplies for impacted agricultural regions.

In the development of California's water resources, the vested rights of water users must be inviolate; contracts under this development between the state and agencies created under state law must be inviolate; and areas in which water originates must not be deprived of any quantity and quality of such water needed to satisfy the beneficial requirements of such areas.

The Water Plan

The present level of water development and transportation in California is not adequate to meet the present level of water use, including provision for outflow through the delta mandated by the State Water Resources Control Board and remedy of the groundwater overdraft in California.

It should be a continuing responsibility of the state to provide, or assist in providing, facilities for the development, conveyance, conservation and utilization of water resources, and thereby make water available to meet the beneficial needs in all areas of the state.

The California Water Plan (Plan), commonly referred to as Bulletin 160, provides for the orderly and coordinated control, protection, conservation, development and utilization of the water resources of the state, which is set forth and described in the Plan [Cal. Water Code § 10004(a)]. The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is to update the Plan on or before December 31 every five years, beginning in 2003 [Cal. Water Code § 10004(b)(1)]. As part of this requirement, DWR must include strategies including, but not limited to, the development of new water storage facilities, water conservation, water recycling, desalination, conjunctive use, and water transfers that may be pursued to meet the future water needs of the state [Cal. Water Code § 10004.5].

As part of updating the Plan, DWR shall conduct a study to determine the amount of water needed to meet the state's future needs and to recommend programs, policies and facilities to meet those needs [Cal. Water Code § 10004.6]. To assist in that investigation, the Legislature adopted AB 2587 (2002) to the Food and Agriculture Code, requiring the Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) to estimate food, fiber, livestock and other farm products production, as specified, and provide that information to DWR for estimating related water usage for inclusion in the Plan [Cal. Food and Agriculture Code § 411]. It is the Legislature's stated intent that neither the state nor the nation should be allowed to become dependent upon a net import of foreign food, and that as the nation's population grows, California should produce enough food to supply the state and also continue to supply the historical proportion of the nation's food supply, approximately 25 percent of the nation's table food [Cal. Food and Agriculture Code § 411, section 1 (1) and (2)].

We recommend adequate funding be provided for the preparation, and update every five years, of a food and fiber forecast by CDFA. The forecast should be based upon 20-year estimates and furnished to DWR for estimating related water usage for inclusion in every Bulletin 160.

We recommend review of all phases of the plan by the proper state agencies and urge appropriation and allocation of funds necessary for the completion of each updated Plan, for timely submission to the Legislature. We do not support user fees for funding these activities.

We recommend that DWR adequately analyze and the Legislature authorize projects of statewide importance consistent with growth and change. We further recommend that the Legislature authorize immediate action where danger and distress threaten.

Priorities for Water Development and Transportation

We recommend the highest priority be given to water development and transportation and support construction of the following facilities:

(1) Facilities in the delta to improve the efficiency of water transfer and to reduce saltwater intrusion;

(2) Additional storage to provide increased reserves and to allow for flexibility in diverting from the delta;

(3) Development of additional water supplies from streams in California by the most economically feasible projects, within the scope of the California Water Plan and the policies of the California Farm Bureau; and

(4) Identification and development of opportunities for groundwater banking, groundwater replenishment, groundwater recharge, and conjunctive use.

The least damaging conveyance system practical, both in construction and operation, should be an integral part of any additional water storage or supply project pertinent thereto.

Any water development project should give high priority to the development and protection of agricultural land.

Areas of Origin

Counties, water districts or local agencies in areas of origin or natural service areas tributary thereto, should retain the privileges within their entities to finance, construct and participate in all projects to assure adequate water supplies for present and future use by the county, water districts or local agencies.

There should be reserved and included in state water development, under the California Water Plan, such upstream water storage reservoirs and other facilities necessary for the beneficial use of water for the areas of origin.

The state's constitution includes an undefined requirement that the beneficial use of water must be "reasonable." This requirement must not be politically interpreted to nullify water rights laws protecting areas of origin.

It is reasonable to retain in each of the hydrologic and groundwater basins the right to all those waters which originate in those basins and which are or will be needed for diversion for beneficial uses in those basins.

The law provides that production of agricultural commodities by imported surface water to replace groundwater overdrafts is reasonable when water is surplus to the beneficial needs of the area of origin of that water. This law should be enforced.

The areas of origin will preserve the right to use their surplus water without the added costs of development for export.

Laws protecting areas of origin must be honored by government projects, and legal procedures must be developed which will assure affordable enforcement of all laws protecting areas of origin of water.

Delta Waters

The state of California should meet its obligations to furnish surplus waters of Northern California to diversion points in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as a point of distribution to areas of deficiency.

We support the current statutory boundaries of the delta and oppose expansion of that area.

It should be the state's obligation (and the federal government should assume its responsibility to the degree that federal projects affect the program) to provide and maintain a sufficient regulated quantity of water in the delta to assist in flood control and ensure the maintenance of water quality. We support the construction of the facilities necessary to enable the state to accomplish these goals.

Delta Water Pumping

The predominant industry of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta area is agriculture, and this industry relies almost exclusively on the waters of the delta area for its irrigation supply.

The future of the water supply to agriculture in the delta has been placed in jeopardy by the pumping of large quantities of water from the area by the state and Bureau of Reclamation during periods of low inflow into the delta, extreme tidal conditions, and the absence of adequate control facilities.

Such pumping directly influences the salinity content of the water supply and also the water level in the sloughs and channels, to the extent that pumping operations of irrigators in certain areas were forced to cease.

We request the Bureau of Reclamation and the DWR to limit and regulate the pumping of water by their respective facilities so as to

protect (1) the agricultural industry in the area from damage, and (2) the water rights of the people in the area.

Conveyance

Recognizing that California's agricultural production will be in jeopardy if long-term conveyance improvements are not made, we support a water supply solution that improves the conveyance of water through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region. Long-term solutions to water conveyance in the Delta region should not serve as an alternative to new storage facilities. Operation of an improved conveyance system should not result in the degradation of water quality in the Delta. We support a water system solution that brings benefits to all of California agriculture, which may include conveyance improvements of above-ground, below-ground, and through-Delta solutions. Agricultural water users shall not be required to mitigate impacts caused by other stressors.

Delta Water Conveyance

We recognize that the problems relating to delta water conveyance are numerous and complex and that a solution may best be accomplished through a process of staging construction and mitigation measures. We would also support firm congressional legislation providing for joint federal and state responsibility for satisfactory water supply and quality control in the area of origin, the delta and areas of export. Congressional legislation should be supported with contracts between responsible local, state and federal agencies. The conveyance plan should optimize the export yield that can be achieved while maintaining levels of delta water quality which are adequate to sustain historical delta agricultural crop yields and crop diversity. Operable barriers or other devices should be used (such as near Franks Tract) to minimize the net flow of salt into the delta by tidal action combined with any level of export operations. Operable tidal flow barriers and other local measures in the south delta channels should be designed and operated to protect the in-channel water levels, water supply and water quality from export impacts. The delta transfer facility, including channel flow control facilities, combined with new storage facilities is anticipated to save many hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water per year which would otherwise flow to the San Francisco Bay during periods of high runoff. It may be feasible to provide additional delta protection and water conservation by the construction of partial barriers, or submerged sills to prevent unrestricted reverse flow of sea water.

Interim Delta Barriers

We support the prompt installation of appropriate facilities to improve the efficiency of the existing delta water transfer system pending provision of a more adequate facility.

Suitable facilities should include underwater sills in deep channels; appropriate barriers in those intermediate depth channels which carry substantial bay salt water intrusion toward the export pumps; and tide gated barriers in the shallow southern delta channels to restore circulation and water depth in those channels and to inhibit and dilute the flow of San Joaquin River salt to the export pumps. These facilities should be designed, where necessary, for easy flood-season removal (or gating) and summer reinstallation.

Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal

Construction of the Auburn Dam and the completion of the Folsom South Canal should be expedited. Federal funding for the Auburn Dam project should be reinstated.

Inflationary conditions increase construction costs, but the outlook for benefit values likewise increase. The federal administration philosophy encourages cooperative financing by local interests in all future federal water projects. We believe the required local support exists, and that there is the utmost urgency for Congress to reauthorize Auburn Dam, which will help protect the interest of all U.S. citizens in the food productivity of the country, reduce our dependence on imported oil and would reduce flood danger to one of California's most populous metropolitan areas.

Water Storage

Urban expansion, environmental requirements, and the need for reliable agricultural water supplies mandate that additional facilities must be authorized and constructed along with flood control and stream bank protection. The increased demand for water has been due to legislated increases for the rapid population growth in this state and the reallocation of water from agricultural uses to environmental uses. To meet this increased water demand and increased agricultural needs for a growing population and environmental uses, new projects must be built that will create a "new" water supply.

The proposed Los Banos Grande reservoir should receive priority for development of feasibility reports, due to its geographical location. This reservoir, or others similarly located, would facilitate water export and flood control during wet periods, thus relieving the Sacramento River of higher summer flows.

Currently, the Sacramento River is not physically fit to act as a conveyance means for upstream reservoir waters. State and federal agencies should immediately initiate needed bank protection projects on this river to reduce seepage, bank erosion and crop damage.

We support the expeditious construction of dams for proposed water storage sites along the west side of the Sacramento Valley and on the San Joaquin River above Friant Dam.

Desalination

We support desalination wherever feasible to develop new water supplies and increase the water independence of urban coastal areas, thereby reducing the pressure from such areas on agricultural water supplies. We support state legislation to promote desalination research and development and increase the cost effectiveness of desalination projects. We believe that the legal right of municipal water agencies to pursue independent, locally generated water supplies through desalination should be preserved. We encourage a balanced approach to the environmental regulation of desalination projects that recognizes the necessity of ample fresh water supplies for all uses.

Forest Thinning and Fuel Reduction

We support funding for active management of public and private forests in California to help prevent forest fires that result in the siltation of our watersheds and reservoirs, and to provide an increased downstream water supply. (Rev. 2019)

No. 302
Water for Food Supply

We should aggressively address the need for an increase in water supply as the population grows, specifically addressing the need for an agricultural water supply that is adequate to produce a sufficient California-grown food supply to meet future needs. These needs include adequate food for California's forecasted future population, adequate food to maintain California's contribution to the nation's food supply, and any net export of food that is needed for worldwide stability and economic stimulus.

The California Department of Food and Agriculture should be requested to forecast these food needs and the water needed to produce that food, in time for inclusion in each Bulletin 160. The Department of Water Resources should be required to address this agricultural water supply need in its Bulletin 160 forecast of water needs in accordance with AB 2587 (2002). The water forecasts in DWR's Bulletin 160 and the food forecasts by CDFA should be coordinated and revised every five years and should forecast the needs at least 25 years beyond each scheduled update.

The Bulletin 160 State Water Plan should also comply with Water Code Section 10004.6, and no weakening of that statute should be allowed. We should pursue all appropriate political and legal means to assure that DWR complies with the existing statutes; to assure that the relevant statutes are not weakened; and to assure that the future agricultural water supply is sufficient to produce an adequate domestic and international food supply as defined above, and to thereby protect the national security that would be in jeopardy if we could not produce our own food. (02/Rev. 2004)

No. 303
Financing Water Project Development

Financing

Every encouragement should be given to water project development by local districts. Through local district development, maximum use of private funds can be realized. Non-reimbursable grants should be made by the state and federal governments to such local project development for flood control, navigation, salinity control, fish and game and recreation values.

Reimbursable costs of any state project should not include the costs of acquisition of sites, rights-of-way and relocation of highways and utilities. The federal government should provide funds on a loan basis at appropriate interest rates to the state and local districts to assist with initial construction of water projects, such loans to be repaid over a specific contractual period with the state or local district maintaining title to and full control of the project. Local governments should not bear the cost of acquisitions of sites, or rights-of-way or relocation of roads and utilities of state projects.

The construction of water facilities has resulted in a demand that such facilities also be maintained to serve recreational purposes.

Inasmuch as storage reservoirs are built to serve the primary purpose of providing a dependable source of supply of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial use, we believe that recreational facilities, when provided, should be self-liquidating and should be supported by adequate charges to be paid by those using the facilities.

We must recognize the changing demands of the state by a much greater allocation of costs to such non-repayment features of multi-purpose water projects as flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife, etc. A more realistic allocation of costs to these features will, in turn, reduce the costs allocated to the water conservation features. Quality and quantity improvement for fish and wildlife and recreation must be paid by public funds.

Environmental enhancement and instream users are encouraged to participate in the purchase and development of new water. As a contributing purpose of the project, these share equally in supply reductions in the event of a drought or other limitation in supply.

We object to demands of the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the excessive releases of stored water for fish and wildlife purposes. Substantial compensation should assist in defraying the cost of construction to the irrigation or water district.

Certain features of these water projects, such as the production of hydroelectric power, must be developed and used so as to help finance the water conservation and distribution features if we are to have maximum beneficial development of our water resources for the ultimate economic growth of California.

The power produced in connection with federal and state water projects must be sold at market value and there must be an adequate allocation of project costs to recreation, so that water users will not have to subsidize these features through higher water charges.

California Water Fund

We worked for the establishment of the California Water Fund by the 1959 Legislature and agreed that this fund be used for water development. We support the continuation of accrual of tidelands revenues to this fund for the purposes of facilitating water development.

Federal-State Relations

We favor the maximum participation of individuals, local agencies and local and state governments in the development of water projects. Federal participation in water development should preferably be in cooperation with state and local interests. We are opposed to federal domination and control of water resource development.

Water rights established by state law and state laws relating to the use of water should be respected by federal agencies. We urge the enactment by Congress of legislation to provide for this.

The increasing needs of the people of the United States for flood control, water conservation and distribution are of serious concern to the public, and in some areas have reached urgent proportions, as illustrated by the recent dry periods. Maximum cooperation between agencies of the state and federal governments will be required to meet these needs.

When it is desirable that cooperation and, coordination of operations exist between the state and federal governments in development of water resources of the state, the state-federal relationship should be clearly stated by contract. Such contracts should provide for the affected state project to store and transfer water, through use of its facilities, for ultimate delivery through facilities of the affected federal projects and, in appropriate instances, for the federal project to store and transfer, through use of its facilities, for ultimate delivery through facilities of the state project.

We consider the 1985 Coordinated Operation Agreement between the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources to qualify as such a contract.

In the event facilities of the state project are of service to the federal project, the United States should pay an appropriate share of the costs, including capital costs, on a proportionate use basis consistent with other deliveries of the state project. In the event facilities of the federal project are of service to the state project, the state should pay an appropriate share of costs, including capital costs, on a proportionate use basis, consistent with other deliveries of the federal project.

The rendering of such reciprocal service by a federal project to a state project should not subject the state project's water deliveries to federal laws restricting the use of water. The state should exercise control with respect to the determination and administration of the right to the use of water.

We are opposed to encroachment by the federal government into vested water rights, and to the development of federal water projects not in compliance with state law. We support the principle of state dominance over the federal government in the field of water rights. (Rev. 2013)

No. 304
Water Pricing and Contracts

State Project

Contracts for the delivery of water from state projects should include but not be limited to:

(1) Short-term contracts for interim deliveries which confer no right; and

(2) Thirty (30) year minimum renewable contracts providing long-term rights to the use of water.

The state's water export contract requirements under the California Water Plan should be at uniform rates, for similar classes of water, adjustable sufficiently to pay to the state the reimbursable costs for such water, water development and delivery to the delta. To the extent possible, these contracts should be maintained on a long-term basis.

When the state delivers said delta water to a contracting agency, the cost to the state for such delivery, including operation and maintenance, should be added to the rate established for water at the delta.

The state's responsibility for the pricing and distribution of water should not reach beyond the local contracting district or agency. The distribution of and establishment of rates for water to individual water users should be a responsibility of the local district or agency to work out, consistent with its financial and operational policy.

Federal Project

Realistic water pricing should form the basis for negotiation of any future contracts and renegotiation of expired existing contracts or those for which mutual renegotiation is agreed. We are opposed

to a pricing structure that is a means to limit agriculture's ability to purchase affordable water and causes it to give up a portion of its contract water supply to the benefit of other water users. Future contracts should be of sufficient duration to allow farmers to secure long-term capital or financing. Any percentage reduction in water supply must be accompanied by a commensurate reduction in capital repayment obligations on present or future contracts.

The development of federal water contracts and prices, together with the allocation of supply, should be sensitive to not only the agricultural benefits of the resource, but the environmental and economic benefits of agricultural water use.

Diverters of natural channel waters per prior water rights must not be involuntarily subjected to federal laws restricting water use when federal projects either use natural channels for project water conveyance or divert upstream or delta water for project use and then replace that water with water from project facilities. (Rev. 2013)

No. 305
State Ownership of the Central Valley Project (CVP)

We cannot support the CVP transfer to the State of California until the following concerns are accommodated:

(1) Assurances are given that the original contractors and exchange contractors will be recognized and receive allocated water supplies. The integrity of the existing contracts and exchange agreements must be maintained;

(2) No new contractors will be added to the CVP without the development of new supplies of water;

(3) The contract duration must be long enough for growers to acquire agricultural capital financing (minimum of 30 years);

(4) Water costs to CVP users will be tied directly to the original capital costs for construction of the CVP and normal operation and maintenance expenditures;

In addition, the paying water users must be identified together with an articulated schedule of financial responsibility.

Water users should include agricultural, municipal, recreational, aesthetic, industrial and environmental users or interests.

(5) The demands of meeting endangered species, water quality, wetlands, marsh, fish and wildlife requirements are to be fully outlined and be shared by all water diverters;

(6) "Drainage": The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's (USBR) responsibility for drainage must be assumed by the state;

(7) Any transfer of the CVP to the State of California should be approved by a majority vote of the original CVP contractors including both districts and users;

(8) Protections must be assured to the areas of origin; and

(9) Central Valley Project contractors must not be made financially, or otherwise responsible for environmental mitigation beyond the degree to which the operation of the relevant diversion and export facilities are clearly responsible.

In the meantime, joint operation between the state and federal projects should be streamlined to the extent possible. We also favor a thorough study by the agencies involved to determine the feasibility of the idea. The "study" should include workshops, or other opportunities for public participation, during the negotiations for contractor and users affected by the proposal. (1993)

No. 306
Local Agency Control of Federal and State Water Projects

We support the control and ownership by the users of the federal and state water projects in California if the following conditions are all satisfied:

(1) The respective rights of settlement contractors, exchange contractors, and other contractors are protected and maintained in the same manner and priority as under federal or state ownership;

(2) Water rights and areas of origin are not impaired;

(3) The transfer of control and/or ownership in itself should not cause a direct increase in the cost of water unless approved by the water users;

(4) Obligations to satisfy water quality and other environmental needs are not reallocated to other agricultural water users;

(5) No new contractors will be added without the development of new supplies; and

(6) State and federal agencies must honor their commitments to provide an adequate supply of water for urban and agricultural as well as environmental uses.

Land retirement and the downsizing of water districts are not successful remedies for an inadequate water supply. (Rev. 2000)

No. 307
Water Rights

Existing water rights must be inviolate. Adjudication is one means for farmers and ranchers to determine ownership of both groundwater and surface water rights.

In the future, prescription should not be an allowable means of obtaining a right to the use of water. Existing prescriptive rights should be recognized when proven and quantified. All pertinent riparian rights should be quantified at the appropriate time according to the greatest potential agricultural use. Unexercised riparian rights should be given priority equal to exercised riparian rights, and we favor legislation to guarantee these historical rights without required reporting. Based on the history of reported use under Section 5101 et. seq. of the Water Code, previously unquantified water rights should not be subject to diminution. No limits should be placed on agricultural water to undermine water rights or to promote reallocation or "forced" sales of water from agriculture's beneficial use.

As a resource of global significance, there should be no higher long-term priority use of water than California agriculture.

Adjudicated riparian rights should not be subject to forfeiture as the result of non-use.

Current methods give adequate protection for instream water uses. No condemnation authority should be permitted for the purpose of providing water for instream uses. Instream uses should have priority only for water which is developed for those purposes and paid for by the beneficiaries. These dedications of water for instream use should not be permitted to interfere with supplying water for the maintenance and enhancement of the state's agricultural, municipal and industrial uses.

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act reallocated 800,000 acre-feet of water per year from agricultural use to stream flow for fish, and 200,000 acre-feet of water for application to wetlands. The Act stated that this water would be replaced for its original purpose of use within 15 years, but this has not happened. The Endangered Species Act also has had the effect of reducing agricultural water deliveries and diversions by holders of water rights. The Federal government has a responsibility to develop new water to offset these losses of agricultural water supply.

Favorable cost-benefit ratios are not more important for water projects than they are for welfare programs, health, wilderness, endangered species, or recreational programs. Most projects built to provide irrigation, flood control and electricity also benefit fish and wildlife by ensuring summer and fall flows in streams that otherwise could have gone dry. No increased authority should be given the State Water Resources Control Board for the issuance of cease and desist orders or restraining orders.

Board actions having adverse economic consequences should be supported by environmental and economic impact reports.

Reclaimed wastewater should remain in the district which performs the reclamation, to the extent it can be put to reasonable beneficial use. Excess reclaimed wastewater should be made available for sale, transfer, exchange, groundwater recharge, groundwater replenishment, or other beneficial use in a financially viable manner.

Water district laws should empower a district to sell surface water, for use outside the district, only that water which is surplus to the demands within the district and the sale of which is not at the expense of agriculture. Forfeiture of water rights should not accrue as a result of temporary water transfers, conservation, or use of substitute supplies.

The beneficiary water rights of agricultural water users must be honored and protected against takings should the controlling interest of an irrigation district change from its original structure.

Any sale of a right to use water for transfer from one hydrologic or groundwater basin to another, or from agricultural use to municipal and industrial use, for more than a single water year must be contingent on the following findings by the State Water Resources Control Board:

(a) Water sold for export from a hydrologic or groundwater basin must be surplus to current and foreseeable beneficial needs of that basin both as to quantity and quality, including the water needed for use of the lands in the basin for production of food and fiber;

(b) The agricultural protection provided by county ordinances and other laws must not be jeopardized or made ineffective by the proposed sale or transfer; and

(c) In some cases, the sale of water is predicated on replacement of the water that is sold by use of reclaimed or polluted municipal and industrial water, or other sources of replacement, other than agriculture drainage water. Use of that replacement water must not damage the water quality or supply for uses by other parties in the basin in which it is used.

Whenever water rights are condemned, the prior owner should receive compensation for the full value the use of such water provided the owner and not just the cost of having acquired the water right.

All protested water right applications should be given field investigations. Hearings need not be held on unprotested applications.

We support the position of the Department of Interior Solicitor General opinions of July 28, 1988, and the concurrence of the Attorney General, stating Congress did not intend to create federal reserved water rights when it provided for the designation of wilderness areas. We believe any water rights claimed for any public lands should be subject to acquisition only under state water rights law and subject to doctrine of unexercised rights, which would give those lands priority below those water rights which have been exercised by previous use. (Rev. 2019)

No. 308
Water Marketing and Transfers

Farm Bureau supports the movement of water between public and/or private entities, on a voluntary basis, when it is in the best interest of the contracting parties to change the place and/or purpose of water use and when potential impacts on third party water rights, non-transferring users and communities within the district, and on the water needs of areas of origin of surface and groundwater are first evaluated and appropriate protections of these entities are assured. The voluntary movement of water in California should lessen the potential for the reallocation of water without compensation.

Open marketing of new or conserved water should be allowed.

New Water

"New water" is water that augments the water supply without adversely affecting other legal users of water. For example, new water would include (1) reduction of losses or flow to irretrievable or unusable bodies of water such as salt sinks, the ocean, or perched water tables, and (2) releases of previously stored water that would not otherwise have been released that is replaced by flood flows in the year(s) subsequent to its release.

Conserved Water

"Conserved water" is water that has been beneficially used where the consumptive use is reduced through changes in crop patterns or fallowing, reduction of non-crop water use, or reduced evaporation. Consumptive use is water removed from the system through crop evapotranspiration.

The water purveyor or water right holder should have a right of first refusal of water sales or leases, which are potentially leaving their jurisdiction, providing they have an equitable transfer plan in place.

Water sales, transfers or exchanges of water originating or allocated to use in an overdrafted basin shall not cause a net loss of historic usable water to the basin and should give protection to the future water development rights of that basin.

Transfer programs should contain the following components:

(1) The burden of identifying and notifying parties and regions with potentially affected water rights or contracts, and the burden of proof of protection of the water rights of third parties and of areas of origin concerning both quantity and quality of water must be on the proponents of a transfer of water and on the government agency approving any such transfer;

(2) Assurance must be provided that the seller will not replace the water sold with other surface or groundwater supplies on the property to which the water sold was appurtenant;

(3) Water users should not forfeit or acquire any right to the use of water beyond the terms of the contract. Under the terms of any contract for transfer of water, the buyer must agree to forfeit any future claim to the water under the doctrine of public use. The propriety of continuing the transfer should be subject to appropriate periodic review by the public agency that approved the original transfer;

(4) When the seller or transferor of water has a water right that is legally limited by reasonable and beneficial use on the property to which the water right is appurtenant, the State Water Resources Control Board should determine that the water used by the buyer and the seller in any year or season is not more than would have been put to reasonable and beneficial use by the seller at that time in the absence of the sale;

(5) When water being transferred is commingled with other water during delivery, it must be assured that the commingling does not adversely affect the quantity or quality of third party water rights;

(6) No water may be sold for export from a water deficient basin and no sale or transfer may create a long-term deficiency. However, underground basins may be used for water storage and subsequent removal with no long term net withdrawal; and

(7) Water districts should have the right to disapprove contracts for the transfer of water under their jurisdiction.

Where a water sale or transfer requires approval by the State Water Resources Control Board, that board should require the findings and assurances covered in items 1 through 5 above. It should also require a full hydraulic and water right analysis whenever necessary to provide reasonable assurance of the proposed protections, except that this requirement might be temporarily waived in an emergency. The board should retain jurisdiction over each sale or transfer that it approves.

Legislation and regulatory revisions should be implemented promptly to provide the above protections and to facilitate the movement of water only after those protections are in place and when consistent therewith.

Groundwater

The transfer of groundwater is complicated by such factors as lack of clear water right law pertaining to these waters, and complicated geologic considerations which are not well understood. Until these matters are clarified, we oppose this type of transfer from the underground supply except where: (1) Accurate reporting shows water banking or conjunctive use as achieving net benefit to the underground water supply; (2) such transfer is the most water-efficient way to control the high water table; or (3) there is a hydrologic study showing a surplus.

Contracted Project Water

Where the present contractors do not desire to continue purchasing contracted water, we favor transfer of that water. Long term transfers that produce adverse local impacts should not proceed unless they are linked to the state's water supply needs.

With respect to environmental assessments, the parties participating in water transfers should not be responsible for funding environmental water purchases beyond the regulatory requirements. Additive water should be purchased by the public at large. (Rev. 1998)

No. 309
Management and Use of Groundwaters and Groundwater Basins of California

In the development and adoption of proposals by the California Legislature establishing statutory policy governing the management and use of ground waters and groundwater basins, alone or in coordination with surface water management and use, existing vested rights of users must be fully protected and such statutory policy should conform to the following principles, which we believe to be in the best interest of individual rights and the continued development of a strong and healthy economy in California:

(1) The Recordation Act should be extended as was the Water Replenishment District Act only as permissive enabling legislation to permit water users anywhere in California, by vote of the qualified electors in the area concerned, to organize and administer their own groundwater basin management programs;

(2) Local water districts or an entity established by affected users should utilize available underground storage and manage their groundwater basins to minimize the involvement of the state or federal government. The district or entity should manage overlying landowners' extraction and supplementation based on safe yields;

Studies of groundwater basins should be conducted by local water districts or contracted through them to other competent agencies or independent professionals. These studies must reflect true existing conditions and enable quality, long-range planning to ensure agricultural viability. Landowners overlying the groundwater basins are and should continue to be responsible for creating groundwater management plans. Exercising their responsibility will help assure that the state or federal government will be prevented from taking local control of water resources. The adoption and the establishment of such management plans are the responsibility of the local districts. We recommend that this relationship be maintained and that the state be given no additional implementing authority. The local districts involved should be required to bear the cost of such studies and investigations, as their constituents should be the ultimate beneficiaries.

Groundwater recharge should be recognized as a beneficial use of water.

The opportunities for water banking, through underground storage or conjunctive use, should be based on tested and scientifically proven recharge ability and safe yield.

Groundwater is critically dependent on the availability of surface water supplies.

In areas of the state which have a documented trend toward overdrafting of groundwater, the priority for future acquisitions of imported water supplies should be dedicated to protecting the rights of overlying landowners to groundwater by groundwater replenishment or to reduce the demand for groundwater pumping.

(3) These studies and investigations should identify potential spreading and percolation grounds for the local districts involved, as good spreading and percolation grounds are quite limited in some areas making it extremely important that these sites be identified and preserved for future use. The preservation of these grounds is a local responsibility and should so remain. In addition, the opportunities for prioritized underground storage should be recognized and preserved;

(4) In the development of groundwater basin management programs by local districts, and in the possible future use of specific groundwater basins as temporary holdover storage of surface waters for future withdrawal and export, the groundwater rights of users in the basin must be fully protected from all damage, including diminution of quantity and degradation of quality. All groundwater recharge basin management plans must take into consideration the potential contamination of both private residential and agricultural wells in the area. In no case will the quality of groundwater be compromised or degraded by the construction of a groundwater recharge basin. We encourage landowners in critically overdrafted areas to continue to devise and implement, under local control, groundwater management plans. We believe that local control over groundwater management is best accomplished through existing water entities or new water entities formed by local landowners for the purpose of groundwater management. Water should not be exported from one basin, or basin system of a watershed, to another basin or area when such exportation would be adverse to the rights of landowners in the original basin. Groundwater rights which are damaged in any manner must be justly compensated;

(5) The groundwater adjudication process should protect property rights, provide for appropriate due process, and improve the efficiency of groundwater adjudications;

(6) Critical problems have developed and are developing in some areas of the state because groundwater basins have become polluted through saline intrusion and the percolation of contaminated return flows from domestic and industrial use. There is need for reclamation and reuse of waters in some areas in order that supplies may be economically balanced with the demand and the need for maintaining hydrologic barriers to the encroachment of saline waters. However, at present, we have no practical effective means of destroying certain contaminants which pose a serious threat when such return waters are used for groundwater replenishment. No landowner's right to groundwater shall be infringed upon in order to prevent saline intrusion or other forms of pollution migration.

We recommend increased research into these groundwater pollution problems to the end that adequate solutions are developed. We support increased research by USDA, Land Grant universities, and private enterprise to study chemical migration and interaction with groundwater. We support research to determine water quality benefits related to agricultural production;

(7) We support local determination of well development and oppose any state control. To protect proprietary interests, property rights, and public safety, we oppose the involuntary disclosure of well completion reports. We support setting of new design standards by the Department of Water Resources. We recognize the value of groundwater basins for prioritized storage uses;

Groundwater storage space should be prioritized in the following ways:

(a) Reserved for native or naturally occurring recharge of a functional basin with reasonable expectation such recharge will eventually occur;

(b) Water imported and stored for beneficial use of an overlying owner;

(c) Water specifically imported and stored for in-basin appropriation;

(d) Water imported specifically for banking and subsequent export;

(8) Groundwater extraction, either private or public, should not be used to increase the yield of the State Water Project or the water use or land area in all such districts the Central Valley Project supplies because this encourages overdrafting and discourages long term, sound water development;

(9) In the development and management of any and all groundwater basin management districts, it is in the best interest of agriculture and property owners alike to require agricultural representation in proportion to water use or land area in all such districts; and

(10) Groundwater management should be consistent with overlying landowners' correlative rights. (Rev. 2019)

No. 310
Waste-Water Reclamation

We support the development of reclaimed water for a supplemental supply especially in areas where fresh supplies may be short or in locations within or adjacent to metropolitan areas where large reclaimed water supplies are available. However, we oppose the state mandating the use of reclaimed water when fresh water supplies are available.

Reclaimed waste-water use as a substitute for non-potable uses should be encouraged only under circumstances assuring cost effectiveness, safety for health, and sustained soil productivity on a long-range basis. Rights to fresh-water supplies must not be damaged as a result of substitution of waste water, in order to protect continued productivity if subsequently developed information shows sustained use of waste water to be detrimental. Institutions furnishing treated waste water should be responsible for maintaining proper quality characteristics for intended uses.

Generators of reclaimable water should actively pursue the usage of their own treated nonpotable water before seeking other users.

We recommend continued research by state, federal and other agencies on wastes and waste water for the reuse of such waste to supplement present conservation management and use programs. The University of California should propose standards on the quality of reclaimed municipal wastes and waste water which would be acceptable for agricultural use and groundwater replenishment. Agricultural land should not be used as a dumping ground for urban and industrial waste when such use is detrimental to crop production.

The state should not substitute locally reclaimed water for its contractual commitments to develop water from the California Water Development System pursuant to the Burns-Porter Act. (Rev. 1994)

No. 311
Flood Prevention and Water Conservation

Optimum water resource management must begin in the upper watersheds where the rain and snow fall, by vegetative cover manipulation, good land management practices, water storage reservoirs, etc. The longer surface waters are allowed to collect and run uncontrolled, the greater the downstream management and control problems become.

We recommend that flood control planning and development be predicated upon:

(1) The conservation of flood waters in underground basins where feasible;

(2) The recognition and consideration of the need for maximum upstream conservation storage to meet the water use needs of California;

(3) The provision for and coordination of flood control storage to the maximum extent compatible with sound multipurpose upstream development, so as to minimize the need for levee construction and channel improvement work downstream;

(4) Consideration and study being given first to the potential for flood prevention and control through upstream development and on-land treatment, and any necessary downstream studies and proposals being coordinated therewith;

We further recommend that encouragement be given for the maximum feasible development of water conservation practices and facilities by individual landowners and by local water districts and agencies.

We support active thinning of National Forests in California to reduce the evapotranspiration loss caused by overcrowded forests.

We encourage counties to adopt flood plain ordinances as a necessary prerequisite to obtaining federal participation under Public Law 99 for the repair of flood damage.

(5) A quick, simple process for permitting of small stream channel alteration projects should be available;

(6) We also recommend that all planning departments and commissions thoroughly evaluate the potential flood hazard to properties downstream from proposed subdivisions as well as the impact on the groundwater supply in the immediate area before any subdivisions or lot splits be granted; and

(7) Applicable environmental statutes and regulations should not be interpreted in such a way as to prohibit or obstruct the maintenance of levees, or the removal of silt accretions. Nor should they be interpreted to obstruct the control of erosion and of vegetative or other intrusions when such measures are required to restore and maintain the hydraulic capacity of relevant natural channels and floodways to the capacity which existed at the time that each flood control project was authorized, or which was created by the authorized project.

Environmental statutes and regulations should not be applied to riparian vegetation areas which exceed the top of the bank. (Rev. 2013)

No. 312
River Deterioration Control

Through the combined efforts of federal and state agencies, many of the rivers of California are being used as channels to convey water from impound areas throughout the state for the benefit of domestic users, recreation, and agricultural irrigation. To deal with serious recurring and damaging problems of bank erosion, sedimentation, seepage, and growth restrictions of the channels, the agencies involved in the releases from impound areas and control of flows of the channels should be made to take the responsibility for protecting and maintaining river banks. The responsible agencies should regulate the flows of those rivers in conjunction with the use of increasingly accurate meteorological data so as not to cause seepage damage, crop damage and erosion problems. Adjacent landowners should not be required to bear the added cost of seepage controls which accrue from higher than natural flows in the river.

Further water development in the Sacramento Water System must consider the detrimental effects of using the existing river as a conveyance system. The effect of seepage, bank erosion and crop damage caused by any further water development should be mitigated.

We recognize that the Sacramento River in its present condition is not physically fit to act as a conveyance means for existing water releases. As a method to correct this Sacramento River deterioration we support the channel stabilization plan of the Sacramento River Bank Protection and Erosion Control investigation by the U.S. Corps of Civil Engineers. Funding an equitable share of the maintenance costs of Sacramento River bank protection should be included in the rate of structure for water project users who benefit from the use of the Sacramento River. (Rev. 2006)

No. 313
Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 Exemption

We support an exemption from the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) allowing landowners to do stream restoration and bank stabilization. The use of the gravel removed from a stream during such a project should not be considered a commercial use if it is used on the property. (1996)

No. 314
Navigable Streams

We are opposed to the State of California extending its claim to private property under the Federal Doctrine of Navigability, and to extending the definition of navigability to streams and their tributaries which are not navigable by long-time historical definition.

We are opposed to the State of California claiming the public has the right to utilize the banks of streams under the State Recreational Navigability Doctrine.

We are opposed to any redesignation of navigability of rivers and lake shores above the existing lines of record as of January 1, 1970, and the subsequent acquisition by the State of California of lands under private ownership along and under the rivers of California.

We are opposed to the public gaining a right to use, or an easement to, the banks of streams under the Doctrine of Implied Dedication. (Rev. 1993)

No. 315
Surface Mining Impacts on Groundwater

We support the use of local government to issue permits and monitor surface mining in order to protect the groundwater hydrology of the area.

To protect the local groundwater from negative impacts of surface mining, the following should be required:

(1) Written notification to all property owners within one mile of a proposed surface mining operation by the local lead agency;

(2) If an impact is identified in the CEQA process, require the surface mining operation to supply baseline ongoing hydrologic monitoring data to the local lead agency on an annual basis; and

(3) A process for aggrieved property owners to petition the State Mining & Geology Board to review the failure of a lead agency to act as it relates to mining activities not in substantial compliance with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act. (1997)

No. 316
Wild and Scenic Rivers

We are opposed to proposals which would prevent the economic development of a stretch of river which has potential resource value; which would necessitate the taking of scenic easements or fee title to privately owned land by eminent domain; or which would unnecessarily involve federal responsibility for a river which is being adequately managed by a state.

Any land designated for wild rivers should be subject to local zoning ordinances.

We oppose the expansion of the National and State Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

No. 317
Salinity Control

Research on and control of all sources of salinity for which control measures are practical should be expedited in order of benefit per dollar of cost. All salinity control measures on federal land, and those measures for the control of natural sources, should be constructed as the responsibility of the general public. Those sources resulting from irrigation projects should be the responsibility of the individual project. Irrigation projects which cannot meet the costs of their fair share of ensuring a usable quality of water in a river system should be encouraged to employ the best feasible irrigation practices. If numerical water quality standards are adopted, they should be tailored to reflect practical control capabilities of each point of return flow. Under current technology it is not feasible to require users to return water of a quality equal to or better than the quality of their source, but a useful quality of water should be maintained for all downstream users.

The determination of what constitutes appropriate best management practices must address the need to maintain a long-term salt balance not only on each farm but also throughout the watershed. On-farm management practices must be determined with due regard to the protection of downstream parties from damage caused by drainage waters with high salinity which sometimes results from excessively "efficient" water application.

Colorado River Salinity

The United States, at great expense, has constructed storage facilities which regulate the flow of the Colorado River and thus make its waters manageable and of much greater utility to both the United States and Mexico. This construction has been at no cost to Mexico. Evaporation from the newly created lakes has lowered the quality of the downstream water, to the detriment of downstream users, including Mexico. As the result of Mexican protests, the United States has, by minute 242 to the United States-Mexico treaty of 1944, agreed to take measures necessary to ensure Mexico a quality of water useful to agriculture, and to do so entirely at United States' expense.

We believe the Mexican irrigators should be required to adopt salinity control management practices equal to those adopted by United States irrigators, and that Mexican drainage systems should be constructed, maintained and operated at no expense to the United States.

San Joaquin Valley Salinity

A drainage system appears necessary in the San Joaquin Valley south of Kesterson. Alternatives for disposal of the water, other than an open ditch conveyance to the delta, must be given priority. It may be necessary to treat or dilute water prior to discharge at its final destination.

Financing methods should be studied by all interested parties and public hearings held at the earliest practical opportunity. Grant funds under such laws as PL 92-500 should be usable for the construction of the drainage system. We believe the drainage water should be made available to be used for electrical generation, and industrial cooling purposes.

Natural water channels must not be used for additional drainage from lands irrigated with water from sources outside the watershed if such drainage will damage established downstream agriculture. We encourage local areas with current drainage problems to develop self-help programs. We support all cost-effective options for addressing the disposal, treatment or use of agricultural drainage water.

To the extent that drainage water continues to be drained into the San Joaquin River at salinities above the Vernalis and South Delta salinity standards, the timing of this drainage to the river should be adjusted to the extent possible to coincide with available dilution from increased flows, such as fish flows or recirculation flows.

The plan for the development of additional water supplies should also provide a solution to resultant drainage problems as part of a new water supply contract.

The retirement of lands affected with severe drainage problems should be considered only after all other options have been exhausted. A program of this type must be voluntary. In addition, the opportunity to return the affected lands to agricultural production should be retained. New technology may become available or dry land farming may be an option. (Rev. 2013)

No. 318
Salton Sea

The Salton Sea, an economic and environmental resource of national importance, is critical as a reservoir for drainage of irrigation, municipal and storm water as declared in 1924 by the Department of Interior.

Any project undertaken to reclaim the Salton Sea must:

(1) Not increase demand on the available water supply, such as diverting usable water directly into the Sea;

(2) Ensure the continued use of the Salton Sea as a reservoir for irrigation, municipal, and stormwater drainage;

(3) Reduce or stabilize the overall salinity of the Salton Sea;

(4) Stabilize the surface elevation of the Salton Sea;

(5) Enhance the potential for recreational uses and economic development of the Salton Sea;

(6) Include full protection of neighboring areas and residents from damages resulting from the project;

(7) Employ the most cost-effective measures available;

(8) Tie any cleanup of the New and Alamo Rivers, including sewage from international sources, to long-term reclamation of the Sea; and

(9) Provide full compensation or provide for agriculture to recover its expense under any plan which restricts, regulates or otherwise alters agricultural inflows to the Sea for any and all costs or impacts, including but not limited to the cost of facilities to alter Sea inflows, lost property values, and loss of crop production.

Any reclamation of the Sea is a benefit to society as a whole, and society should bear the cost of any reclamation project or any liability arising from reclamation. (1999)

No. 319
Mexican Sewage Problems

We support the binational effort to continue the cleanup of the waters of the New and Tijuana Rivers. (2013)

No. 320
Nonpoint Source Pollution

Management practices to address nonpoint sources of pollution should be based on technically and economically feasible control measures.

The current focus of the Clean Water Act should remain that of achieving fishable and swimmable standards.

(1) Nonpoint source programs should emphasize a self-determined, incentive-based approach.

(2) Efforts to address nonpoint runoff and improving water quality should prioritize impaired watersheds or water bodies using a "worst case first" approach.

(3) Federal funding must be adequate to develop site-specific information, technical assistance, and cost sharing for local programs.

(4) Clean Water Act regulations should not infringe on property rights; should not result in unfunded mandates for state and local governments; and should be subject to cost/benefit and risk assessment analysis.

(5) Limits on agricultural grant and/or cost share programs should be removed or minimized.

(6) Implementation of the federal Clean Water Act should not alter federal or state water rights and water allocation systems and should encourage state control over these programs. The authority for determining impaired waters, establishing standards and criteria, and developing and implementing appropriate response programs and plans should remain with the appropriate local entity and be based on sound science that proves they will have a positive result.

(7) Regulatory provisions regarding the release of water from fields should only come to bear at the point where the drain water enters a public waterway. Recycling water through closed irrigation systems, be they single or multiple systems and/or public or private, should not be considered a release of water into a public water system. We support increased research by USDA, Land Grant universities, and private enterprise to study chemical migration and interaction with groundwater. We support research to determine water quality benefits related to agricultural production.

(8) We endorse appropriate best management practices as an alternative to numerical standards to more effectively address the point and nonpoint sources of pollution which vary greatly on a regional watershed basis. These management practices should be developed based on sound science that proves that they will produce a positive outcome without any adverse re-directed impacts. Implementation decisions must be made locally and must be financially practical for landowners to apply. Farm and agricultural operations should be provided assurances where they are implementing these management practices.

(9) The state should control nonpoint source pollution through the state's three-tiered nonpoint source management plan. Tier 1 is the self-determined implementation of management practices. Tier 2 is the regulatory encouraged implementation of management practices through the use of Management Agency Agreements between other agencies with the appropriate regulatory authority (i.e., Department of Pesticide Regulation for pesticide use, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for timber harvest activities) or the waiver of waste discharge requirements based on specified conditions. Tier 3 is the issuance of waste discharge requirements for individuals or specified groups of dischargers. In every instance, the least stringent tier of enforcement should be employed before advancing to the next level of enforcement. Management practices recommended in any tier should be based, to the maximum extent practical, on technically and economically feasible control measures. Implementation of the nonpoint source management plan and management practices needs to reflect flexibility for changing environmental and economic conditions.

(10) Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), if required under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, shall not include TMDLs for waterbodies impaired only by nonpoint sources. In the event that a TMDL is prepared for agricultural nonpoint source pollution in any waterbody, the TMDL shall be based on reliable monitoring data acquired from the impaired waterbody, in conformity with currently accepted scientific principles. Any load or waste load allocation should be proportional to the actual discharge from the affected source or category of sources. No source or category of sources should be subjected to disproportionate restrictions to offset the inability of other sources or categories of sources to achieve their proportionate share of a TMDL. Implementation plans for TMDLs must be developed and approved by the State and to the extent practicable, include stakeholder involvement. Nonpoint source management must be left exclusively to the states because it involves land use management issues properly within the sovereign authority of the state, not the federal government. Regulatory requirements should not place responsibility on agriculture water owners or water users for pollutants or impairments that already exist in the water. Merely concentrating pre-existing water components through processes such as evapo-transpiration should not constitute the creation of a water quality impairment. Any implementation plan for nonpoint sources must conform to the State Nonpoint Source Management Plan. Because land managers must rely on the expertise of professional advisors in determining appropriate management practices to address nonpoint sources on their lands, because the determination of appropriate management practices is at this time still an experimental science, and because even the most thoroughly tested and reliable management practices can be overwhelmed by uncontrollable natural events, such as rainfall, floods and droughts, land managers must only be held responsible under a TMDL for implementing recommended management practices, and not for guaranteeing the ability of such practices to achieve TMDL load allocations. TMDL implementation plans must recognize the complexities of nonpoint source pollution and the experimental nature of nonpoint source management and must not penalize land managers who undertake good faith efforts to control nonpoint sources on their lands. No source, whether point or nonpoint source, should be penalized for failure to achieve load or wasteload allocations or to attain a TMDL within the mandated time limits, if the owner or manager of such source has made reasonable, good faith efforts to control such source. TMDL implementation plans must maintain a sound balance between the water quality improvement goals and economic improvement goals of the people and communities in TMDL-affected watersheds, since the ultimate goal of improving the quality of the human environment requires recognition that a healthy economy is essential to a healthy environment. TMDL attainment timelines must not be rigid but must allow for adjustment if economically feasible pollution controls are not available or if recessions or other uncontrollable events impede the implementation of more stringent controls.

Agricultural nonpoint drainage should not be restricted by TMDL implementation when the need for TMDL regulation results from a reduction in an assimilative capacity of the waterbody that is caused by non-agricultural processes. (00/Rev. 2013)

No. 321
Watershed Planning

We support local, voluntary watershed management planning efforts as tools for the enhancement and protection of water quality and other natural resources in the State of California. All regulatory programs for the enhancement and protection of water quality and other natural resources should be based on and include funding for an accurate analysis of current water quality conditions (current baseline analyses).

Implementation of all watershed planning efforts should occur through a voluntary approach. Sufficient funding should be provided to support broad-based educational outreach, technical assistance, and scientific evaluation, including current baseline analysis. We encourage agricultural producers to voluntarily participate in watershed planning activities to protect water quality and other natural resources and make further regulation unnecessary.

Before beginning any watershed program that increases regulation or cost of agricultural activities or imposes mandates on local governments or individual landowners related to water quality improvements, the appropriate federal, state or local governmental entity shall prepare an accurate analysis of current water quality conditions (current baseline analysis) for the water body in question. The current baseline analysis should evaluate the existing conditions in the watershed and identify any water quality impairments using scientific methods and quantitative data. The current baseline analysis should also document past improvements already made and weather events or geologic conditions that contribute to the water's impairment.

After establishing a scientifically sound current baseline, the appropriate agency in conjunction with affected landowners should identify goals for improvement that are reasonable and reflect the real and actual uses of the water body in question.

Governmental watershed planning efforts with a regulatory impact on agricultural landowners should, at a minimum, include:

(1) Notice to all affected landowners;

(2) A current baseline analysis based on sound science of the identified impairment(s);

(3) A cost-benefit analysis;

(4) Substantial agricultural landowner involvement in the development of the program in consultation with other appropriate stakeholders;

(5) The confidentiality of individual resource management plans prepared in conjunction with a watershed program;

(6) Respect for private property rights;

(7) Protection for existing water rights;

(8) Reasonable and realistic timeframes;

(9) Scientifically valid monitoring programs; and

(10) Compensation for disruption in agricultural operations.

All watershed programs should be flexible and recognize the need for adaptive management. All programs should shield from civil and criminal liability agricultural producers participating voluntarily and in good faith in the watershed program.

Through the watershed program, if threatened or endangered species become established, agricultural producers should be given "hold harmless" liability protection and "incidental take" protection by the agencies so that agricultural practices for their operations are not impaired.

In addition, where these actions by government diminish an owner's right to use his property, damage or restrict the usefulness of his property, or constitute a taking of that owner's property, the government should provide due process and compensation to the exact degree that an owner's property has been diminished by the government's action. (00/Rev. 2013)

No. 322
Waste Discharge Permits

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge permits or state "waste discharge requirements" should be issued to operators only. If further financial responsibility is required by the permit issuing agency, performance bonds or other assurances should be required of the operator, rather than naming non-operating parties to the permit. An exemption from the fees for waste discharge permits should be granted for operators who are not causing pollution discharges.

The Environmental Protection Agency should increase the size limits for exemptions from NPDES permit requirements to accommodate California aquaculture operations appropriate to pollution discharge standards. (Rev. 2001)

No. 323
Agricultural Representation on State and Regional Water Boards

The membership of the State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards should include voting representation of agricultural interests.

Each Board member should be appointed based on demonstrated interest and knowledge of water quality, water pollution control and prevention, water resource management, and experiential knowledge of beneficial uses. Board members should be required to gain a broad understanding of the contributions of agriculture to the environment and each region's nonpublic economic vitality. The pool of candidates eligible to serve on State and Regional Water Boards should be expanded by dispensing with the 10-percent NPDES Income Rule. Board members should be able to vote on all issues presented by revising conflict of interest rules to conform with the Political Reform Act. (Rev. 2017)

Natural Resources

No. 351
Environmental Policy and Procedure

We support the wise use of our resources. Agriculture must use all practical means to maintain the healthy environment on which it depends. Environmental regulations must be based on peer-reviewed, scientific evidence. Agriculture should not bear a disproportionate burden of meeting environmental regulations.

We are concerned by the erosion of individual rights in environmental litigation and in particular with the lack of a requirement that intent be proven by the accuser. These protections are grounded in the United States and California constitutions and are fundamental to the American system of justice. The rules of evidence, burdens of proof, and other procedural safeguards for the rights of the accused that apply in criminal prosecutions and civil suits related to violations of other laws must be applied with equal force in litigation alleging violation of environmental laws.

Federal and state environmental regulatory agencies should be required to study all impacts of any regulation they propose which will affect government, industry or agriculture, before such regulation is adopted. Those affected by any regulation imposed should have the right of a hearing and appeal. Local government entities with enforcement responsibilities should have authority to apply reasonable tolerances in consideration of local conditions. (Rev. 2000)

No. 352
Environmental Regulations

Federal and state agencies fail to consider adequately the loss of industry, agricultural land and open space that occurs as regulations are adopted. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and relevant state statutes, agencies should give greater consideration to economic impacts as they relate to the areas directly affected by the regulations. In addition, government agencies should be required to consider the cumulative impacts of all regulations proposed for an area, especially regarding those impacts to base industries. Agencies should also evaluate and mitigate the impact of regulations on farm and ranch properties as they relate to urban sprawl and air quality. (2001)

No. 353
Air Emission Offset Credits

We support granting agricultural producers the ability to generate emission reduction offset credits as an incentive for voluntary implementation of farming emission control practices. Technology and equipment that reduce emissions of criteria or hazardous air pollutants or any identified toxic air contaminants by the California Clean Air Act of 1988 or the Federal Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended, should be eligible for offset banking. We support the generation or acquisition of emission reduction credits from agriculture by other regulated source categories, especially when such agriculturally generated reductions are more cost effective and will result in a positive socioeconomic impact and benefit for the farmer.

Agricultural emission offset credits should remain the proprietary right of the farmers who have reduced emissions from a base year beyond that prescribed by the California Clean Air Act. (Rev. 2010)

No. 354
Environmental Carbon Incentives

We support enhancing and expanding the ability for growers of all agricultural commodities to be able to voluntarily participate in an environmental carbon incentive program where they would receive compensation if they commit to make operational changes that would reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The program should reflect the diversity of California's commodities and incorporate flexibility to deal with possible changes, including market and climatic conditions, that could require operational modifications. All sources and sinks of greenhouse gas emissions need to be included to ensure that any net contribution that growers provide is recognized.

Adequate infrastructure and background scientific research should be completed to ensure that an effective and uniform environmental carbon incentive program is developed. Funding programs for GHG reduction and carbon trading should include secure and equitable shares for agricultural projects.

Any climate-change policy that is developed should address the following:

(1) USDA will have the primary role in developing agricultural and forestry GHG reduction or sequestration parameters for carbon offset protocols;

(2) Ensure that farmers, ranchers and related industries are not put at a competitive disadvantage;

(3) Contain a robust offset title that fully recognizes the important role that agriculture can play in carbon reduction plans;

(4) Protocols to establish offset credits for GHG reduction or sequestration rates are based upon peer-reviewed science;

(5) Retroactive efforts or incremental improvements undertaken by agricultural leaders to reduce GHG emissions and/or sequester carbon must be fully eligible to participate and receive compensation in a carbon credit trading program;

(6) The use of domestic agricultural offsets must not be limited;

(7) Certain practices to reduce GHG emissions will have multiple environmental benefits. Projects that participate in a carbon offset program should not be excluded from participating in other markets for environmental services that exist or may exist in the future;

(8) Activities that result in GHG reductions measured against a fixed baseline date should be deemed eligible/additional;

(9) No leakage analysis should include impacts of offset projects outside the United States;

(10) Agricultural landowners should not be required to place a conservation or other easement over their property to obtain eligibility to participate in carbon trading; and

(11) Consider water storage and infrastructure that allows agriculture to positively influence climate change. (10/Rev. 2020)

No. 355
Compensation for Conservation

All current and future incentive programs that provide payments to landowners for providing specific habitat or conservation benefits, particularly as it pertains to the Endangered Species Act, should include:

(1) Liability protection: If a participant (i.e., farmer, rancher, landowner) commits to make habitat improvements that could lead to an increase or diversification of species, or if they commit to some type of conservation projects that later fail, farmers, ranchers, landowners and adjacent landowners must be protected from liability of unintended outcomes which violate environmental regulations;

(2) Protection of confidential information: Proprietary data about the participant's property and its environmental value collected by a participant or an implementing agency during the course of a conservation project must be kept confidential with no threat of exposure through a Freedom of Information Act or Public Record Act request;

(3) Regulatory Assurances: Contractual arrangements for participation in a conservation or environmental enhancement project must include provisions for termination or renegotiation without increasing the regulatory burdens that would otherwise be imposed. The threat of regulatory enforcement must not be used as a tool to force participation in an unjust contract; and

(4) Sunset Clause: Ongoing revenue payments should be defined with contractual time limits. However, these time limits should not preclude an individual from participating in programs to benefit wildlife on a continual basis.

These four elements are crucial to creating sound conservation programs that serve the public, species, and farmers and ranchers. With the addition of these protections, CFBF would encourage landowners to participate in conservation incentive programs as they would fairly and adequately compensate them for the conservation and habitat values they provide without undue risk of regulatory harm. (03/Rev. 2017)

No. 356
Air Emission Control Strategies

All government agencies should consider the effects of resultant higher fuel consumption of internal combustion engines as well as the exhaust emission products when considering anti-pollution measures.

The California Air Resources Board must be held accountable for economic impacts associated with any rule packages they promulgate. All such rules must go through independent, third-party, cost-benefit analysis before implementation.

We support a licensed exemption from catalytic converters for both government and private equipment which can be shown to be used extensively on dry rangeland, dry land farming or forest land because of fire hazard concerns.

Because of the required special equipment and the undue hardship and extra expense to farmers, and in many cases, reduced cost effectiveness, we support all efforts to exempt farm equipment from retrofit requirements. We support incentives that eliminate and/or substantially reduce the cost of air pollution control devices, retrofits or equipment reducing internal combustion engines on agriculture.

Agricultural practices requiring emission abatement strategies should be eligible to select from a menu of emission abatement options.

We support increased research to produce more efficient, less polluting implements of husbandry. In the meantime, those implements

should be exempt from air pollution control devices.

When air pollution control devices or practices are required largely because of high pollution levels found in air drifting into the region from other areas, the district of origin should be responsible for any additional costs associated with Clean Air Act compliance measures.

All capital expenditures for pollution control devices should be eligible for an investment tax credit. (Rev. 2010)

No. 357
Air Quality Standards

We support reasonable and achievable uniform air quality standards at local, state and national levels. We support local input, control, and administration to achieve air quality standards and regulations. Landowners and/or farmers should not be held responsible for pollution caused by natural or exceptional events, such as wind or pollution from sources that cross international borders into California. All public land managers must adhere to the same air quality standards, rules and regulations to which private entities are held.

We support regional or basinwide input, control, and administration where air pollution problems exist within a multi-county/multi-state area.

We believe interstate air basins may require interstate compacts, but that for intrastate basins, the states should have primary authority. Where either state or federal jurisdiction is involved, we believe one agency should have clear authority to issue any necessary permits and do any monitoring of compliance.

We support the direction and guidance of the USDA Task Force on Agricultural Air Quality and its role in reviewing and making recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture on issues and proposed policies targeting agricultural air quality. We oppose any efforts which require written air pollution control permits for individual farms, ranches or animal confinement facilities or a general permit for the industry.

We support the development and implementation of conservation management practices to assist farmers and ranchers in meeting the objectives of air quality standards. These practices should be voluntary, incentive-based, consistent with sound science, and subject to cost/benefit analysis. We support the farmer's ability to acquire and operate equipment necessary for the production of crops, fowl or animals without encumbering delays resulting from permitting requirements.

We support research to determine air quality benefits related to agricultural production. We support research that quantifies the ozone-scrubbing effects of crops.

California Air Resources Board

State Air Pollution Control Districts must accurately estimate the costs to business as identified by the four-digit standard industrial classification code or its equivalent, when preparing air pollution control regulations. These Districts must equate efficiency in pollution reduction measures with the costs to be incurred by the general public when adopting any regulation.

We support basing air quality standards on sound, peer-reviewed scientific data and analysis regarding health risks and benefits of regulations, with the goal of providing maximum health protection at reasonable cost.

We support air quality regulations which allow local jurisdictions and private industries to concentrate their efforts on the most important health risks or problems. (Rev. 2010)

No. 358
Agricultural Burning

We urge rural cooperation concerning burning restrictions, but we need much more research into crop and animal residue disposal before we can forego some types of burning. We should cooperate with the proper agencies to develop feasible methods of waste disposal. Any regulations, legislation or administrative action affecting the burning of agricultural residues should provide for:

(1) Reasonable time certainty in the removal of agricultural wastes;

(2) Proper delineation of air basin characteristics for minimizing agricultural air emissions, yet maximizing burn days;

(3) Simplicity of implementation in declaring burn and no burn days; and

(4) Allowing county Agricultural Commissioners to determine if there is a prevalence of disease or pest that warrants burning to prevent dissemination and/or economic damage.

We support the concept of increased penalties for the flagrant violation of the agricultural burning regulations. Landowners should not be penalized for the unintentional burning of trash illegally dumped by trespassers or vandals. If trespassers or vandals dump and/or burn trash illegally, the landowner should not be held responsible.

Weather forecasting for agricultural burning days should permit the announcement of those days as soon as practically possible to permit greater cooperation by farmers.

Counties should maintain burning regulations for abatement of diseased bee hives. If burning is not feasible or allowed, supervised burial at the nearest landfill should be done immediately. (00/Rev. 2006)

No. 359
Waste Disposal

Waste disposal sites should be diverted away from productive agricultural lands. Urban wastes, including but not limited to food waste and yard trimmings, should not be applied to agricultural land unless it is for the purposes of producing certified compost, or they are proven to be safe and beneficial. In such an instance that application of urban waste on agricultural land occurs, the landholder should be indemnified from liability. The landholder should retain the right to refuse delivery of urban waste if they believe it will be potentially harmful to their ability to farm. We cannot support the land application of urban waste solely on the basis that it is the least costly means of disposal or is used to meet waste diversion goals.

Wastes should be separated and recycled. There should be incentives for all residents who make an effort to separate waste for proper recycling when such facilities are available. We encourage the production and use of recycled products.

Any beverage sold and not required to be consumed on the premises where sold, should be in non-toxic biodegradable containers or in containers for which a substantial refund is offered for the return thereof. Any non-consumable product that normally incurs a disposal fee above normal volume and tonnage rates at the end of its useful life (e.g., appliances, electronic equipment, tires) should have that disposal fee charged at the original time of purchase. When these time-of-purchase disposal fees are collected, they should be used to create refunds for the proper disposal thereof. Individual agricultural commodities should not be singled out for purposes of funding statewide recycling projects. Existing laws pertaining to littering should be enforced with greater vigor.

Manufacturers should be encouraged to make fewer disposable non-recyclable products out of non-biodegradable material. The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) should develop more comprehensive programs to reduce solid waste and increase landfill space availability in the geographic region where the waste is generated. Alternate methods of disposition of waste, such as incineration or disintegration should be explored.

The disposal of all waste shall occur in an environmentally sensitive manner consistent with applicable state and federal law. (20/Rev. 2021)

No. 360
Illegal Dumping

Illegal dumping on both public and private property has significant impacts on the health and safety of rural and urban communities.

Particularly in a rural and agricultural setting, illegal dumping has severe consequences on environmental and employee safety, food safety, and with limited opportunities for enforcement of the perpetrators, is costly to landholders and the aesthetic of rural lifestyles.

We urge the continued strengthening and enforcement of illegal dumping laws in California.

Public agencies should consider and fund preventative measures to deter illegal dumping on public and private lands.

When violations do occur, fines and penalties should be sufficient to discourage illegal dumping on public and private properties. Proceeds from these fines and penalties should be placed in a fund to mitigate cleanup costs for future cleanups.

If the individual or entity responsible for illegal dumping cannot be identified, then public agencies should be responsible for cleaning up the dumped materials and investigate and recover costs from the responsible party.

In no case should private landowners face civil or criminal penalties associated with illegal dumping for which the landowner is not a responsible party. Landowners should not be responsible for the costs of cleaning up material illegally dumped by others.

Should the violation occur on private property, appropriate local public agencies responsible for cleanup should work with landholders to obtain access to private properties for cleaning up material illegally dumped by others.

We support grants and other funds being available for cleanup of illegal dumping on private lands. (2020).

No. 361
Hazardous Materials

We urge the development of disposal systems which provide incentives to encourage lawful disposal of hazardous materials.

The designated County Certified Unified Program Agency (UPA), County Fire Marshal, or Agricultural Commissioner should coordinate inspection requirements among their agencies in order to alleviate the overlapping multiple inspections and fees some counties are subjecting farmers to. The inspection and regulation of hazardous materials should preferably be directed by the County Agriculture Commissioner. The designated UPA should make use of the information provided on the California Electronic Reporting Service that every business storing hazardous materials is required to file rather than requiring additional information during the inspections. The Threshold Planning Quantity (TPQ) for propane and fertilizers should be increased to 500-gallon liquid tank storage, 2,000 pounds, or 1,000 cu. ft. per tank. In addition, for agriculture operations with minimal amounts of hazardous material, the inspection should occur once every four years at the discretion of the County Agriculture Commissioner. (Rev. 2020)

No. 362
Underground Fuel Tanks

We support legislative efforts to implement low-cost methods of onsite cleanup of leaking underground tanks and enact reasonable limits on the liability for the costs of cleaning up leaking underground tanks. (1989)

No. 363
Agricultural By-Products Recycling

We support the use of agricultural by-products that accomplish their primary purpose and provide additional environmental benefits.

Agricultural by-products are not industrial waste. Fruit, nut, vine and vegetable processing by-products are unused materials generated from food product processing. We encourage the reuse of these products wherever possible and for such uses as animal feed, biomass fuel, soil amendments, value-added products or other recyclable or reclaimable products as may be identified. If monitoring is required, local agencies should put in place a responsible program that meets the needs of good environmental stewardship in the local watershed and the needs of the governing regulatory authority.

Producers must retain the prerogative of disposing of animal waste by land application to the maximum beneficial extent. But in all cases, the effects of downstream pollution must be taken into consideration. The use of animal wastes by recycling through feedstuffs should be thoroughly researched, and not prematurely prohibited.

Composting should be exempt from regulation by the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) when it is on a farm, using farm-generated plant and/or animal waste materials. (06/Rev. 2022)

No. 364
Wilderness Areas

We believe that properly managed land results in higher sustained yields of water, forage, timber, minerals and energy. Grazing and logging are important elements of the multiple-use concept. We support efforts to minimize acreage designated as wilderness. All public land designated as non-wilderness should be managed in accordance with federal statutes and regulations allowing and regulating continued utilization of renewable resources.

Adjacent and affected landowners should be notified and local public hearings held prior to lands being designated as wilderness. Local governments should be involved to establish coordination with federal agencies.

Users of any roads that are in or adjacent to wilderness areas including livestock, mining and forestry and have been previously permitted should be given an unconditional guarantee that such activities could continue for all time. (Rev. 2011)

No. 365
Hardwood Rangelands

We are opposed to the regulation of hardwood rangelands, including the requirement for Timber Harvest Plans (THPs). (1995)

No. 366
Vegetative Management and Wildfire Hazards

We support legislative, administrative, and educational efforts to reduce dangerous levels of fuels in the forests, brushlands and rangelands of California.

We are opposed to any efforts which would restrict or discourage use of prescribed or controlled burn programs on private land. However, we recognize that prescribed burns are only one of the tools that can be utilized. Prior to prescribed or controlled burns, fuel loads should be reduced, preferably through mechanical thinning, logging, and/or grazing. In addition, all public land managers must adhere to the same air quality standards, rules and regulations to which private entities are held and increased public burning should not adversely affect burning activities of private industries.

We urge continued participation of state and federal agencies in controlled burning programs by providing adequate financial resources, advice, and the allocation of standby crews and equipment for the protection of adjoining landowners during and after controlled burns.

We support efforts and policies that encourage prescribed burns as a management tool. Any comprehensive prescribed-burn program must not only promote the safe use of prescribed burns and other forest-management tools but should also adequately address legal-liability standards in conjunction with regulatory requirements.

We support the granting of variances from air-quality standards to allow greater opportunity for prescribed burns, streamlined permitting, and cooperation with and among local, state, and federal agencies both in permitting and cooperative pre-burn projects.

In addition, we support the continuation of the Vegetation Management Program (VMP) which offers cost sharing on prescribed burn projects carried out by the California Department of

Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) on non-federal lands.

Funds made available to any agency for control and prescribed burn program purposes should be used to assist producers and landowners in cooperative programs upon lands where the benefits from the expenditure of such funds will provide substantial public benefits through the reduction of fire hazards and enhancement and protection of range, recreational areas, wildlife habitat, timber lands and water sheds.

We recommend that the administrative regulation of the VMP and the controlled burning programs remain with CalFire.

Grazing is often the most natural, cost-effective way to avoid the accumulation of excessive amounts of dry grass, weeds and brush. We urge legislation that would require that all lands controlled by governmental agencies be grazed except where the agency makes a clear, scientifically supportable case that a particular area should not be grazed.

We support additional research to document the positive role of livestock grazing in the control of wildfire hazards and to improve resource conditions. (Rev. 2019)

No. 367
Harmful Invasive Species

We support a comprehensive national policy addressing the introduction and management of harmful invasive species. Programs should rely on cooperative, voluntary, partnership-based efforts between public agencies, private landowners, and concerned citizens.

The development and adoption of statutory policy and control measures to deal with harmful invasive species should be based on the following principles:

(1) Regulations and statues that do not interfere with or erode property rights;

(2) Clear criteria to delineate what are harmful invasive species and not defined to include beneficial non-native species;

(3) Regulations that include emergency measures to allow for timely use of chemical controls;

(4) Recognize and address the role of harmful invasive species as part of the consideration of endangered or threatened species determination;

(5) Funding dog inspection teams used for pest detection;

(6) State and federal funding adequate to develop science sufficient to determine long-term effects of non-native species;

(7) Development by California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), seed growers, and the seed industry of practices such as: (a) the seed industry making accredited seed-test results available to growers for pathogens/diseases of concern, and (b) the development and dissemination of best management and production practices for the seed industry and growers to prevent the introduction and spread of harmful pathogens/diseases that pose a high risk to California agriculture; and

(8) Allowing aggrieved parties to initiate mediation proceedings with CDFA for damages resulting from the introduction into a county of a harmful seed-borne pathogen/disease. CDFA should ensure that existing seed complaint and mediation processes are capable of making findings related to grower losses caused by pathogen-infected seed and the responsible party pay for economic damages caused to the grower.

Indemnification of crop and livestock losses from harmful invasive species should be available when it can be documented that the quarantine requirements or treatment methods are the basis for the loss. Funding for inspection services and facilities and for public education and outreach efforts should be increased.

Public lands should be managed to reduce and eliminate impacts of harmful invasive species as effectively as private lands and in coordination with neighboring privately owned or leased land. Any efforts on public lands that affect the uses and private rights held by public land permittees and users shall be subject to compensation and fair market value for the taking of these limited property rights by the introduction or proliferation of harmful invasive species.

Proper incentives should be provided for farmers and ranchers to effectively control noxious and aquatic weeds along with support for an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach.

We believe federal, state and local agencies should work more closely with private landowners and industry to address harmful invasive species problems. Any harmful invasive species management program that is proposed, other than actionable pests should not create additional restrictions on agricultural producers, landowners and industry.

When determining opportunities for biofuel crops, these crops' potential impacts on other farm and rangelands as harmful invasive species must be considered. (04/Rev. 2015)

No. 368
Fertilizer Use

The use of fertilizers, both natural and synthetic, has a long history of improving agricultural production. We support their continued economic use in all instances where safe and without significant adverse environmental impact.

No. 369
Sewage Sludge Disposal

With the conflicting scientific information currently available from reputable research institutions, we urge a cautious approach on the utilization of sewage sludge as an agricultural fertilizer or soil amendment.

Until more scientific data are accumulated on the safety of land application of sewage sludge on California farmlands and crops and until the liability issues are resolved, and a comprehensive long-term health risk assessment is completed, we do not support the lessening of protections governing its use.

We should insist on the development of guidelines for the land application of sewage sludge which would include but not be limited to the use of a site-specific assessment.

We support the use of a site-specific environmental assessment which carefully considers, among other things, the levels of heavy metals in the soils and water supply in the area destined for the application. Any site-specific plan must address and provide for disposal of salts without third party impacts.

We cannot support the land application of any municipal or private waste solely on the basis that it is the least costly means of disposal. Generators of sewage sludge should maximize the use of their sewage sludge within their own cities and counties before seeking other users.

All applications should be done in a manner which minimizes risks to the public, the environment and the long-term viability of agricultural land. Local agencies must retain their ability to regulate the land application of all forms of sewage sludge.

Farmers and ranchers utilizing sewage sludge should be sensitive to the implications of marketing products grown with sludge. Those utilizing sewage sludge should follow prudent management practices, including requiring the producer/seller to fund independent testing to ensure conformance to standards of composition and to guarantee that maximum application/loading rates are not being exceeded and that soil and water contamination will not occur. The testing should occur on a regular basis. Sludge products should meet the strictest pathogen and pollutant criteria established by current law.

Farmers should protect themselves from risks by securing an indemnification and hold harmless agreement with the sludge generator and others associated with the application, underwritten by an appropriate private or public insurer. All contracts should be signed by the titled landowner and any affected lessees.

All liability for pollution caused by sludge, that was otherwise legally applied, shall be borne by the sludge generator. (Rev. 2001)

No. 370
Cannabis

With the further development of state regulations related to cannabis, it is important that Farm Bureau engage in this issue to protect agriculture as a whole.

California Farm Bureau does not advocate for or against cannabis, but it may advocate on issues related to cannabis that affect other agricultural crops or producers.

County Farm Bureaus shall retain local discretion to address the development of policies regarding cannabis, since there is extreme variation from county to county in how cannabis is viewed.

For the purpose of this policy, industrial hemp is not considered to be cannabis.

It is recommended that:

(1) Local jurisdictions continue to have the authority to decide how to implement cannabis regulations.

(2) The regulation of cannabis not lead to additional regulations for other agricultural crops. Cannabis should be afforded no additional regulatory or administrative benefits over other agricultural crops or producers.

(3) Initial funding to develop cannabis programs should not derive from the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) budget.

(4) The fiscal impacts on the CDFA as well as to individual county Agricultural Commissioner departments from regulatory responsibilities related to the state cannabis regulations be paid for out of revenues received at the state level from the cannabis permitting or taxation process.

(5) Land use programs important to agriculture such as the Williamson Act, Timberland Preserve Zone and Right to Farm not be impacted by the cultivation or processing of cannabis. Cannabis cultivation may be a compatible use—not a qualifying use—under the Williamson Act.

(6) The state work to develop an impairment standard related to the use of cannabis for public safety and employer guidelines.

(7) Vigorous educational efforts be maintained to inform youth, parents and others concerning the harmful effects of drug abuse.

No. 371
Pollinators

Native pollinators provide benefits to agricultural production. Agricultural producers support voluntary efforts to improve habitat for pollinators as long as they do not interfere with agricultural practices and use. (2020).

No. 372
Climate Change

Market-based incentives, such as carbon credit trading, are preferable to government mandates.

We support:

(1) Science-based, peer-reviewed research to determine the causes and impacts of global climate change;

(2) A voluntary market-based carbon credit trading system with clear, science-based and consistent standards for calculating the amount of carbon sequestered by agricultural practices that is not detrimental to other agricultural producers, provides credits for previously implemented practices that sequester carbon, and accounts for regional ecological differences;

(3) If a government agency is to set the "carbon credit" standards for agriculture, it should be the USDA or CDFA;

(4) Compensation to farmers for future, current and past activities such as planting crops, managing native and tame grasslands, planting and managing forestland or adopting farming practices that keep carbon in the soil or plant material or improve water quality or water-use efficiency;

(5) Alternative energy sources, which will minimize atmospheric pollution;

(6) Incentives to industries seeking to become more energy efficient or to reduce emissions of identifiable atmospheric pollution and the means of preventing it;

(7) Market-based solutions, rather than federal or state emission limits, being used to achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from any sources;

(8) EPA's re-evaluation of burdensome emission-control rules for farming practices, farm equipment, cotton gins, grain handling facilities, etc.;

(9) The inclusion of the agricultural community as a full partner in the development of any policy, legislation or markets;

(10) Research and development to better assist farmers in handling weather events and better adapting to weather conditions;

(11) Initiatives, research and education that promote soil health, water quality and soil/water conservation, yield, and quality efficiency, to be implemented on a voluntary basis;

(12) Ongoing educational campaigns emphasizing the positive impact agriculture has on the climate;

(13) Education programs for farmers and farmland owners with negotiating carbon sequestration language to provide fair and equitable compensation, adequate legal protection and liability limits;

(14) Unbiased science-based research on climate change;

(15) Scientific research to document the continuous improvement and beneficial impact of agricultural efforts designed to increase climate resilience, improve water quality and soil health, sequester more carbon in the soil, and prevent soil erosion;

(16) Incentivizing farmers to voluntarily improve on-farm energy efficiency;

(17) Incentivizing improvements to the current electric grid;

(18) Using a broad spectrum of power sources like renewables, hydroelectric, biofuels and nuclear energy to help facilitate the market-derived cost of energy;

(19) Federal and state climate change policy that reflects regional variations;

(20) When sources of greenhouse gasses are being evaluated, wildfires should be considered and compared as a source of greenhouse gas emissions as a means of supporting timber harvest and fuels reduction;

(21) Research and education to create standards in the carbon credit markets; and

(22) The ability of farms of all sizes to participate in climate programs.

We oppose:

(1) Climate change legislation that establishes mandatory cap-and-trade provisions;

(2) Climate change legislation that is not fair, affordable, or achievable;

(3) Any law or regulation requiring reporting of any GHG emissions by an agriculture entity;

(4) Any climate change legislation that would make America California less competitive in the global marketplace and put undue costs on American Californian agriculture, business and consumers;

(5) Mandatory restrictions to achieve reduced agricultural greenhouse gas emissions;

(6) Any regulation of GHG by EPA;

(7) Any attempt to regulate methane emissions from livestock under the Clean Air Act or any other legislative vehicle;

(8) The imposition of standards on farm and ranch equipment and other non-highway use machinery;

(9) Inclusion of the carbon impacts resulting from indirect land use changes in other countries in the carbon life cycle analysis of biofuels;

(10) Taxes or fees on carbon uses or emissions;

(11) Any and all emissions taxes on livestock;

(12) Any laws or policies that implicate agricultural activity of any kind as a cause for climate change without empirical evidence; and

(13) Any new climate change program that would detract from or weaken the current USDA safety net programs (crop insurance, ARC/PLC, etc.). (2023)

Property Rights and Land Use

No. 401
Property Rights

Property rights are basic and essential to the personal freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America. Private property must not be damaged nor taken for public use without critical and absolute need documented therefore, with no possible alternative demonstrated. Property should not be condemned in fee title if a lesser interest will suffice.

In no event should eminent domain be used to take private property for a private business development.

Water rights are valuable property rights that are inviolate.

We oppose further extension of the power of eminent domain or the right of immediate possession (condemnation to possess) to federal, state, or local governmental agencies, or the granting of such powers to private corporations, foundations, or institutes.

Property owners must be given every protection of the courts in any determination of the necessity of taking property, including unreasonable delay, or property rights for public use together with ascertainment of just compensation determined therefor. Additionally, we oppose the practice of government entities requiring donation or improvement of a right-of-way as a condition for issuing a use or building permit when the activity requested under the permit is unrelated to the right-of-way.

A copy of the detailed appraisal report, including the comparables as it applies to the subject property, shall be rendered to the property owner at least 60 days prior to a filing of an action in eminent domain. Regardless of zoning or current use, the appraisal should reflect the value of the service area the project will serve, the proposed use, or the current use, whichever is greater. Furthermore, the appraisal should include the cost of adverse operational impacts that will be encountered where eminent domain is exercised.

When exercising power of eminent domain, all levels of government must take care to minimize the loss of local property tax base. Where feasible, especially in projects with a recreation potential, privately owned and operated business enterprises must be afforded the opportunity within the project to develop a replacement tax base for local government.

An announced intention of a public agency to exercise eminent domain must stipulate a reasonably short time limit. Further, where such threat of exercise of power of eminent domain results in actual losses to subject property owners through lowered property values, lower rental values, loss of home or income, severance damages, etc., a just compensation to the injured party must be provided by the public agency in question.

Where private property rights are to be affected by any government agency, we support adequate notification of landowners and the general public. That agency should notify all affected property owners of record by registered letter, giving the date, time and place of the hearing, description of the land to be affected and other conditions resulting from the exercise of police powers.

Where police powers are used to provide a general public benefit by forcing dedication of property, the laws pertaining to eminent domain should apply so as to compensate property owners for damage to or taking of private property.

We oppose mandated buffer zones on agricultural land to mitigate for changes in adjacent land uses. If buffer zones are required to protect public and/or private projects, they should be owned and maintained by the governmental agency or private entity. The cost of providing and maintaining a buffer zone should rightfully be borne by the creator of the project, and not the impacted farmer or rancher.

We believe that where these actions by government diminish an owner's right to use his property, damage or restrict the usefulness of his property, or constitute a taking of that owner's property, the government should provide due process and compensation to the exact degree that an owner's property has been diminished by the government's action. (Rev. 2008)

No. 402
Governmental Access to Private Property

Government officials must show just cause prior to entering upon private property. (1995)

No. 403
Mineral Rights

A simple means should be available by which the owner of surface rights to former federal land could also acquire the mineral rights to the same land.

Fee land owners of surface rights should be compensated for all costs of surface land areas occupied or used under any action by another party, which takes land out of production or use, if such use has and is providing income to surface land owners.

Costs should be determined for current loss, ongoing costs, lost income and compensation for disruption of normal farming practices. These costs should be determined by mutual agreement or through a mediation process.

Surface owners should be allowed to regain use of the surface for agricultural production immediately upon the abandonment, suspension or idling of oil, gas, and geothermal resource extraction activities. (Rev. 2012)

No. 404
Intellectual Property Rights

We encourage the strengthening of current intellectual property rights, including plant and seed patents and trademarks, for the purpose of deterring unauthorized use or crop production.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office should reinstate the 10-year domestic production window for purposes of considering new plant and seed patents.

We encourage all governmental entities to protect our trademarks and patents when considering sharing intellectual property with global trading partners. Sharing of intellectual property that could result in amplified foreign competition should be discouraged, unless there is no financial disadvantage to American agriculture.

Government entities and private industry should encourage foreign countries to participate in research projects of new technology and intellectual property.

Enforcement of patents and trademarks should be extended to countries without intellectual property rights regulations through trade negotiations and treaties. (2003)

No. 405
Swamp and Overflowed Lands

Where lands were conveyed to private parties many years ago, with the understanding that those lands qualified for such conveyance as "swamp and overflow lands" the grantees, who in good faith reclaimed and made them productive, should, in the interest of equity, have clear title to them, despite challenges, which claim that some of the lands are actually "tidelands" rather than "swamp and overflow lands." (Rev. 2009)

No. 406
Farmed Wetlands

The current criteria used to define wetlands is too broad and results in large amounts of lands regulated that, from a practical standpoint, do not have wetlands values or functions. For example, man-made or artificial wetlands should not be subject to regulation as they are not naturally occurring waters of the United States. Prior converted cropland no longer exhibits wetland characteristics and should not be regulated as such. Additionally, the definition of ag lands recognized by the agencies is insufficient and should include all commercial agricultural operations as defined by the California "Right-to-Farm" law [Civil Code § 3482.5(e)].

Normal and customary farming practices should be exempt from wetlands regulations. Wetlands legislation should also result in the classification of wetlands by value and function since all wetlands do not share the same values and functions.

Owners of privately held and farmed wetlands must be assured that the priority for use of their lands is agriculture. We support legislation to require compensation be provided to landowners for the loss of value and/or economic use of private lands due to wetlands actions.

Landowners whose agricultural properties receive "wetlands" designations by government agencies for the purpose of administering commodity programs, conserving natural habitats or preserving open space must have full right of a fair and reasonable appeal before the appropriate government agency. Appeals procedures should be expeditious, inexpensive and should allow for judicial review.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service should serve as the lead agency in wetlands delineations of all agricultural land. (Rev. 1995)

No. 407
Wetland Restoration

In light of the loss of productive agricultural acreage, we support maintaining or expanding our current level of agricultural land resources to help meet the needs of our nation and the world. Therefore, we oppose efforts to restore extensive acreages to wetlands wherever land has previously been under cultivation for commercial crop production unless the landowner voluntarily agrees to surrender the traditional use of the property. (Rev. 2009)

No. 408
Mitigation

Proposals to use agricultural land for mitigation should be considered by each county Farm Bureau on their own merits on a case-by-case basis.

We oppose government mandated deed restrictions or easements acquired by the use of eminent domain.

Agricultural Land Mitigation

When mitigation is required for farmland conversion, CFBF supports the use of voluntary agricultural conservation easements.

Subsequent easements granted on lands with agricultural easements should not restrict or reduce the agricultural productive capacity of the land, including crop choice.

Mitigation Banks

Due to the inherent conflict of interest, mitigation banks should not be owned or operated by a governmental agency or agencies when the agency or agencies have regulatory responsibilities over the private property or operator. (Rev. 2019)

No. 409
Government-Owned Land

Long-Term Goal

We believe that ownership and operation of the maximum of land resources should be under private rather than governmental control.

County Boards of Supervisors should protect the environmental and socio-economic well-being of their local communities and citizens. This can be accomplished by engaging in joint coordinated resource planning with federal land management agencies as allowed by agency regulations, an executive order established in 2004 and by federal environmental statutes.

Lands acquired by government or utilities for particular purposes and are no longer essential, should be returned expeditiously to private ownership with preference to previous owners where possible, and without reservation of water and mineral rights. Where county or public roads formerly served such areas, the public interest in and public access rights of such roads should be restored by the government or utility before disposition.

We believe federal, state and county land disposals to private operators should be in sufficiently large units to be economic, but small enough to be of interest to the average size operators.

Small, isolated units of publicly held property should be offered for sale to private operators, with preference to adjacent owners.

Acquisition of Land

State, local and federal agencies should not acquire agricultural land for the purpose of fish, wildlife, and habitat protection or public recreation. Agencies proposing such acquisitions must be required to demonstrate that no government-owned or controlled land is available for the above purposes. The government should complete a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review on any land proposed for acquisition to determine if acquiring such land is in the public interest. In addition, to acquire or to have land conveyed to the government, the agency should also be required to demonstrate conclusively an integrated program of land use and the need for the acquisition before being permitted to purchase, further expand or to transfer land from one governmental agency to another.

Management plans and budgetary information should be required on all lands proposed for acquisition by government agencies, prior to such acquisition, so that they can be made a part of any public hearing process.

Preparation of management plans prior to acquisition would give a number of assurances:

(1) That management of the lands would comply with local jurisdictions' general plans;

(2) That the lands would remain in agricultural production; and

(3) That the lands would be managed so as to minimize damages to adjacent private ownerships.

We oppose the practice of government funding through grants or other means to organizations and foundations in order to purchase private land with the intent, purpose or understanding that such land will be resold or donated to some governmental entity. Such practice frequently diminishes the tax base of local units of government and ultimately increases governmental costs, agency staffing and appropriations.

Compensation

Landowners should be entitled to the fair market value when land is acquired by government agencies for the creation or expansion of park lands, the acquisition of right-of-way easements or other uses.

We believe that counties and the state should be fully reimbursed for any lands transferred to another level of government, and counties should be fully reimbursed for any private lands transferred from the county tax rolls to the government. If cash reimbursement is impossible, we recommend transfers of government land of equal value.

Multiple Use

We continue to support the multiple use of federal, state or county lands.

We are opposed to government and public agencies changing multi-use policies on government-owned land that will have a negative economic effect on local governments and surrounding

communities. We believe that when considering competing uses on these lands, that the responsible agencies should consider the impacts of losing base industry and funding for affected counties when determining the priority of uses. Any proposal to restrict multiple-use activities on government-owned lands should be offset by the transfer of productive public lands to private ownership.

Uses of these lands include apiary placements, grazing, mining, timber management, wildlife, feral horses and burros and recreation. When considering the impacts to resources, management of all of these uses is necessary in order to protect the environment. Activities like livestock grazing should not be singled out for regulation when other activities in many instances may prove far more detrimental to the resources.

Lands under government control should be administered to encourage the greatest use and improvement. Where such lands are available for private use, there should be as much security in tenure for the user as is compatible with the public interest together with encouragement in the adoption of land improvement programs in cooperation with government. We also believe that prior use of property develops an equity for which compensation should be made, if encumbered.

Grazing

Grazing rights should be protected for present and future generations. Individuals charged with administering grazing on public lands should be adequately trained in rangeland management.

All agencies charged with managing grazing on public lands should develop a process to train and eventually certify employees as "rangeland professionals." Over a reasonable period of time, the acquisition and maintenance of this certificate would become a condition of employment.

We urge a strategy be developed by the agencies in cooperation with permittees to allow grazing to continue on expiring permits until the necessary documentation required by the agencies can be completed.

We support the continued authorization of off-highway vehicle travel by federal land grazers as necessary to comply with the terms and conditions of their permits.

The public has the right to expect that ranchers will demonstrate stewardship on federal lands entrusted to them. Public benefits provided by science-based management include: thriving, sustainable rangelands; quality watersheds; productive wildlife habitat; viable rural economies; and tax-base support for critical public services.

To ensure the continuation of these public benefits, ranchers require opportunity for profit, growth, security of tenure, and the ability to market and apply their resource management expertise. They also require incentives for additional investment in improvements and protection of their private property rights.

The California Department of Parks and Recreation has for many years evidenced an extreme bias against livestock grazing in state park units. A similar bias has also long been evident in the management of our national parks. While we understand and agree that livestock grazing is not compatible with certain uses, the systematic elimination of grazing throughout the public park system is unjustified and in some cases is unnecessarily jeopardizing park resources and adjacent private properties. We therefore support legislative or other actions to promote grazing as a land management tool when appropriate in public land systems.

We support a grazing fee for federal lands that is based on an economic formula. This formula should:

(1) Be based on good scientific data;

(2) Provide for the economic and social stability for the industry and Western rural communities;

(3) Recognize permit value;

(4) Recognize good stewardship and resource enhancement; and

(5) Recover the direct and reasonable costs of managing the grazing program.

Wild Horse and Burro Program

The taxpayer has the right to expect the Wild Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act to be fully implemented. This includes managing population numbers of wild horses and burros to protect rangeland health and the other authorized multiple uses that share the same ecosystem. The Act requires the establishment of herd population ranges within each herd management area. We support an aggressive schedule of gathers that reduces herd numbers to within these established ranges. We believe that timely gathers by helicopter are the only cost-effective and humane way to finally achieve and maintain the numbers at or below the required levels.

We maintain that the only way to bring the Wild Horse and Burro Program costs under control in the short term and decrease them over time, is to gather and remove horses to the minimum allowable numbers as quickly as possible and then maintain those population levels with tools such as fertility control, sex ratio adjustments and occasional removals.

We encourage the agencies to explore ways to reduce the cost of long-term holding through improved pasture contract solicitation and utilization of currently existing land set aside programs.

We support the inclusion of both the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service when developing policies, legislation and funding proposals affecting the management of wild horses and burros.

Water Rights

We believe publicly held land should be treated exactly as private land in the establishment of water rights and that the same state laws and judicial history should govern the establishment of quantity, quality, and priority of rights.

Ecosystem Management

So far it appears that the only purpose of ecosystem management as used by government agencies is to remove appropriate and beneficial multiple uses. We believe that timber harvest, mining and grazing activities are a valuable component of the ecosystem management and that recreational activities, the impacts of wildlife and feral horses and natural events like fires and floods must be considered. We further believe that these activities should be managed with the same scrutiny as grazing, timber and mining activities.

Endangered Species Act / Section 7 Consultation

There should be no interruption of existing grazing rights under grazing permits and leases on federal lands during a consultation between the federal land management agency and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act. Grazing permits that expire during consultation should be renewed under the same terms and conditions until consultation is complete, unless there is clear and convincing evidence that such terms and conditions present an imminent threat of direct injury to individuals of the species that is the subject of the consultation, which jeopardizes the continued existence of the species on lands covered by the permit or lease before the consultation can be completed. If such evidence is produced, only the least burdensome additional interim terms and conditions should be imposed which are required by the need to protect the continued existence of the species until consultation is complete.

Rights of the Grazing Permittee or Lessee and Duties of the Federal Land Management Agency Under Section 7 Consultation

Grazing permittees and lessees should have full rights of participation as applicants in any Section 7 consultation directly affecting their permits or leases, including notice of and full rights of participation in all meetings, and copies of all data, reports, analyses, opinions and other documentation related to the consultation. All scientific data, reports, analyses, opinions, and management expertise presented by applicants should be given equal status to such information from any other source and should be received into the record and given full consideration by the land management agency and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Decisions resulting from the consultation should be based on sound science regardless of the source.

In consultations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the federal land management agency should be required to protect and maintain all uses on its lands as delineated in its Land Management Plan and provided for under other federal laws governing its jurisdiction over the federal lands, to the fullest extent such uses can be maintained without jeopardizing the continued existence of the subject species. It should be the land management agency which makes the final decision regarding restrictions on such uses for the purpose of protecting species, and such decisions should be upheld so long as they are based on substantial evidence produced during consultation.

The land management agency should be required to prepare a written analysis of all management alternatives, including those presented by the applicant, and justify its preferred alternative based on substantial evidence in the record. The preferred alternative should be the alternative which imposes the least restrictions on the applicant consistent with protecting the continued existence of the species. The applicant should be allowed to respond to the draft analysis of alternatives and to present additional evidence before the final preferred alternative is adopted.

The applicant should have standing to challenge any interim or permanent terms and conditions imposed for the protection of the subject species, on the ground that they are not supported by substantial evidence, or that there are equally effective but less restrictive alternative terms and conditions presented to the federal land management agency during consultation and supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Post-Fire Management

For the long-term forest health and productivity, post-fire salvage, reforestation and weed and brush control should be among the highest priorities on all government owned lands. Timely post-fire timber salvage can provide funding for these rehabilitation activities as well as substantially reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Proper timing of restoration activities, such as seeding and brush control, is important for preventing invasive species, tree encroachment, and erosion, and to protect water quality. It is important to have clear national direction on post-fire salvage and reforestation to encourage these activities.

We support the development of an improved communication strategy between wildfire incident command team managers and grazing permittees. (Rev. 2020)

No. 410
Benefits of Livestock Grazing

Livestock grazing provides many benefits to the environment, wildlife, ranchers, and communities. Grazing is an important management tool on private and public lands. The continued benefits derived from grazing California's private rangelands are often dependent upon managed grazing on public lands.

Grazing animals have been a natural, vital part of grassland ecology for thousands of years. California's rangelands include rich and varied habitats. The species that rely on these rangeland habitats largely exist today due to the positive management practices of the ranchers who have owned and operated these lands and are committed to the continued health of these landscapes. Grazing plays an important role in managing healthy ecosystems. Grazing management should continue to adapt to and utilize scientific research and industry-tested management practices. Grazing is often the most practical, economic and environmentally acceptable way to prevent the accumulation of excessive fuel loads and thereby reduce the damage caused by wildfires in California rangelands.

Benefits of livestock grazing include:

- lowered fire hazard by reducing fuel loads;
- improved control of invasive species;
- improved water quality, biodiversity, wildlife habitat, and plant communities; and
- maintenance of open space.

We support efforts to educate both the general public and government agencies as to the scientific research and resulting data regarding the effects of well-managed livestock grazing. We support incentives and monetary compensation for environmental benefits provided by producers. We support controlled grazing on qualified Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) land, and state and federally managed land.

Grazing on California's rangelands is often the most profitable use and the use that provides the greatest environmental benefits. Rangelands should be recognized at a level equivalent to that of other agricultural lands.

Private rangelands are often located in California's fastest growing counties and are at significant risk of conversion to development and other uses. These rangelands are a critical foundation of the economic and social fabric of California's ranching industry and rural communities; and they will only continue to provide this important working landscape for California's plants, fish, and wildlife if private rangelands remain in ranching. (2009)

No. 411
Government or Public Utility Purchases of Land in Fee or Easement by Eminent Domain

Governmental agencies and utilities should not purchase excess lands with the intent of reselling them. Any land acquired by government or utility that is in excess of stated need should not be leased or sold to another party or agency before offering it back to the original owner for the price acquired or appraised value, whichever is less, or to the current owner of the parcel from which it was created at the appraised value.

Any land abandoned or not put to intended use within five years of its acquisition must be offered to its previous owner at the purchase price or appraised value, whichever is less.

State and federal agencies should be prohibited from using eminent domain for acquiring agricultural land for the purpose of fish, wildlife, and using eminent domain for habitat protection or public recreation. (Rev. 2001)

No. 412
Antiquities Act

Congress should have sole authority in creating any new national monument. Any proposal to create such a monument should first be approved by the member(s) of Congress, landowners and counties affected by this decision. (2001)

No. 413
Protection of Archeological Sites

Land improvement and management projects on government lands or funded with public money are often needlessly delayed or deferred due to statutory and regulatory requirements to protect archeological (cultural) resources.

A simple, cost-effective system is needed to ensure that these necessary, valuable projects can move forward in a timely manner, while still providing for protection of these cultural resources. The level of protection should be commensurate with the potential for disturbance from the project and the relative value of the protected resources. (2004)

No. 414
Environmental Review Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) should recognize that adverse impacts on agricultural resources significantly

affect the environment. Agricultural resources include agricultural land, its watershed, and surface and ground water resources used for agricultural production as well as other natural and economic components necessary to produce agricultural commodities in an efficient and profitable manner. Local government should be required to establish a threshold at which the conversion or loss of agricultural resources to non-agricultural uses becomes a significant environmental impact, along with economic viability. Any subsequent CEQA review should be at both the planning and project level.

We support legislative efforts to require that all public agencies comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) when acquiring any interest in agricultural resources. American Indian tribes should be required to comply with CEQA and NEPA on any project, whether or not the land is held in trust status by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Customary plant and animal husbandry practices are not subject to CEQA review. We oppose any changes in CEQA that would add regulatory burdens on agricultural activities, including farming in greenhouses. We also support legislation which would exempt commercial timber growing and harvesting from the CEQA because the Forest Practice Act adequately protects the environment. (99/Rev. 2006)

No. 415
California Coastal Commission

The authority of the California Coastal Commission relative to agriculture and agricultural practices should defer to local government agencies through approvals of Local Coastal Plans (LCPs) and delegated permitting authority thereunder; protecting and promoting a viable coastal agricultural industry should be integral to any LCP. The Coastal Commission should support production agriculture within the coastal zone through categorical exclusions of on-going agricultural practices from any coastal development permitting requirements.

Intensification of land use, as defined in the Coastal Act, should not include rotation of crops, changes or conversions to or from permanent crops, changes in irrigation water uses, field preparation and grading, spraying, or other cultural practices, or necessary infrastructure to support ongoing crop cultivation and grazing operations currently permitted under applicable local ordinances. The long-term sustainability of coastal agriculture should allow for flexibility to respond to market conditions and improvement or changes to management practices.

Consideration should be given to include long-term fallowing as agricultural best management practice; replanting of a crop after a fallow period should be exempt from a coastal development permit. (86/Rev. 2018)

No. 416
Threatened and Endangered Species

Recognizing the failure of the current system of regulation to recover species and its inherent disincentives for farmers and ranchers to conserve habitat, our goals for the amendment and reauthorization of the ESA should focus on the following principles:

(1) Agricultural producers should not be held liable for any "take" that occurs, accidental or incidental, during normal agricultural operation;

(2) The ESA should be an incentive-based law;

(3) Landowners shall be treated fairly;

(4) The ability to produce food, fiber and all other agricultural products is not abridged;

(5) Landowners shall be fairly compensated for losses when their property is converted or restricted in use to benefit the public;

(6) A thorough scientific review of listing and delisting petitions, biological opinions and recovery plans is required. All ESA actions must be science based, practical and economically feasible. Creation of recovery plans for every listed species should be the highest priority for the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and responsible federal agencies and should be completed as quickly as possible. Designation of recovery habitat should occur only upon completion of the appropriate recovery plan, and should be based upon the plan while setting a realistic goal for delisting a species;

(7) Terrestrial and aquatic rear-and-release programs should be encouraged. Offspring of those captured and released shall be considered when evaluating the recovery of a listed species, and when assessing the viability of an entire population in order to determine listing or delisting of the species under the ESA;

(8) A peer review of data should be required prior to listing; and

(9) Any conservation efforts on public lands that affect the uses and private rights held by public land permittees and users shall be subject to compensation at fair market value for the taking of these limited property rights. (Rev. 2006)

No. 417
Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Compatibility

The Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep (SNBS) is listed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act, and lives primarily on federal lands in Inyo, Mono, and Fresno Counties. We believe the SNBS should not be listed as a subspecies, but rather as part of the larger Bighorn Sheep population. Absent scientific evidence of disease transmission, domestic livestock grazing should not be restricted due to SNBS presence or critical habitat designation. We support:

(1) Scientific research that clearly defines the influence of domestic sheep, including potential disease transmission, on the population sustainability of Bighorn Sheep;

(2) Research to determine the many causes of premature death and disease in Bighorn Sheep, such as range conditions, transplant policy, nutrition, mineral deficiency, lack of genetic diversity, predation, adverse winter conditions, observed density-dependent decrease and others;

(3) Agency efforts to restore the population that focus on the key factors affecting the species, such as predator control, lack of genetic diversity, and transplant practices;

(4) The use of domestic sheep grazing practices to minimize the risk of contact between domestic sheep and Bighorn Sheep, until completion of scientific research on the potential risk of disease transmission; and

(5) The responsible action of public lands agencies to provide alternative allotment allocations for instances where sheep producers' grazing has been revoked due to Bighorn Sheep health concerns. (2011)

No. 418
Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans

Habitat conservation plans (HCPs) and Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) should remain voluntary, incentive-based measures. Private property must not be considered for inclusion in an HCP and/or NCCP reserve area without: prior written notice to each affected property owner; and written permission of the affected landowners. Biological surveys should not be conducted on private lands without written permission from the landowner.

Any buffers necessary for protection of adjacent landowners shall be the responsibility of the entity proposing the HCP and/or NCCP and not that of the adjacent landowners. Landowners adjacent to HCP and/or NCCP preserves must be eligible to obtain indemnification if species protected under the HCP and/or NCCP migrate onto their properties. Such indemnification for landowners must be for the same term as easements or other means used to acquire and/or create habitat lands.

Government agencies must meet strict deadlines in the development of recovery plans, HCPs, NCCPs and the designation of critical habitat. Throughout this process, affected farmers and ranchers should be consulted. No changes should be made to an HCP and/or NCCP without approval by all parties subject to the HCP and/or NCCP.

Scientific justification is needed to show that species are present in the area included in the HCP and/or NCCP or immediately adjacent to the area included in the HCP and/or NCCP before species are included.

When government lands are used for HCP and/or NCCP purposes, the goals of the HCP and/or NCCP must be consistent with traditional multiple use activities.

The development and implementation of HCPs and/or NCCPs must not interfere with the protection of private property, public health or safety. (Rev. 2009)

No. 419
Management of Habitat and Conservation Lands

We are concerned with the impact on farming operations when the agricultural operation is next to property managed for habitat and conservation purposes. Any chemical spray buffer or other required buffer should be on the property managed for habitat and conservation purposes.

The owner of the property managed for habitat and conservation purposes shall control all rodents, pests and noxious weeds on their property. If the owner does not do so, they must compensate the neighboring farmer for any losses that he or she may incur as a result of rodent, pest or noxious weed problems resulting from the adjacent habitat or conservation property. However, compensation should not be a planned substitute for control.

If damage attributed to wildlife becomes an economic problem on adjacent agricultural properties due to the habitat and conservation property, appropriate measures must be taken to control the wildlife, for example deer fencing, or the farmer or rancher must be compensated for his or her losses.

If land managed for habitat and conservation purposes includes levees, those levees must be maintained to protect the current uses from flood losses.

Land managers must be responsible for posting and patrolling such property to keep trespassers from entering and/or crossing adjacent private property.

If threatened or endangered species become established on lands managed for habitat and conservation purposes, agricultural producers should be given "hold harmless" liability protection and "incidental take" protection by the agencies so that farming and ranching practices on their operations are not impaired.

The owners of property managed for habitat conservation purposes must meet periodically with adjacent agricultural landowners to discuss issues for maintaining agricultural operations in the area.

We support the use of grazing animals as an important component in the effective management of habitat and conservation lands.

Specifically, prescribed livestock grazing should be designated as a biological control of invasive plants or for fuel load reduction. Incentive payments for applying prescribed grazing should be included in Farm Bill conservation programs.

The placement of bee hives on all conservation lands is reasonable to help offset the loss of land available to beekeepers due to urbanization and other factors.

We support and encourage the expansion of foraging sites for honey bees and other pollinators beneficial to agricultural production.

Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

Haying and grazing of CRP acres should be permitted at the discretion of the secretary of agriculture in weather-related or other emergency situations or as a maintenance tool in a timely manner; however, in these cases, the CRP payment for that year should be reduced by the value gained from haying or grazing.

We support a partnership with the federal Wild Horse and Burro Program whereby contract holders could receive either a CRP rental payment or a payment for housing wild horses and burros during all or a portion of the contract.

We oppose breaking of CRP contracts to bring land back into production without some form of reparation. (12/Rev. 2020)

No. 420
Wildlife Corridors

Government-identified wildlife corridors should not cause regulatory impacts on private landowners. Landowners should be compensated for any decrease in agricultural production and land values or use caused by wildlife corridor designation. Landowners should be given the opportunity to review proposed designations to ensure that the data used to identify the corridor is accurate and correct. Government should take the presence of wildlife corridors into consideration when approving development projects, to reduce the impacts of wildlife displacement onto agricultural lands. (2008)

No. 421
Planning and Zoning

Agriculture must participate in the planning and planning implementation needed to guide the orderly development of our rapidly growing communities.

A. Local Control

Planning and planning implementation must remain primarily a local function with final land use decisions remaining with local government. Where metropolitan areas cross county lines or where major transportation corridors inextricably link neighboring counties' patterns of growth, the concept of regional planning may be appropriate to address growth related issues. However, we oppose any effort to authorize taxing or statutory authority for any regional government that supersedes local control. Any regional or subregional planning law should require the adoption of an agricultural element that does not restrict the right to farm or create uses incompatible with agriculture, nor restrict private property rights in the county's regional, subregional or general plan.

All governmental agencies, including schools, should be responsible to local planning agencies (city or county) in their selection of new facility sites as established in general plans.

Jurisdictional problems and disputes should be resolved by contractual agreements between the involved local governments utilizing their joint powers of authority.

B. Land Use Restrictions

We recognize the need for adoption of planning guidelines or criteria for local planning implementation. These guidelines and criteria should be adopted to serve area needs and only after adequate public hearings within each planning area affected. Any changes to a county's general plan must be the subject of local public review, public input and the public hearing process. Restrictions on agricultural land use activities without compensation must be reversed. Any restrictions should be strictly limited to those which are clearly necessary for public health and safety. Existing restrictions should be reviewed by the appropriate governmental agencies and those not clearly necessary to protect public health and safety should be removed.

Easements to convert agricultural land to wildlife habitat or other non-agricultural purposes inconsistent with agriculture should be subject to public and environmental review.

C. Land Use Initiatives

Judicious and sound land use decisions do not lend themselves to the initiative or referendum processes. Deliberative government procedures which take into account the interests of all stakeholders, including landowners, result in the most appropriate land use decisions. Local land use planning initiatives should be considered by each county Farm Bureau on their own merits on a case-by-case basis.

D. Spheres of Influence

Landowners within a city's current or proposed sphere of influence and/or planning areas shall be notified by mail and entitled to participate in all phases of the planning process affecting those areas.

E. Role of the State in Land Use Planning

We support legislation to provide a means of compensating landowners for loss of land values, and local governments for loss of tax base as a result of restrictions applied for the purpose of providing general public benefits.

We oppose the concept of state mandated housing requirements, especially in unincorporated areas. Land zoned for agricultural purposes should be exempt from the fair share housing allocation process. Any proposed legislation, at both the regional and state level, related to growth projections or mandates, should recognize that compact development is more efficient and essential for the protection of our state's agricultural land resources. In general, urban housing and commercial development should be confined to within municipal borders.

We oppose government mandated agricultural deed restrictions in perpetuity that threaten the ability of future generations to manage their resources. However, we encourage innovative alternative compensation programs, such as conservation easements, development rights transference and the issuance of tax credit certificates for property owners who are adversely affected by zoning changes.

F. Agricultural Elements in General Plans

Where appropriate, counties should be encouraged to adopt agricultural elements in their general plans. Agricultural elements should not be used as a tool for preservation of open space unless supported by the local agricultural community.

Non-farm related developments should not be deemed compatible in agricultural zones if the proposed use significantly compromises the productive capability of the parcel or the agricultural zone; displaces or impairs agricultural operations in the area; or induces nonagricultural growth or intensifies pressure for conversion of other lands from agriculture.

Zoning requirements for ag operations, including greenhouse ranges and nurseries, should not require traffic management plans or use permits as part of the approval process. Zoning variation for greenhouses and nurseries should be treated the same as any other agricultural operation located within any zone that allows agricultural use by right.

G. Water Supply Planning

Water supply planning, to serve existing water users and new urban developments, should be an integral part of the general plan process. Local water agencies should be required to demonstrate that there is a sufficient, sustainable water supply that does not compete with agricultural water sources for a proposed urban development prior to approval by the planning agency.

Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) should not directly or indirectly regulate land use, property development, subdivision requirements, or property rights. Cities and counties retain land use authority under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and should not interfere with formation or operation of GSAs formed by local water entities, in order to protect their land use authority.

H. Phasing Boundaries and Urban Limit Lines

We would support the concept of urban phasing boundaries and limit lines when and if it includes as a prominent part the following provisions:

(1) Preservation of the existing irrigation water rights and supplies in full;

(2) Implementation of an effective Right-To-Farm ordinance;

(3) Compensation to affected owners for any consequent decrease in value;

(4) Mandatory use valuation assessment for property tax purposes as currently provided enforceably restricted lands;

(5) Preservation of the rights for landowners to utilize new technology for farming purposes;

(6) Appropriate mitigation by local planning agencies to facilitate long term agricultural viability of operators adjacent to urban phasing boundaries and limit lines;

(7) The urban phasing boundary or limit line has a specific time limit, not longer than the existing general plan; and

(8) The urban phasing boundary or limit line includes only lands that can be adequately serviced by water, sewage and other critical infrastructure needs where they do not burden agricultural needs.

Any habitat protection, green belt, urban phasing boundary and limit line, or similar land use restriction for agricultural land should include the above provisions as a prominent part.

I. Farming in Urban Areas

Where appropriate, we support the creation of general plan goals, objectives and policies that support and encourage continuation or initiation of agricultural uses and opportunities in urban or transitional areas.

J. Economic Development Zones

We support federal and state economic development zones that use tax incentives for land use purposes only under all of the following circumstances:

(1) Ongoing agricultural operations in the area will not be adversely impacted;

(2) Existing businesses are not put at a competitive disadvantage;

(3) Boundaries follow the guidelines set forth in the Cortese-Knox Act; and

(4) The proposed economic development zone is consistent with the appropriate jurisdiction's general plan.

The existing general plan process is the preferred method for designating areas for development. Economic development zones should not be used as a pre-zoning technique for development.

K. Infrastructure Financing

We support setting goals and priorities for state and local infrastructure planning and expenditures to help ensure that future public works investments support more fiscally sound, economically and environmentally sustainable patterns of development in California.

Infrastructure financing assessments on agricultural land should be in direct proportion to the benefit accrued to the agricultural use of the land. Assessments on agricultural land should not subsidize development.

L. Climate Change Adaptive Planning

The primary role of the Federal, State and regional governments regarding climate change adaptive planning should be to inform local government (cities and counties) on proven and peer-reviewed science on climate change. If an adaptive plan is deemed necessary by a local government, it shall retain primary responsibility for developing that plan, through the same process as that for preparing a General Plan. Any such plan should make protection of agriculture a high priority. (Rev. 2023)

No. 422
Coordination by State Agencies

Whenever a state agency initiates planning for an action that may affect land use in a county that is engaged in federal and state land use planning, the state agency should be required to notify the affected county of the proposed action. We support legislation to require state agencies to coordinate their actions with affected counties and with the local comprehensive plan and/or federal and state land use plan of the county.

We should work to rewrite California's Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program to require local government involvement and to analyze economic impacts. (1999)

No. 423
School Site Selection

In addition to the school site selection criteria contained in the California Department of Education School Site Selection Guide, schools should be mandated to involve the county agricultural commissioner at the beginning of the process of school site selection when considering sites adjacent to agricultural operations and to comply with recommendations of the county agricultural commissioner. (2015)

No. 424
Bioregionalism

Bioregionalism recognizes that California possesses a diversity of natural habitats, most of which extend across local jurisdictional boundaries and often encompassing many local authorities. This concept may be useful in certain situations in understanding the complexity of protecting both agriculture and the environment in the state and in promoting cooperation between local jurisdictions to conserve and protect agriculture and the environment.

We oppose bioregionalism when it does any or all of the following:

(1) Erodes private property rights;

(2) Erodes local control;

(3) Increases the influence of non-elected bureaucrats;

(4) Centralizes decision making into a few hands;

(5) Increases the power of government;

(6) Increases the cost of government; and

(7) Disrupts agricultural practices and operations. (Rev. 1996)

No. 425
Variances and Conditional Use Permits

Whenever special conditions are attached to variances they should be specific and deal solely with mitigation requirements that arise from granting the variance. Conditional use permits should not be used to address unrelated social ills. Conditional use permits should not be more restrictive than established in current California state or federal law, unless they are necessary to address specific local situations. (1996)

No. 426
Conservation of Agricultural Land

We are committed to the overall protection of our agricultural industry, as well as the land. We believe the most efficient way of conserving agricultural lands is through the use of voluntary incentive-based programs (e.g., Williamson Act, voluntary agricultural conservation easements) and not through cumbersome governmental regulations. We believe that the economic viability of the agricultural industry should be a high priority in the preservation of the farmland base. We do not support government-mandated deed restrictions, but in the event they occur, just compensation should be provided commensurate with the economic impact of the restriction.

A. Williamson Act

The California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act) has been beneficial in helping to establish and conserve recognized areas of agricultural land and open space, and we will work for its strengthening and its use by more counties.

I. Contract Compliance

Williamson Act contracts must be complied with by all successors in interest of the owner. The restrictions on use apply equally to land acquired by American Indians. The Bureau of Indian Affairs should not allow contracted land to be taken into trust status until the nonrenewal process has run in its entirety. Intermittent fallowing necessary to maintain the viability of the farm or ranch operation does not invalidate contract compliance.

II. Cancellation and Non-Renewal

We support the closing of any loophole in the Williamson Act that could be used to undermine the program's integrity. Land uses that result in the cessation of agricultural pursuits on contracted land clearly undermine the program's integrity and should never be allowed in agricultural preserves. The cancellation of Williamson Act contracts should be approved only under extraordinary circumstances. The non-renewal process represents a landowner's contractual right and is the preferred method of exiting a Williamson Act contract. We view inappropriate cancellations of Williamson Act contracts as a violation of those contracts between the landowner, county and state.

III. Compatible and Incompatible Uses

Certificates of Compliance on antiquated subdivisions maps or government land patents should not be allowed to subvert a Williamson Act contract. The construction of new rental residential units, unrelated to the agricultural operation, should not be allowed on land enforceably restricted by a Williamson Act contract.

We also believe that definition of "recreational activities," as defined under the Williamson Act, should exclude uses that

result in the cessation of agricultural pursuits on contracted land or that have negative impacts on adjacent agricultural lands.

Williamson Act-contracted land should not be acquired by a government entity or joint powers authority to expand parks or wildlife refuges. These uses are incompatible with the continued agricultural use of surrounding contract properties.

Furthermore, habitat enhancement projects on private contracted lands should not be allowed to continue if the project hampers agricultural production on the neighboring properties.

Energy projects located on Williamson Act contracted lands should be incidental and accessory to the agricultural operation and should not impede or reduce the productive agricultural capacity of the land for future uses.

B. Agricultural Conservation Easements

There should be a mechanism to permit the sale of development rights for a period of time less than perpetuity so long as all such transactions remain voluntary. We support legislative efforts to provide substantial income and property tax relief to farmers and ranchers who voluntarily agree to convey agricultural conservation easements or enter into enforceable restrictions similar to Williamson Act contracts, but with longer terms. Deductions for qualified charitable donations of agricultural conservation easements should be allowed to be carried forward until fully utilized.

Easements to convert agricultural land to wildlife habitat or other non-agricultural purposes inconsistent with agriculture should be subjected to public and environmental review.

Subsequent easements granted on lands with agricultural easements should not restrict or reduce the agricultural productive capacity of the land, including crop choice.

C. Farmland Security Zones

We urge all county governments to offer Farmland Security Zone (FSZ) contracts to landowners requesting participation.

D. Fee Title Acquisition

We oppose government purchase of productive agricultural land for the purpose of leasing it back to growers to produce food, fiber

and other agricultural products. Fee title of productive agricultural land should remain in private ownership. (Rev. 2023)

No. 427
Growth Management

Urban development should not be allowed to exceed infrastructure capacity, including water supply availability, wastewater disposal or drainage capacity. Urban development should not be allowed to result in the degradation of air quality, or groundwater or surface water quality. We support the integration of air quality studies and water development in any growth management strategies to achieve significant reductions in urbanization-related emissions and encourage increased investment in water development and other essential infrastructure. (Rev. 2001)

No. 428
New Towns

New towns should only be allowed in areas that are not suitable for agriculture. However, in the event new towns are proposed, they should be located and designed to assure that adverse impacts on agricultural land, such as competition for water, can be satisfactorily mitigated. Furthermore, the town's drainage should dispose of its salt load without causing long term salinity problems either in groundwater or in downstream surface waters. They should be self-supporting in typical city services and utilities required, including, but not limited to, schools, police and fire protection and sewer, water and solid waste disposal, and established on existing public roads or transportation corridors.

In addition, any new town proposal should also be required to plan for an appropriate ratio of employment opportunities to residents and provide housing for all, including persons providing services within the community.

We support limiting entitlements for new towns to five years unless infrastructure is installed and lots are sold. (Rev. 2000)

No. 429
Government Support of Development Rights Programs

If any type of government financing is instituted to fund the purchase or transfer of development rights programs, we believe the following provisions are essential:

(1) The programs must be voluntary;

(2) They should be in defined areas with emphasis on the urban/rural interface;

(3) State or federally funded programs should require mandatory local matching funds to insure local participation and cost effectiveness;

(4) Specific authorization must be made so that customary husbandry practices can be maintained; and

(5) These funds may not be used to facilitate the transfer of privately owned land to public agencies. (89/Rev. 2001)

No. 430
Land Use

Planning and planning implementation should give due consideration to the following:

(1) That agriculture is a basic industry making an invaluable economic contribution, and the encroachment of incompatible uses into agricultural areas should be prevented;

(2) That agricultural land should be recognized and accorded a high priority in county and city general plans and zoning ordinances;

(3) That we support local planning which accommodates orderly, logical contiguous patterns of urban development. To help contain urban sprawl and protect our agricultural resources, responsible government agencies should discourage urban development of agricultural land unless the local jurisdiction has demonstrated efficient use of existing incorporated areas. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) should be required to recognize existing infill and density with specific evaluation findings of each prior to approving a petition or application for a sphere of influence change, annexation or other action that includes productive agricultural land;

(4) That we oppose establishment of urban "leap frog" centers in the state's agricultural areas without due consideration of the adverse effect on ongoing agricultural operations and the fiscal resources of the local government;

(5) We oppose the acquisition of land in rural areas when its transfer to trust status by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is for the purpose of building casinos or conducting tax exempt businesses;

(6) That the operations of farmers should be allowed without needless restrictions;

(7) That the approval of growth management plans should recognize economic as well as environmental factors;

(8) That the demand and need for food will increase with the anticipated worldwide growth in population. Therefore, the recognition of farm land as an important resource should be a high priority;

(9) That agricultural lands shall not be designated open space or viewshed for land use planning purposes; and

(10) The development of brownfields, urban properties that have been contaminated with toxic or other substances, can help reduce the pressure to convert agricultural land to new development while enhancing economic development and improving the quality of life. We support the implementation of a public policy strategy to assist in the reclaiming of land with real or perceived problems of contamination. We believe regulatory streamlining and reducing the costs of cleanup are essential for the success of any brownfield initiative, although in no case should the reclamation and development of brownfields be allowed to adversely affect water supplies or nearby agricultural land.

The implementation of planning for agriculture should be aided by assessment practices which recognize the current agricultural uses of land. (Rev. 2008)

No. 431
Viability in Agriculture

We believe that a viable agricultural property is best defined as land with appropriate economic and natural resources, which when subject to prudent management, and considering adjacent land uses and regulatory constraints, is justifiably retained in agriculture. We do not believe that the price paid by the current owner of agriculturally zoned property should be the sole consideration in determining whether the subject property is agriculturally viable.

The current use of an agricultural parcel should not be the sole determining factor in establishing its economic viability. Small parcels should be recognized as a component in the fiscal scheme of farming and ranching operations. Decision makers should recognize the cumulative impact of the continual creation of small parcels on our state's agricultural resource base. The creation of small agricultural parcels should be based on appropriate local land use. (Rev. 2023)

No. 432
Energy Development

Newly proposed uses for any previously acquired utility easements should require additional compensation to the landowner.

We should use all available means to protect land from transmission and utility corridors where workable alternate routes not passing through agricultural land are available.

When underground utility or transmission lines are installed, costs should not be borne by all utility company customers but should be paid for by the customers requesting underground service.

We seek to develop an orderly plan for the consolidation, development and placement of transmission lines across agricultural land so that the lines will have the greatest degree of compliance with present land use patterns.

We believe the California Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission should work together to develop responsibility and authority to seek mutual cooperation between private and public utility companies.

We urge the use of existing lines and rights-of-way or upgrading of existing lines to transport power.

We believe that any new development of energy resources or expansion of utility transmission facilities should be conducted on existing public lands. Where suitable public land is not available, we urge the support of lease/rent of new utility easement as an alternative to a single payment for condemned land. (Rev. 2002)

No. 433
Historical Use of Rights-of-Way

All changes in use and/or ownership of rights-of-way must honor the reversionary rights and revert to original parcels. The local government agency which receives certification for interim use must be responsible for right-of-way maintenance and policing. (1997)

No. 434
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife should accept habitat enhancement funds as mitigation instead of requiring land acquisitions. (Rev. 1999)

No. 435
Recreation

Population growth and concurrent shrinkage of the work week has increased the demand for recreational space, jeopardizing the agricultural productivity of land in favor of its incidental recreational capability.

We recognize the need for sound programs of outdoor recreational development. It is our desire to cooperate with the public agencies responsible for such programs. It is also our desire to see that agricultural interests are adequately protected when recreational uses are proposed in agricultural areas.

To this end we recommend:

(1) that representatives from agriculture be included on commissions and committees concerned with planning recreational programs;

(2) that private enterprise be afforded every opportunity to develop and operate recreational facilities when and where feasible and when compatible with agricultural activities;

(3) that local units of government assume the responsibility for and costs related to public recreation, including planning, development, liability, public safety and control;

(4) that regional entities conform to local general plans when proposing trail access to private or public lands;

(5) Recreational developments include public safety considerations, including law enforcement and emergency services access, lighting, fencing and signage, as necessary, to deter access to private property;

(6) that regional entities give serious consideration to the detrimental physical impacts (garbage, fence damage, compaction, crop damage, etc.) as well as the liability to the landowner inherently created by locating trails adjacent to or through private property; and

(7) that established governmental recreational programs become self-sustaining.

We recognize the potential to develop free enterprise recreational activities. Legislation is needed which would:

(1) provide that there be no duty of care by the landowner or operator to trespassers;

(2) place a reasonable limit on the amount of liability to guests resulting from damages caused by ordinary hazards such as falling rocks, tree limbs, and irregular terrain;

(3) encourage the Fish and Wildlife Department to license ranchers in the growing and harvesting of game as a business;

(4) prevent implied dedication of property rights resulting from the use of property by persons not so specifically authorized; and

(5) encourage that stock fish of comparable quality be purchased from private hatcheries if they are competitively priced in relation to the cost of rearing such fish through existing federal and state hatcheries.

Land Acquisition and Financing Policy

Fifty percent of the land in California is owned by the government. This offers adequate opportunity for outdoor recreational development without need for further land acquisition by public agencies. This government land ownership is well dispersed over the state and can be made accessible and suitable for recreation through the development of access ways and the necessary onsite facilities.

Whenever a determination is made by any governmental agency that productive agricultural land is needed to protect public facilities or interests, the governmental agency should be limited to the acquisition of rights to the use of the land to the degree necessary to afford the protection required.

General obligation bonds should not be used for recreational purposes, except for recreational facilities that are incidental to infrastructure projects which are appropriately funded by general obligation bonds, such as reservoirs. Such programs should be as self-supporting as possible from revenues obtained through user fees, rather than on revenues derived from adjacent landholders, such as crossing fees, parcel and other special taxes.

Acquisition of access ways over private land for such purposes should be only by negotiation, purchase or lease and not by the use of the power of eminent domain. Greater emphasis should be placed upon development of existing government land.

No future acquisitions of private land by governmental agencies for public use should be allowed to decrease the percentage of land in California which is sharing property tax responsibilities. Future decreases in private landholdings should be offset by sales of public land, either from state, federal or foundation status to private, tax paying status.

Riding and Hiking Trails

We oppose the development of public recreational trails where they are incompatible with adjacent agricultural uses. These trails increase the likelihood of, including but not limited to, theft, vandalism, ecoterrorism, bioterrorism, fire, and food safety and create other problems for neighboring agricultural lands. Unless these issues are addressed to the satisfaction of the impacted landowners and lessees, no trail should be constructed in agricultural areas. When trails and their required buffers are developed, both should be confined to the subject property and should not adversely impact neighboring agricultural operations. We oppose the abandonment of existing compatible equestrian trails on government lands. Trail development should be limited to government-owned land such as government-owned rights-of-way, forest, park and rangeland.

However, should these trails be established on property not owned by the government, they shall be purchased or leased at the owner's option with public funds and the governmental agency responsible for their existence must be responsible and

liable for damages arising out of their use. The use of so-called "police powers" of local government to force the dedication of private property for use by a relatively small segment of the population should be opposed.

Rights-of-Way for Recreational Trails

Landowners should not be required to donate rights-of-ways for recreation trails and other recreational uses as a condition for obtaining any use permit. Such a requirement amounts to the taking of property without due compensation. These trails through and uses of private property also add an increased exposure of the landowner to liability to those injured on the property and upon adjacent properties for off-trail movement. The public agency responsible for the trail should be responsible for indemnifying the property owner or agricultural lessee, against liability and property loss, and compensating landholders if recreational uses create damages such as, but not limited to trespassing, theft, vandalism, fire, damage related to food safety concerns, and crop loss.

Public River Access

Local government must be responsible for mitigating impacts and compensate landowners if public river access occurs next to agricultural lands creating damages such as, but not limited to, trespassing, theft, vandalism, and crop loss.

To ensure that a proposed public access plan shall not infringe on any farmer's right to farm, it is imperative that an adopted Right-to-Farm ordinance be posted and enforced on all recreational access sites. (Rev. 2020)

No. 436
Urban Open Space Preservation

We believe that the preservation of open space lands for visual and recreational benefits within urban centers is a valid concept. However, by no means should the concept of "open space" be confused with the idea of "agricultural preservation."

In the acquisition of agricultural land for open space, said land should not be priced at values lower than that obtainable without down zoning. (Rev. 1988)

No. 437
Motor Vehicles on Public Lands

We support legislation and regulation necessary to adequately regulate the indiscriminate use of motor vehicles on public lands.

Public land management agencies and organized motor vehicle clubs should cooperate in the effort to control indiscriminate use of motor vehicles on public land which results in damage to the land and related natural resources.

No. 438
Trespass Laws

We urge the continued strengthening and enforcement of trespass and vandalism laws in California.

We support legislation which would provide for punishment commensurate with the degree of damage resulting from acts of trespass and/or vandalism.

We support stronger enforcement by the police and punishment by the judiciary of anyone violating trespass and vandalism laws. We support a minimum $500 fine, community service and restitution with a portion of the fine going to help fund local rural crime prevention efforts for all convicted trespass offenders.

We urge that a lien be placed against a person doing property or fence damage, by a court of law, in a complaint filed by the law agency involved.

We support the proposition that no liability nor cause of action shall arise against landowners if trespassers are attacked by guard dogs protecting herds, flocks, crops or property, or if they incur other injuries while trespassing.

We support mandatory restitution for property and/or fence damage caused by vehicles, trespassers or vandals. (Rev. 2003)

No. 439
Trespass Marijuana Grows

Law enforcement shall notify the landowner or managing agency when aware of trespass marijuana grows on private agricultural/resource properties or public lands (USFS/BLM) to provide public safety, protection of wildlife and the environment. In addition, law enforcement shall make reasonable efforts to make arrests with convictions for the person(s) responsible for the trespass grow(s). If law enforcement eradicates trespass marijuana grows from private agricultural/resource properties or public lands they should also, in coordination with the landowner or managing agency, remove all environmentally hazardous infrastructure, refuse, and toxic substances found at the site(s) in a timely manner. Funding for cleanup and restoration activities should be a collaborative effort between law enforcement, environmental agencies and other public or private entities. The costs associated with the cleanup process resulting from trespass grow(s) should not be the responsibility of the private landowner. (2013)

No. 440
Rural Crime

The continued rise in rural crime such as vandalism and theft of agricultural property underscores the need for stricter laws, increased enforcement, and prosecution to the full extent of the law in these areas. We support the efforts of the Rural Crime Prevention Task Force in addressing this problem.

We encourage the assessment of administrative, civil, and criminal charges and monetary penalties for rural crimes at levels equivalent to the severity of the violation and in a manner that encourages the prosecution of violators by state and local officials.

We support additional government funding for the establishment and enhancement of Rural Crime Investigation programs in each Sheriff's Department in California.

Specifically, we encourage (1) the use of the NCIC identification system for farm machinery and agricultural commodities; (2) efforts of county governments to establish ordinances to aid in identification of ownership of agricultural commodities; (3) the development of a livestock identification system, including stricter inspection of animals leaving the state, at points of sale and at slaughter facilities; (4) scrap metal dealers to work with local law enforcement to curb the theft of equipment with metal parts for scrap; and (5) further training of local law enforcement officers in the prevention of agricultural crimes.

We support state funding and enforcement personnel to aid local law enforcement with the removal of illegal drug production from private and state lands, and funding and enforcement personnel from the federal government to aid local law enforcement with the removal of illegal drug production from federal lands.

The increase in illegal drug manufacturing presents a serious problem, especially in rural areas. Innocent property owners should be held harmless for the clean-up costs of clandestine labs.

We support efforts to create a statewide solution to metal theft from rural areas. To reduce the market for stolen metals, a statewide standard for scrap metal recycling should be established.

We support funding of a tracking system covering all counties in California to record agricultural crime and loss data.

We support improved communication efforts between local law enforcement agencies and the agricultural community. (Rev. 2019)

No. 441
Vandalism and Disruptive Activities on Public Facilities

Civilian authority and the courts should accept the responsibility for protecting the rights of the public from dissident elements and vandalism at public facilities. We urge that current laws be enforced, including those pertaining to restitution.

No. 442
Structural Fire Insurance

Rural residents should have access to reasonable structural fire insurance. (2019)

No. 443
Firearms

We support:

(1) Firearm safety programs;

(2) Legislation that would prohibit lawsuits against any firearm manufacturer for the illegal or accidental use of firearms by a third party;

(3) Mandatory imprisonment of persons convicted of a felony involving use of firearms;

(4) State-issued individual conceal/carry permits being recognized nationally;

(5) The removal of sound suppressors from the National Firearms Act, as well as removal of the $200 tax stamp; and

(6) Legislation or regulatory action to allow for the inclusion of both a post office box and a physical address on driver licenses issued by the California Department of Motor Vehicles.

We oppose:

(1) Limiting the rights of United States citizens to purchase, possess, or sell firearms through registration and licensing;

(2) Any additional expansion of taxes on or new taxation of firearms, ammunition, or reloading equipment and supplies;

(3) More stringent gun control laws; any new commitment in gun control should be made by the strict enforcement of current laws;

(4) Mandatory background checks for private firearms transactions between law-abiding citizens of the United States;

(5) Restricting lawful firearm use and hunting through the enactment of no-shooting zones, land use restrictions, and other regulations without a clear, factual, and undeniable public safety concern;

(6) Using taxpayer money and money from hunting and fishing licenses to pay for anti-gun promotions, advertising campaigns, or propaganda from anti-gun groups, elected government officials, or government agencies;

(7) Any restriction on the use of lead ammunition;

(8) Limiting or restricting the purchase or possession of ammunition and the implementation of any type of ammunition tracking; and

(9) Gun-free zones, including military bases. (Rev. 2017)

No. 444
Minor Felons

The names of minor children who have been convicted of a felony should be public information. (1986)

No. 445
Wildfire Home Hardening and Defensible Space

In support of protecting private property, structures, and rural communities from catastrophic wildfires, all agencies must recognize regional differences in vegetation, potential wildfire risk, and community wildfire mitigation efforts, and distinguish between various types of structures. Home hardening can be part of a multifaceted approach to mitigating wildfires and should not replace other necessary strategies like vegetation management and fuels reduction. In identifying the appropriateness of risk-mitigation strategies, financial and economic considerations must be taken into account. (2022)

Labor

No. 551
Agricultural Labor

Agricultural labor is a complex, unique and important aspect of agriculture. We support equitable enforcement of and compliance with laws affecting agricultural labor. A sound agricultural labor relations program emphasizing the realities, importance and dignity of agricultural workers should be promoted.

A. Agricultural Labor Recruitment

Agricultural workforce availability should be developed to the fullest.

B. Agricultural Collective Bargaining

We recognize the right of agricultural employees to organize and bargain for their services as well as their right to refrain from these activities. The right of agricultural employees to cast secret ballots on the issue of union representation in the seclusion of a private voting booth during an election supervised by the designated public agency must be preserved as the best and sole means to this end.

Any procedure allowing for the submission of ballots by mail must protect the right of employees to cast secret ballots in such a voting booth instead of by mail, the integrity of the election, and the right of voters to express their sentiments about unionization free from any party's influence while voting.

We support legislation that would bring agriculture under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Until that time, we continue to seek changes that will conform the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act with the NLRA.

C. Workers' Compensation

We support federal legislation that encourages states to provide basic systems of minimum workers' compensation benefits following the "wage-loss" concept for work-connected disabilities. Such federal legislation should also encourage states to improve state statutes without infringing on their rights to enact and administer their own systems of workers' compensation benefits. Workers' compensation should be the exclusive remedy for work-connected injuries.

Violators of laws prohibiting fraud in and abuse of the workers' compensation system should be vigorously prosecuted and punished for their violations. Professionals knowingly representing a fraudulent claimant should be prosecuted.

We oppose changes in workers' compensation policies or laws that increase costs to agricultural employers and have a negative impact on existing jobs and job creation.

D. Minimum Wages

We support a minimum wage on a uniform national basis. Any California minimum wage should be based on living costs in the lowest-cost areas of the state, allowing localities to set higher minimum wages as they see fit. Alternative compensation should be allowed for minors, learners, and employees working under productivity-based systems.

E. Hours

We strongly oppose legislation or regulations that limit hours or the workweek in agriculture. Because of the seasonal nature of agriculture and weather-related issues, flexibility is necessary in determining hours worked during the workweek.

We oppose workday or workweek overtime requirements that may be suitable for certain occupations but are incompatible with

competitive production agriculture. Agricultural employment is exempt from the overtime provisions of the federal Fair Labor Standards Act, and of the few states with overtime provisions for at least some agricultural employees, California's provisions are the most onerous and restrictive. California agricultural employers should not be put at a competitive disadvantage with producers elsewhere, and the state's agricultural employees should not suffer wage loss caused by reductions in their daily or weekly work hours.

F. Unemployment Insurance

We support an equitable national compulsory unemployment insurance program for agricultural employees. We urge action to reduce fraud and abuse in any such program. Eligibility requirements should be made realistic to reflect agriculture's seasonal employment practices.

Striking employees should not receive unemployment benefits. (Rev. 2022)

No. 552
Employee Safety and Health and Accident Prevention

Accident prevention measures should be developed and used by agricultural employees to their fullest extent. Employers and employees should be encouraged and assisted to inaugurate safety practices to prevent injuries. Agricultural employers should develop, implement, and update as appropriate written Injury and Illness Prevention Programs (IIPPs) to identify and eliminate or reduce hazards specific to their operations.

Use of the media and safety programs should be increased wherever possible to disseminate accident prevention information. Educational institutions and insurance carriers should be encouraged to assist in accident prevention programs.

Safety orders should be based on demonstrated needs that are documented by scientific evidence and sound risk-assessment principles.

Enforcement of safety orders should be equitable and based on a statewide, clearly identifiable protocol.

Accident prevention should be through educational efforts rather than through increased liability penalties or more restrictive safety orders.

We support effective enforcement of present laws to prevent illegal use of legal drugs and any use of illegal drugs. (Rev. 2006)

No. 553
Agricultural Labor Relations Board Access Rules

Union organizers are not exempt from California's trespass laws. We strongly object to Agricultural Labor Relations Board access rules that allow union organizers or Board agents to enter private property without the owner's consent. We especially object to a rule that allows union personnel to take access during a strike for the purpose of communicating with nonstriking workers. We believe these rules violate the state and federal constitutional safeguards against unauthorized access of persons to private lands. (Rev. 2017)

No. 554
Supplemental Agricultural Labor

To satisfy agricultural labor needs, we support the establishment of an economical and effective system under which labor from other countries could be employed on a timely and flexible basis to work in agriculture. (Rev. 2009)

No. 555
Immigration Reform

Federal law enacted for comprehensive immigration policy reform should include the following provisions:

(1) Pathway for current undocumented workers residing within United States borders to obtain legal authorization for employment and residence that offers these workers sufficient incentive to come forward, including extending protected status to their spouses and minor children who are present in the United States;

(2) Worker visa program for agricultural employers through a simplified, expeditious, and less costly application process for both employers and foreign workers;

(3) Allowing a worker to maintain the worker's current residency in the United States without requiring the worker to return to the worker's country of origin; and

(4) Security of our borders with other countries in a manner that allows legally documented individuals to travel without risk to health, safety and property.

We urge the Immigration and Customs Enforcement to enforce the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 by following the intent of Congress as embodied in the law as written.

Laws governing apprehension of unauthorized immigrants should be carried out uniformly in all industries. (87/Rev. 2019)

No. 556
Strikes and Labor Disputes

We support the enactment of legislation that would prohibit strikes at harvest time in the perishable products industry.

Recourse to injunctive relief and recovery for loss of property, personal injury, or crop destruction should be assured.

We support the adoption of creative means of settling employee disputes with fairness to all in a manner that will prevent interruptions in the orderly flow of agricultural products from producers to consumers.

Governmental entities should refrain from taking positions on labor disputes and boycotts unless the entity is a party to the dispute. (Rev. 1986)

No. 557
Boycott of Agricultural Products

We are opposed to boycotts of agricultural products because they can have a detrimental effect upon the entire economy. Such boycotts are often based on misinformation and a disregard for the facts.

When boycotts of agricultural products occur, we will use all resources available to present to the public the true facts. (Rev. 1984)

No. 558
Wrongful Discharge and Damages

Employment should be terminable at the will of either the employer or employee unless they have agreed in writing that it shall be for a definite duration.

Damages in wrongful discharge cases should be limited to the amount of contractual damages actually incurred by the employee as a result of a wrongful discharge. (Rev 2021)

No. 559
Public Employee Labor Relations

We recognize the right of public employees to organize and bargain for their services as well as their right to refrain from these activities. However, public employees should be prohibited from striking. (Rev. 1995)

No. 560
Equal Pay for Equal Work

We favor the principle of "equal pay for equal work," but decisions on the levels of compensation for various jobs offered by an employer should be left to the marketplace. (86/Rev. 2022)

No. 561
Youth Employment

We find the employment of youth to be socially and economically sound and support laws and regulations which ensure safe and healthful working conditions for minors. Frequently, regulatory agencies overly restrict the opportunity for youth to obtain gainful employment.

A farmer's family members working on his/her own operation should remain free of regulations regardless of the farmer's legal organizational structure.

We encourage more vocational training and work experience programs at the high school level so that proper training and certification of competence can be achieved prior to operation of mechanical equipment. (Rev. 1994)

No. 562
Employee Housing

Laws and regulations governing employee housing should be fairly written and equitably enforced to encourage such housing.

The federal, state and county agencies which enforce employee housing laws should designate among themselves the one which is to be the lead and exclusive agency to enforce those laws in each county; preferably, that agency should be the most local one.

When an inspection of employee housing is completed, the inspector should immediately inform the housing operator of any action which the operator must take to correct any deficiency. All government agencies should be governed by the same set of regulations.

Local governments should provide incentives for the development of farm worker housing, such as fee waivers, density bonuses, and fast-track approval of permits.

Employers and county Farm Bureaus should provide information to employees to establish nonprofit organizations to utilize the government funding available for farm employee housing, including eventual ownership. This type of housing should be located in already existing urban and/or community service districts.

Lodging accommodations available to the general public that are used for employee housing should have to meet only those state and local standards generally applicable to such accommodations. (Rev. 2009)

No. 563
Farm Labor Contractors

We support the freedom to use farm labor contractors in the recruitment and management of migrant, seasonal and day-haul farm workforce (employees). The farm labor contractor should be recognized as the sole employer of said workforce (employees).

Growers using the services of farm labor contractors should deal only with those who are registered and licensed as such and who obey applicable laws, especially those governing wages, hours, working conditions, and health and safety standards.

The Department of Labor should make available information on disposition of violations and labor citations issued against labor contractors. (Rev. 2022)

No. 564
Essential Services

Essential employees are needed to maintain the services and functions Americans depend on daily and need to be able to operate resiliently in emergencies.

Many states look to the federal government for clarity on essential services classification and how it impacts farms in their communities. The U.S. Department of Agriculture and other federal partners such as the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency have issued guidance to help state and local jurisdictions and the private sector identify and manage essential services. Additionally, some states have provided more-specific guidance on particular segments of agriculture including sod production as well as horticultural industries.

As considerations related to the health and safety of California's residents are a priority, it is important that essential services connected to agriculture continue unabated. Agriculture provides not only agricultural products but also thousands of jobs in all parts of the state.

During emergencies, all agricultural practices should always be immediately deemed essential services to California. This designation allows all agriculturalists to continue to produce agricultural products to the best of their abilities.

Further, all ancillary agricultural services should also be deemed essential. These ancillary agricultural services include but are not limited to fertilizer and pesticide sales and applications, irrigation delivery, soil testing, processing and packaging, and commercial trucking and transportation. (2022)

Health, Education, and Public Assistance

No. 601
Family Values

As an organization, we strongly support and encourage individual members to embrace and promote the fundamental principles and family values on which the nation was founded. (1996)

No. 602
Health Care and Health Insurance

We are concerned about the adequate delivery of primary health care and the reduction of health care costs.

We encourage and support programs for medical school applicants who intend to practice medicine in a rural area.

Because of our concern about the maldistribution of physicians in rural areas, we encourage the acceptance of family nurse practitioners or physicians' assistants, with proper medical supervision as an extension of quality medical care.

We support programs to encourage doctors and nurses to practice in rural areas. We support the continued development and use of technologies, such as telemedicine, to promote continuing the education of health care providers and for diagnostic purposes in California's rural hospitals and community clinics to assure quality health care.

Rural access to telehealth services is necessary to ensure health equity. We support access to telehealth services.

Preventive measures must be encouraged as a method of reducing health care costs including, but not limited to, improved personal health habits, safety and health education.

Any legislation to require employers to provide health care benefits to their employees should be on a uniform national basis, with strict cost-containment provisions.

We support actions necessary to assure the viability of strategically located rural hospitals. We also support the retention of basic medical care in California's rural hospitals and community clinics.

State and federal mandated health care programs to the

counties shall be paid for by the mandating governmental agency in a timely manner.

We support the continued development and use of paraprofessional programs in rural communities as an adjunct to local medical care.

We encourage donations of surplus medical equipment to help supply rural health care facilities that otherwise lack sufficient resources. (Rev. 01/Rev. 2021)

No. 603
Valley Fever Vaccine

We support state funding for necessary research for the creation of a vaccine for Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever). (1998)

No. 604
Cooperative Extension

Cooperative Extension should continue as a non-partisan, non-political educational service agency within land grant colleges, and in California, within the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources of the University of California. We strongly support an active and evolving role of Cooperative Extension in production agriculture.

Since ongoing programs of the Cooperative Extension benefit the entire economy and population of California, its budget funds must be adequate to meet the needs of such programs. We strongly urge county boards of supervisors to allocate the funds necessary to fulfill their portion of the county's Cooperative Extension budget in order to continue these important programs, such as 4-H and farm advisors.

We support a non-fee policy for Cooperative Extension services.

Cooperative Extension should fill vacancies with qualified candidates as rapidly as possible to maintain continuity in research programs and extension efforts.

We support efforts by Cooperative Extension to address the changing needs of agriculture, specifically in mechanization and evolving technology, to prepare our farmers and our labor force to fulfill agriculture's present and future needs. (Rev. 2017)

No. 605
Education

A. School District Organization

School districts should be large enough to provide personnel and financial resources adequate for an effective district, yet small enough to assure reasonable participation and substantive control by citizens of the district.

Minimum standards for any form of school district should recognize the diversity of the state and a single standard for all districts should be avoided. The form of school district organization should be decided by local stakeholders.

School district employees should not serve on any school board because of the inherent conflict of interest.

B. Finance

School funding should be adequate and predictable to facilitate advanced planning and consistent programming to meet local needs. The formulas for local funding should be reviewed to best reflect the needs of all communities.

State sales and income tax money should be the principal source of funding public schools. We oppose a statewide property tax for schools or any other purpose.

The entire cost of programs mandated by the state should be paid for by the state. Likewise, federally mandated programs should also be fully supported by federal funds.

We support the use of state lottery funds only for the purpose authorized in the original ballot initiative.

We are concerned about the high cost of public education and urge that measures be taken to make the educational system more cost effective. All unnecessary or ineffective education programs and compliance and reporting requirements, which contribute to excessive school administration costs, should be eliminated.

A mechanism should be provided at the state level to fund needed building programs and deferred maintenance. This mechanism should be expeditious to enable school districts to construct facilities needed to accommodate student growth in a timely manner and allow for the consideration of projected student enrollment growth.

C. Teacher Credentialing

We support the original intent of teacher tenure to protect teachers against political abuse, however, tenure should be reformed so that it cannot be used to unduly protect underperforming teachers.

Single subject credentials create a hardship on small and/or rural school districts where teachers need to be competent in multiple subjects. Therefore, provisions should be made for multiple subject credentials.

D. Curriculum

Health and nutrition education should be given high priority in the instructional program of every school district.

We are concerned about the low achievement of students attending public schools. Curriculum should stress basic education in the primary grades. The No Child Left Behind program and California's educational achievement standards should be reviewed due to the implications of the program on children, family and school systems.

We strongly urge that educational programs, especially those at the elementary level, be implemented so that all students can develop an understanding of economics and the strategic national importance of supplying our food, clothing, pharmaceuticals and other life-sustaining items.

We urge educators to emphasize English language instruction to rapidly assimilate the limited and non-English speaking students into the educational mainstream.

Students should advance primarily with ability and achievement, not age.

E. Agricultural Literacy

Farm Bureau strongly supports integrating the study of agriculture with subjects currently being taught. We also believe ag literacy efforts should focus on three areas: teacher training, student programs and resource material.

F. Vocational and Career Agricultural Education

There is a need to continually update courses to fill the demands of developing agricultural technology. Vocational and career technical agricultural education such as farm related Regional Occupational Centers and Future Farmers of America (FFA) is vital for development of talent and leadership needed in farming and agricultural service industries.

We support the use of provisions in the Education Code relating to independent study programs as a means for school districts to grant excused absences for students participating in leadership development programs such as 4-H, FFA and approved ag literacy activities.

Vocational and career technical education in our secondary schools and post-secondary schools should be strengthened and made more effective. Career education programming should be emphasized in the education system.

Instructional programs in agriculture, business, home economics, and industrial education should be supported at the Department of Education and local school levels.

Adequate financing should be provided for agricultural, vocational, and career technical education programs.

We support active involvement in coalitions whose goal is to make sure schools provide a balanced education that includes challenging academic studies and career technical education for "hands on" learning—so our children are prepared for a career and have the skills to succeed, whether they choose college or not.

G. Community Colleges

Support should be given to local communities' specific needs for occupational education and training as well as encouraging higher education. Community colleges should work with the California State university system and the University of California system to provide educational programs and services such as online classes, emerging agricultural technologies, and counseling while maximizing opportunity for education.

H. Contract Negotiations

We support uninterrupted educational programs for children by opposing the use of sanctions, boycotts, slowdowns, strikes or other techniques of withholding services by public school employees.

Penalties should be imposed on those who fail to honor contracts. (Rev. 2019)

No. 606
Educational and Training Programs

We support funding for development and expansion of educational and training programs designed to improve the skills and opportunities of California agricultural employers, employees and their families. Public facilities should be utilized to provide practical training for adults to increase both their resourcefulness and self-sufficiency while raising their standards of life.

We support the use of public-private partnerships that provide incentives, funding, and resources for apprenticeship and workforce training programs to improve employee skills in emerging agricultural technologies.

All federally sponsored educational programs for the families of migrant agricultural employees should be administered through established school systems.

All programs involved in manpower development training, education and referral (including related service programs in the poverty area) should be reviewed and evaluated by the appropriate local governmental body, prior to funding approval. (Rev. 2020)

No. 607
Fairs

Fairs are one of the many ways of telling agriculture's story to the public. Fairs can and have served as an incentive for young people to pursue careers in agriculture.

Fairs often serve as a method of bringing closer contact between urban and rural residents.

Methods for funding fairs must be studied with consideration given to current requirements and benefits to the public.

We should assist in improving and encouraging agricultural participation in fairs and appointment of agricultural representation on county, district, and state fair boards. (Rev. 1992)

No. 608
Public Assistance Programs

The major goal of a public assistance program should be to restore initiative and productivity to the lives of needy individuals while protecting the integrity of the family. To further this purpose, we support the work incentive approach. This allows adults of families receiving public assistance to retain a portion of their income and still receive public assistance payments up to a set income level, provided they continue to seek full-time employment and are registered with the Employment Development Department for that purpose.

Public assistance costs should be totally funded by the federal and state governments. The highly transient nature of our population and rapid changes in local socio-economic conditions create great inequities and unjustified burdens on local government under the present cost-sharing system. Local governments have no direct input in determining the programs or program levels and should not be required to fund programs of national or statewide concern.

We also support the policy of requiring all members of families receiving public assistance who are able to work, except full-time students, to register for employment with the Employment Development Department; to accept work if available; or to undergo appropriate available training for employment as determined by the Employment Development Department. The Department of Social Services should relinquish the responsibility of training public assistance applicants to appropriate adult education programs.

We support action that would be directed toward eliminating the substantial level of abuses of and fraud in public assistance programs. These abuses create the probability that ultimately those individuals who are truly in need of assistance will suffer.

Statutes relating to public assistance fraud should not dictate restitution alone in lieu of criminal prosecution.

Public assistance departments should report periodically and in writing all apparent excesses in public assistance grants that result from loopholes in the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Public assistance payments should also be set to discourage recipients from migrating to certain states and/or counties to take advantage of high payments relative to the cost of living.

Those who apply for government-funded public assistance program benefits should be required to show proof of their legal status.

Persons convicted of a crime should not be eligible for public assistance benefits or Social Security disability payments while incarcerated. (Rev. 2019)

No. 609
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

The purpose of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) should be to aid only those in need.

In an effort to curb the abuses and promote nutritional health in the program, we recommend the following changes:

(1) Only foods designated by the secretary of agriculture can be purchased. The designation should be based on nutritional values;

(2) The U.S. Department of Agriculture should promote the purchase of healthful food;

(3) Eligibility for the programs should be only to a proven legal resident with a valid Social Security number;

(4) Those households that receive income of more than 150 percent of the National Minimum Wage should not be eligible for SNAP;

(5) Students as a category should be eliminated as individuals eligible for SNAP;

(6) Strikers should be prohibited from accessing SNAP. Food purchased with SNAP benefits should not be allowed to be returned for cash; and

(7) Implementation should be streamlined to reduce costs.

We support more aggressive enforcement of SNAP regulations to eliminate fraud and abuse. (Rev. 2012)

No. 610
World Hunger

We believe California should use its agricultural production capacity to help meet the goal of eliminating world hunger. This will result in:

(1) Improvement of the quality of life for all people;

(2) Reduction of political tensions that lead to war and the expense of war; and

(3) Strengthening the state's economy through the development of agricultural markets.

International trade in food, grain and livestock products will

continue to play a major role in relieving the pressure of supply/demand imbalances.

We support:

(1) Securing a commitment from the federal government to provide leadership in combating world hunger;

(2) Increasing the commitment to P.L. 480 and other concessional sales programs; and

(3) Maintaining the reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier of food for the hungry of other countries.

Agricultural leadership at all levels shall seek to promote the necessary partnership between the public, government and industry to bring an end to hunger and chronic malnutrition. As food producers, we should become more involved in how tax monies are spent on food programs. (Rev. 2009)

Philosophy of Government

No. 651
Economic Productivity

We support laws, rules, regulations, actions and economic policies which encourage productivity, and oppose those which do the opposite.

We support educational programs or other avenues which inform the public on these issues.

The federal, state and county agencies that enforce laws and regulations on a particular subject should designate among themselves the one that will take the lead to enforce them in each county; preferably, that agency should be the most local one. (93/Rev. 2010)

No. 652
Political Action for Farmers

We strongly encourage the agricultural community to make a personal commitment by participating on local, state and national policy-making boards and committees.

We urge our members to work closely with their elected representatives in government, advising them and keeping them informed of producers' problems and needs, including suggestions on legislation. (Rev. 2009)

No. 653
Initiative and Referendum

The people of a state should have the fundamental right to reserve to themselves the power to legislate through the initiative and referendum processes, and such power must not be usurped or impaired by any branch of government.

The initiative process should not be abused or used to circumvent public discussion during the legislative process. Initiatives proposed by the Legislature should have clearly defined language, subject matter and intent. The single-subject requirement should be strengthened for all initiatives.

The Legislature should be required to determine specific expenditure allocations when spending initiatives are approved by the voters. (Rev. 2009)

No. 654
Legislation by Due Process

We believe a basic principle of democracy is that laws should only be made by public officials who are subject to a vote of the people. Wherever practical, the responsibility for enacting laws should be returned to elected officials. No directives of commissions or boards not covered by the California Administrative Procedures Act should be enforceable until they have been submitted back to and approved by an elected body.

No. 655
Voter Registration Requirements

No person should be permitted to vote in any election in any community where he/she has not been a bona fide resident for at least thirty days. Voters should not be allowed to register on election days for the election being held. To assure residency and to prevent multiple registration, some identification should be utilized as a standard to check voter registration in California.

We recommend that national election projections on election day not be released to the public until all polls are closed.

A common language is essential to the United States of America, and an understanding of our language is a requirement for naturalization. Therefore, we urge elimination of a requirement for bilingual ballots in every public election. (Rev. 1993)

No. 656
Termination of Government Agencies

During the annual state budget process, all government agencies or activities should be reviewed. If the value of their activities and/or services does not justify their cost, they should be modified or terminated. (Rev. 2009)

No. 657
Local vs. State Jurisdiction

We urge the state of California to take prompt legal action against local governments that adopt ordinances and regulations that are outside their jurisdiction. (1988)

No. 658
Litigation

We support strengthening provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure relative to the awarding of expenses, attorney fees, and punitive damages to individuals subjected to bad faith legal action or to tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay in the course of a legal action. Specifically, we support broadening the definition of "frivolous" to mean without merit or for the purpose of harassing an opposing party.

We support tort reform. This reform effort should include, though not be limited to, a cap on the amount of damages that can be awarded for non-economic loss.

If a government agency, or subdivision thereof, brings an enforcement action against a private citizen, and the citizen prevails, he should be entitled to attorney fees and cost of suit. (Rev. 1996)

No. 659
Public Hearings

Any public hearings affecting agriculture should be scheduled by the government agencies in areas impacted by the proposed regulations.

For changes in federal regulations, publication in the Federal Register does not provide sufficient notice for affected parties. Federal agencies should distribute any changes in regulation to affected parties or organizations with an interest in the changes. In addition, they should document the distribution of these regulations. (Rev. 2001)

No. 660
Freedom of Information Act

The Freedom of Information Act and State Public Records Act are valuable tools for the collection of information from state and federal agencies. State and federal agencies should respond within their statutory deadlines to all requests for information.

The Freedom of Information Act should not apply to anyone participating in federal conservation programs. Information contained in farm and ranch plans should be exempt from the Act. (Rev. 2005)

No. 661
State Legislative Districts

We believe that State Senatorial Districts should be based on the geographical boundaries of the counties within the State of California and that no one county or portion thereof should be represented by more than one Senator. (2020).

Monetary and Tax

No. 701
Government Finance

A. General

The people of this nation are carrying an excessive burden of both public debt and taxes from which there can be no relief until expenditures are controlled. All levels of government must exercise strict economy, eliminate duplication of effort, promote operational efficiency and undertake only those programs appropriate for each level of government.

To accomplish these budgetary goals in California a constitutionally imposed government spending limit is essential. However, the current limitation must be flexible enough to reflect the state's economic growth because much of our prosperity depends on continued investment in public infrastructure.

Federal and state governments should remain fiscally responsible for any matching fund-type programs as long as the programs continue to be in effect.

In determining compensation for public employees, all factors including wages, vacations, medical benefits, job security, and retirement should be considered, and performance evaluations should be standardized.

Taxes should be fairly, broadly, and openly imposed and efficiently collected. The taxpayer should have a fair and speedy appeals system.

The taxpayer should be afforded the right to be presumed innocent of any wrong doing or error in the calculation of tax payments. The burden of proof should rest with the government not the taxpayer.

The taxpayer should always have the right to deduct expenses related to defending oneself in a tax dispute.

The tax system should be structured in a manner such that all citizens can make a direct contribution toward the support of various levels of government.

Governmental operations related to the protection of the public health, safety and welfare should be funded through general tax revenues.

Whenever possible the levying of new or increased taxes should be contingent upon a determination made by those persons upon whom the tax is imposed.

Fines levied by a regulatory agency should not be used to fund the agency but should be credited to the general fund.

Further, agencies that are sued by any entity should be required to pay their settlement costs including the payment of attorney fees from their operating budget.

B. In Lieu Taxes

All government-owned enterprises and properties should be required to fund their equitable share of the services provided by local governments and special assessment districts through the imposition of payments in lieu of taxes or other means.

We strongly support the policies that require the federal government to pay annually into each county or local treasury an amount of money that fully compensates local government for the economic activities and property taxes lost because the land is in federal ownership. The first revenue source used for payment of these "in lieu" taxes should be from the money received by the federal land management agency from the uses and/or sale of products from these lands.

Payment of "in lieu" taxes to local government for state owned land should not be discretionary. These payments should be on appraised fair market value or the purchase price and indexed according to Proposition 13.

Unpaid in lieu taxes should be subjected to listing on the delinquent tax role, assessment of interest and penalties, and auctioning off the property by the county if unpaid after the appropriate time period.

C. Property Tax Exemptions

Agricultural land that is acquired by nonprofit entities should not be eligible for a property tax exemption if it is taken out of production.

D. Tax Loss Reimbursement

All governmental entities acquiring property should be required to satisfy existing tax liens or levies on such property and should be further required to provide for the assumption of the bonded or other long-term indebtedness imposed by other governmental agencies when the property was considered as a base for the amortization of the indebtedness.

E. Bonded and Long-Term Debt

The two-thirds voter approval requirement for local, general obligations bonds, with the exception of school facility construction bonds, is a constitutional requirement. Government, however, has the authority, through lease-purchase and the joint exercise of powers, to circumvent this protection to property owners.

The result of utilizing other debt obligation procedures has been to increase the total amount required for a project because general obligation bonds usually bear a lower rate than joint power or lease-purchasing financing.

Any bonded or other long-term public indebtedness, or commitments containing annual renewal options, should be approved by the electorate or incurred only with the limitations that have been established by them.

In recognition of government funding of projects with no vote at all, we believe that any real property acquisition or improvement affecting the property tax should require approval of two-thirds vote of the qualified voters voting.

A reasonable limit should be placed on the total amount of such debts or commitments that may be imposed on any property in relationship to the value of the property.

F. Power to Levy Property and Special Taxes

The use of the power to levy ad valorem taxes should be limited for local government. Such power for state purposes should continue to be constitutionally limited to serve the exclusive purpose of maintaining the state's credit.

We are opposed to a statewide property tax for education or for any other purpose, including the shift of property taxes from local agencies to offset state funding for education.

We oppose any form of property taxation which results in a transfer of local revenues to other agencies.

The imposition of parcel taxes should require a two-thirds vote of the electorate. If a parcel tax is assessed on a legal parcel and an inconsistency is found between the legal parcel and assessor's parcel number, it should be the obligation of the local taxing jurisdiction, rather than the landowner, to utilize the appropriate legal parcel identification mechanism. Agricultural or timber

production zoned property should be exempt from paying more than one parcel charge as long as the parcels, whether contiguous or not, are under the same ownership.

G. Property Tax Limitation

To the maximum extent possible, property taxes should only be used to provide governmental services to property. Other government spending programs should be financed by net income or sales taxes.

Consumption taxes are preferable to increases in income or property taxes.

We oppose any legislation and/or election that would increase property taxes on agricultural land over the one percent limit incurred by Proposition 13 unless approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate.

We support protection of the intent and integrity of Proposition 13 for all individuals, residents, and businesses.

We oppose any such policies, including but not limited to "split-roll" and amendments intended to increase the frequency of reassessment events.

H. Local Sales Taxes

Local sales tax levies presently fail to recognize that a share of the revenues derived is properly related to the place where the taxable property is to be used or the place of the purchaser's residency.

A modification of the apportionment procedure should be made to provide for a more equitable distribution of local sales tax revenues.

We oppose any legislation and/or election that would increase local sales and use or transaction and use taxes for specific purposes unless approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate or the Legislature.

We oppose the application of sales tax on services or intangible goods.

I. Property Tax Relief

Experience has demonstrated that increased subventions from the state to local units of government are more likely to be used to expand programs than to reduce property taxes.

We believe that meaningful property tax relief can be achieved by a recognition of the various levels of government that specific functions and services are properly an exclusive responsibility of an appropriate governmental entity.

We urge an ongoing program of analysis of the capabilities of the various agencies of government and the needs of the people they serve.

J. Corporate Taxation

We oppose the imposition of double income taxes on the retained earnings of C Corporations and the dividends distributed to shareholders.

K. Joint Powers Agencies

A joint powers agency should be prohibited by law from issuing revenue bonds connected with profit seeking activities which are not normally considered a function of government, without approval by the electorate of the component entities.

The authority of joint powers agencies to issue revenue bonds should be authorized only in those instances where the direct net income from the facility can reasonably be expected to retire the bonds and pay the interest.

A joint powers agency should be prohibited by law from issuing revenue bonds for any purpose where any of the parties to a joint powers agreement are precluded from individually issuing revenue bonds for the same purpose.

L. Assessment Practices

Sales used by assessors in valuing property for ad valorem tax purposes often do not represent the sale of comparable property for comparable uses, and the sales of comparable property are many times utilized without regard for the rate of absorption or the market demand for like properties.

We urge that the State Constitution be amended to reflect that all improvements including, but not limited to, barns, sheds, pumps, motors, irrigation and filtration systems, shall be valued on a depreciated basis.

We urge that the Revenue and Tax Code be amended to place the burden of proof to establish the correctness of assessment upon the assessor.

We recommend that the Legislature cause a study to be made of the operation of the division of intercounty equalization of the state Board of Equalization for the purpose of determining the validity of the intercounty equalization procedure presently utilized. The responsibility of hearing appeals from counties relative to the Board of Equalization determined assessment ratio for that county having to do with intercounty equalization should not rest with the Board of Equalization but should be the responsibility of a separate uninvolved agency.

M. Taxpayer Appeal from Assessments

We recommend that the Legislature broaden the scope of judicial review of taxpayers' assessment appeals by providing the right to a trial de novo in the Superior Court in resolving issues of fact such as determining the true cash value of property being assessed.

We recommend that the provisions of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to assessment appeals be amended to permit the introduction of all testimony and evidence germane to the value of the property, to include the record of appraisal procedures and assessed value findings for prior years.

Members of local assessment appeals boards should be required to take a property tax valuation course offered by the Board of Equalization.

N. Timber Taxation

Non-industrial timberland owners when selling timber to another party should have the option of paying the yield tax based on the harvest value schedule or on the amount actually received for the timber.

Timberland values for tax purposes should remain at such a level so as to maintain the continued production and harvesting of timber.

O. Utility User Taxes

We oppose the use of utility user taxes to fund local government without a vote of those affected.

P. Funding County Government

The legislature should comply with its statutory commitments to county governments and fully fund the Williamson Act Subvention, Trial Court Funding, and the County Revenue Stabilization programs.

Q. Environmental Fines

Fines collected by governmental agencies for violation of environmental laws should be used only for the remediation of the cause of and direct effects of the cited violation. These fines may not be used to fund agency operations including the payment for staffing that agency. (Rev. 2022)

No. 702
Program Fees and Special Assessments

User fees and other service program fees as well as environmental program fees, hereinafter collectively called program fees, or assessments should not be substituted for taxes, and should be limited to the amount necessary to provide the service or commodity furnished. These fees or assessments should be used for the purpose for which they were levied. In the case of environmental program fees, the amount should be based on the direct cost of processing the program enrollment application or renewal.

Unless initiated or supported by those directly affected, we are opposed to any user fees imposed by government agencies in lieu of, or in addition to, tax revenues to support program regulations or enforcement. These fees represent taxation without representation and are detrimental to the economy.

Services historically paid for through general fund revenue should not be switched to program fee funding without specific authorization by the affected voters.

We are opposed to any changes in laws authorizing benefit changes/assessments or program fees that:

(1) Diminish voters' rights of protest/referendum;

(2) Diminish existing limitations on charges/assessments/fees; and

(3) Diminish existing exclusions for charges/assessments/fees.

Any governmental agency authorized to impose benefit assessments, program fees or taxes should be directed by a governing body whose members are elected directly to that office by the voters in the affected area. Adequate notice should be provided when any new or increased fee or benefit assessment is proposed.

The governmental agency should be required to semiannually classify all parcels subject to charges/assessments according to use and to adopt, by ordinance or other appropriate "Legislative Act," a schedule of benefits and assessments/charge, based on the classification.

All levels of government which conduct operations financed primarily by charges or fees for services provided the public should be required to establish enterprise fund accounting procedures for those operations. (Rev. 2012)

No. 703
Restoration

We support landowners' efforts in restoration projects on private property. A completed restoration project promotes a healthy environment.

Landowners who engage in restoration projects that benefit water quality, wildlife or the public should be eligible for a waiver of any and all fees from federal, state or any other governmental organization that has oversight on the restoration project. (2007)

No. 704
Assured Funding of State-Mandated Programs

No state-mandated programs should be imposed on local agencies without complete and timely funding for the lifetime of the program being provided for in the legislation.

All state-mandated programs, including existing legislation, shall be reviewed by the State Legislative Analyst every two years to assure adequate state funding and the continued appropriateness of the program, and the Analyst's findings be made a matter of public record. (Rev. 1998)

No. 705
Rural Fire Protection Funding

We support state and federal funding for rural fire protection districts in order to maintain adequate standards of safety training and performance.

We urge government agencies, when developing regulatory mandates, to recognize that in many cases rural volunteer fire protection districts have different needs than do urban fire departments. Furthermore, there is a great contrast in financial and personnel resources available to urban fire departments versus rural fire districts. When these differences are not addressed, severe strain on resources occur at the rural level. Government mandates should not apply to rural volunteer fire districts without the support and financial backing from the mandating agencies.

Except in the case of gross negligence, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection should not pursue fire suppression costs from private landowners\tenants\operators. (Rev. 2003)

No. 706
Income Tax Liability

Changes in the state and federal tax code should be enacted to provide relief for those taxpayers whose tax liability exceeds the amount of their assets because of foreclosure or voluntary reconveyance. (Rev. 1989)

No. 707
State Personal and Corporate Income Taxes

Where possible, we favor amendment of the California Revenue and Taxation Code to provide full conformity with the Internal Revenue Code, including without limitation to the provisions of Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code providing for net operating loss carryovers, the provisions of Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code providing for expensing of qualifying capital expenses, and the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code affecting the taxation of sub-chapter S corporations.

Property owners affected by eminent domain should be given the option of replacing the condemned property or reporting the taxable gain over a period of years as in an installment sale procedure.

California's income tax system should include an automatic adjustment (indexing) procedure to compensate for inflation.

The California income tax reporting procedure should be simplified to the maximum extent practical. (Rev. 2019)

No. 708
Fuel Tax Reporting

Procedures for reporting state gasoline and diesel fuel taxes should be made part of the state income tax form as is done on the federal income tax form.

Foresters (owners, lessees and custom foresters) involved in growing and harvesting timber should receive the same diesel fuel tax exemption at the point of purchase as other agriculturalists currently receive. (Rev. 1995)

No. 709
Estate and Gift Taxes

We support permanent repeal of the federal estate tax.

Until permanent repeal can be achieved, we support the highest exemption and lowest tax rate possible, while excluding the value of agricultural real and personal property from the value of the gross estate, provided the real and personal property remains in agricultural use. To prevent non-agricultural interests from using the exemption as a tax haven, we support a requirement that more than 50% of the estate consist of agricultural real and personal property, and that the decedent materially participated in the operation. Establishing a full, unlimited stepped-up basis, at the time of death, should have a high priority as changes to the estate tax code are proposed.

We support increasing the estate tax exemption, the lifetime federal gift tax exemption and the annual gift tax exclusion amount and indexing them for inflation.

We oppose any regulatory action by the IRS that might cause undue hardship on a farmer's or rancher's ability to pay the estate tax when the majority of an agricultural estate is tied up in farmland, farm equipment, or other non-liquid agricultural assets.

We oppose unreasonable and unfair IRS estate tax audits. Audits that result in an additional tax due should not require full payment in the current two-week timeframe but should allow sufficient time for a farmer or rancher to sell land without additional penalty. A reasonable timeframe is nine months, similar to the first estate tax payment due after the death of the decedent. Payments should also be allowed to be rolled into the Section 6166 payment plan, if the estate originally qualified.

For agricultural operations subject to the estate tax, audits should not rely on an IRS agent's sole opinion but should be based on the opinions of California-licensed appraisers with agricultural experience.

We oppose IRS special consensual liens on property or a surety bond that are designed to protect the interest of the government installment payments as allowed by section 6166 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). These liens inhibit the ability for the farmers or ranchers to continue to borrow capital to run their businesses. (Rev. 2013)

No. 710
Owner-Financed Sales

We support modification of the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the minimum interest rates on owner-financed sales of real property. (1999)

No. 711
Possessory Interest

We are opposed to the taxation of possessory interests on federal land for agricultural production or extraction of natural resources. However, the possessory interest value of leased property from the government should accurately reflect the lessee's or permittee's actual rights to use the property. (Rev. 2006)

No. 712
Farm Machinery Tax

We urge the state of California to eliminate the farm machinery (equipment) personal property tax.

If farm machinery is to be assessed, it should be done in a uniform and equitable manner.

We support eliminating the California Sales and Use Tax Law on farm equipment to allow California farmers and ranchers to be more competitive in world markets. (Rev. 2001)

No. 713
Taxation of Cooperatives and Other Corporations

We oppose any effort to tax cooperatives on disbursements or credits taxable in the hands of their patrons.

The net savings and income of farmer cooperatives should be subject to a single federal income tax to be paid either by the cooperative as earned or by the patron when received in cash. Non-cash patronage allocations should be treated as income when received or when redeemed at the producers' election.

Any change in the interpretation of laws relating to the tax status of farmer cooperatives should include a grace period of at least two years during which an adjustment to the new interpretation can be made. Further, such changes should not affect long-established practices nor apply retroactively.

Any legislation affecting the tax status of the cooperative farm credit institutions should include an exemption for income used to build legally required reserves or returned to the members of the institutions.

Corporations should be permitted a deduction for earnings distributed to stockholders as dividends and taxable in the hands of stockholders.

Corporations engaged in farming should be allowed to file tax estimates in essentially the same manner as is available to individual farmers. (Rev. 1987)

Technology, Transportation, Energy, and Utilities

No. 751
Transportation

California's agricultural and rural areas are particularly dependent on the maintenance of efficient and economical transportation facilities. Transportation systems should reflect long-range planning as well as the integration and inherent advantages of each mode of people and product movement: surface, air, water, rail and mass transit. We believe governmental regulation should be minimal and encourage the development of public-private partnerships to meet the state's transportation needs.

A. Highways

We support consideration of all reasonable and cost-effective means to generate funding for construction and maintenance of our state highway system.

We support the use of motor fuel, weight fee, toll revenues and vehicle tax revenues for highway construction and maintenance. These fees should rightfully be designated as user fees and should not be diverted to non-highway uses by the local, state, or federal government. Property taxes should not be used for highway purposes.

When constructing roads, bridges and other transportation structures, steps should be taken to rein in project costs. We support the design/build construction approach as one such cost-saving practice.

We strongly oppose transportation taxes that impose a per mile tax on vehicles and/or a ton-mile on commercial trucks.

B. Commercial Motor Vehicles

We support state and federal highway transportation laws to enable efficient transportation of goods within the state and across state lines.

We support working with other interested groups to aggressively pursue actions in the Legislature, Congress and appropriate federal and state agencies to ensure that we have an efficient and competitive transportation system through which we can safely and effectively move agricultural products.

We support flexibility with electronic logging device (ELD) and Hours of Service regulations for perishable agricultural products, livestock and apiary.

Implementation of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act by the state should provide reasonable access to terminals without added costs to the terminal operators. We support the increased federal and state ceilings on weight and size limits for both intrastate and interstate highways that permits states to increase limits if they so choose.

Neither drivers nor trucks should be subjected to unreasonable restrictions in the use of highways, freeways and surface streets or roads. We support maintaining the state and federal agricultural hours-of-service exemptions as they are vital to the efficiency of agricultural production.

Public safety is our highest priority. Load securement regulations should be based on the best available science to safely transport that particular load.

Small amounts of organic matter (e.g., chaff, leaves) blowing from otherwise properly secured loads and not causing a hazard to motorists should not constitute an offense.

We strongly urge the Department of Transportation, the California Highway Patrol, and local law enforcement authorities to subject all foreign truck drivers and their trucks to the same safety rules and regulations as domestic drivers and their trucks when operating in California.

We support the use of radar. We believe it serves as a deterrent to excessive speed and is a method of reducing the loss of life as well as the number of accidents on our streets and highways.

We support the rights of the state to set speed limits appropriate to local conditions without the sacrifice of federal funding.

We support the voluntary use of a designation for agricultural vehicles eligible for commercial registration. We also support an increase in the mileage limit for implements of husbandry which are transported on highways from field to field or are incidental to agricultural operations.

We encourage the development and implementation of a program to address agriculture's unique needs with respect to hazardous material transportation.

C. Tandem Towing

Motor vehicles should be allowed to lawfully pull two pieces of farm equipment in tandem.

D. Bridges and Roads

Rural bridges and roads should be rehabilitated to updated standards and maintained to provide for a fuel and cost-efficient farm-to-market transportation system. Maintenance of the investment already made in the rural facilities benefits shippers, the consumer, and the recreationalist alike.

We recognize the potential need for the limited construction of toll roads and bridges by government entities where there is no reasonable alternative. We oppose government funding of perpetually private toll roads and bridges. Land acquisition for the construction of private toll roads and bridges should be by contractual agreement, rather than eminent domain. New private toll roads and bridges should not use taxes or fees and should rely on other funding sources for construction. Tolls should provide sufficient revenues to retire the facility's indebtedness and provide for ongoing maintenance and operating costs.

We oppose the conversion of any existing bridges or roads to toll bridges or roads.

E. Mass Transit

We encourage the development of cost-effective, local mass transit.

CFBF supports the concept of mass transit in California, provided that CFBF policy priorities are met regarding the following issues: local land use, urbanization, sprawl, cost effectiveness, and environmental impacts including compliance with CEQA and NEPA and in accordance with LAFCO.

We oppose the High-Speed Rail Authority's 2012 plan as well as subsequent updates to that plan that are in direct conflict with CFBF policy.

F. Route Planning

In the route planning and location of highways and freeways, and mass transit facilities, major consideration should be given to all of the following:

Conservation of productive agricultural lands by use of all available means to protect such lands from highway and freeway corridors where alternative routes are available;

The economic impact of withdrawal of such lands for transportation purposes;

Avoidance of congested developments and use of present rights-of-way where feasible; and

Adequate compensating values for property taken, including severance losses and loss of operating efficiency resulting from division of operating units.

Mitigation requirements should not result in excessive impacts to agricultural land. Instead of complete conversion out of agricultural production, mitigation objectives should be integrated to ensure working landscapes are retained wherever possible to minimize the displacement of agricultural production. Mitigation land should remain in private ownership and eminent domain should not be used to acquire land for mitigation purposes.

G. Non-operation

We support changes to the current vehicle non-operation permit process. We believe that a small penalty should be assessed for failing to report a vehicle placed in a non-operation status when the vehicle is relicensed. The Department of Motor Vehicles should be required to send all notices of renewal on vehicles that are in a non-operational status. No charges or penalties should be assessed when the vehicle is in a non-operational status. License fees should be charged only when the vehicle is relicensed and placed into service. Higher penalties should be assessed for those caught using unregistered vehicles on public roads.

H. Fleet Registration

DMV should allow coordination of multi-vehicle registrants for all registrants who so request.

I. Highway Safety

All motor vehicles should be equipped with standard-metal safety buckles and flame-resistant material for upholstery. To ensure a safer, insurable driving population, we believe that all California drivers must have a valid driver's license. (Rev. 2020)

No. 752
Incentives to Meet Diesel Emission Regulations

To improve air quality and reduce diesel fuel demand, longer combinations should be allowed on California highways, utilizing state of the art over-the-road tractors which meet the 2010 emission standards, to haul this longer and heavier combination. This would provide a positive economic alternative for replacing nonconforming equipment. Existing trucks could still be converted but would not be allowed to haul these larger combination trucks. Such an undertaking would provide cleaner air and reduced costs by improving fuel and manpower efficiency.

Furthermore, large scale implementation of this alternative would provide industry wide mitigation benefits to reduce the need for retrofitting field tractors and forklift fleets. It is more effective to utilize capital in the most efficient manner to meet the clean air objectives by directing that capital to high use vehicles. (2009)

No. 753
Junked Cars Littering County Roads

The posting of private property should not be required for the removal of abandoned vehicles by tow companies nor should abandoned vehicles become the responsibility of agricultural landowners. We support the abatement of these vehicles on a statewide basis.

We favor that the fine for willful abandonment of vehicles on public or private property upon complaint from landowner should be the same as the fine for littering. Also, if an abandoned vehicle is stripped, the 72-hour tag should be waived. (Rev. 1992)

No. 754
Communication Services

We believe that communication services are necessary for maintaining public safety and promoting commerce. (Rev. 2009)

No. 755
Rural Broadband

We support access to rural broadband development, so that rural communities remain competitive. The siting of any broadband infrastructure should respect private property rights. Any impacted private landowner should be compensated for any related impacts, and landowner participation shall be voluntary. (19/Rev. 2021)

No. 756
Right to Repair

We support the availability of OEM diagnostic equipment used for agricultural purposes. (2019)

No. 757
Automation

We support the development and use of automation, mechanization, and robotics.

We oppose any tax, fee, or other measures that would hinder the use of such automation, mechanization, and robotics. (2019)

No. 758
Energy Resources

Agriculture must have a consistent supply of power. In view of the continuing prospect of fuel and energy shortages, it is in the interest of the United States to become less dependent upon foreign energy sources. A reserve should be made available of North American continental natural energy resources such as hydroelectric, coal, oil shale, geothermal, petroleum, agricultural material, nuclear energy, solar, wind, wood, biomass and all other sources.

Adequate fuel supplies for the State of California need to be ensured. Efforts are needed for harmonization of fuel standards on a national level to secure adequate fuel reserves, to increase refinery capacity, and to prevent the competitive disadvantage that occurs from having unique state standards that increase the costs of fuel production and price. Consideration should be given to government action to provide encouragement, such as guarantees against the risk of price manipulation by foreign energy sources, so that private developers can undertake costly research and development without the hazards of unfair competitive practices outside the control of our market structure.

Farm Bureau should take an active role in educating the public as to energy alternatives, conservation, and priorities. (Rev. 2007)

No. 759
Renewable Energy and Fuels

We encourage the development and use of all efficient and cost-effective forms of renewable energy and fuels from agricultural, forestry, industrial and household sources and byproducts. We should publicly and aggressively promote these renewable sources, all being forms of biomass, for economically viable uses such as a fuel and energy source, lubricity agent, emission-reducing additive and as unleaded gasoline octane or cetane enhancers.

If potentially harmful invasive species are being considered for biofuel crops, the impacts on other farms and rangelands must be addressed.

We support:

(1) Coordinated California state policy that fully addresses the environmental benefits of renewable fuels produced from biomass;

(2) Development and/or expansion of commercial markets for agricultural biomass;

(3) Use of a renewable energy and fuel standard to stimulate the development of renewable energy and fuel sources if supply is adequate and competitively priced;

(4) Incentives for research and development that allow renewable sources of fuel and energy to be cultivated and processed in California in an economic and environmentally sound manner;

(5) Phasing out government subsidies for the manufacturing and blending of corn-based ethanol; and

(6) Phasing out tariffs on imported ethanol.

Any increase in California's renewable energy portfolio standard (RPS) should only occur after a forecast demonstrates that it will not increase retail electricity rates by more than 3.5% for every 10% increase in the RPS. Other than electricity utilized on site, no solar projects sited on prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance or unique farmland should count toward compliance with an increase in the RPS target over 2020 levels. (Rev. 2016)

No. 760
Electrical Power Generation

We encourage both private and public funded research in new methods of generating power or storing power for use at a more convenient time.

We encourage the voluntary development of renewable energy such as hydroelectric, solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass on public and private lands that is cost effective to rate payers. Local land use decision-making should not be usurped in the determination of suitable siting of renewable generation facilities. In the decision-making process for solar-energy projects on public land, priority should be given to those projects located on marginally productive or nonproductive land. Solar energy projects located on private agriculturally viable lands should be subordinate to the agricultural operation and should not permanently impede or reduce the productive agricultural capacity of the land for future uses. Notwithstanding the foregoing, large-scale utility-sized renewable energy facilities proposed for exclusively agricultural zoning designations or lands used for agricultural mitigation may be allowed to the extent those lands become non-viable and should require a conditional use permit to mitigate the potential negative impacts on neighboring farming operations.

The interests of agricultural electricity users must be protected when additional low-cost federally generated power supplies are allocated to non-federal utilities.

In a period of energy shortage, priority should be given to the energy needs of agriculture for use in the production, harvesting and processing of farm products, and the manufacture of essential agricultural chemicals.

Water of a quality which makes it useful for agriculture or domestic consumption should be protected for those uses. Irrigation districts should not allocate irrigation water to new energy generation uses, unless approved by water users. Instead, cooling water for electric power generators should be supplied by sources in the following order of priority:

(1) Ocean water;

(2) Waste water which would otherwise be discharged to the ocean; and

(3) Drainage water not suitable for agricultural, domestic or industrial reuse.

Cooling tower vapor emissions may be detrimental to crops. Storage ponds for water supplies and blow down disposal should displace a minimum of land capable of producing food.

Air emissions from coal generator stacks may be detrimental to air quality, thus affecting growth rates for some crops and animals, particularly if plants are located in areas in which temperature inversions are common, or air drainage is poor. (11/Rev. 2023)

No. 761
Fuel Supplies

It should be a CFBF and State of California priority that the State work toward developing the necessary policy reforms and supporting technologies to expand the infrastructure needed to ensure that adequate fuel supplies are available within the state to avoid undue price spikes (particularly diesel supplies used by the state's farmers and ranchers). (05/Rev. 2015)

No. 762
Regulation of Utilities in California

We support the California Public Utilities Commission in its constitutionally and legislatively assigned functions, except that the authority of the Commission to fix just compensation for utility property taken by eminent domain should be repealed. We recommend that agriculture and industry be represented on the Commission.

As deregulation of electric, natural gas and telephone utilities proceeds, regulation should be limited to only that amount of control required to protect the public and to assure basic, minimum service is provided to all California residents. Wherever possible, we support market-driven solutions to problems. Statewide public interest and public convenience must be the guiding principles of any regulating authority. To assure cost-effective and reliable service, regulation of the monopoly functions of utilities must continue, including terms of service, price and profits.

Any statewide central procurement entity for electric generation:

(1) Should not be a state-operated entity.

(2) Should be subject to state oversight if operated as a private entity.

(3) Should provide for public input in the process that establishes rates charged to customers.

(4) Should minimize costs to customers and use of revenues strictly limited to the core purpose of the entity.

(5) Should include all hydroelectric generation as renewable energy or zero carbon.

(6) Should purchase generation on behalf of customers in a manner that accounts for the need to balance impacts from intermittent generation sources on the electric grid.

(7) Should undergo a cost-benefit assessment to determine the attributes comprising the entity. (99/Rev. 2020)

No. 763
Electric Service for Agriculture

We urge the appropriate authorities to make substantial reduction in the costs allowed in electric rate base of electric utilities.

We also urge substantial reduction in total electric charges for agriculture by computing the electric rates on a true cost-of-service basis and by eliminating the multitude of surcharges now loaded onto agriculture.

Rates for agriculture should be better suited to how electricity is used in agricultural operations, including the elimination of ongoing charges when electricity is not used. (Rev. 1999)

No. 764
Net Metering

Financial and operational incentives should be provided to farmers to encourage their installation of solar, wind, hydro and other on-the-farm electric generating systems. When more energy is produced than used by the farmer in any calendar year, the farmer should be paid for that surplus energy.

When producing power on a farm site with multiple meters, the solar or other electric generating system should be allowed to be placed where it functions best for the system. If the net metering credit for the meter attached to the generating system exceeds the usage recorded on that meter, credit should then be passed on to any other meters under the same ownership located on all properties up to the full electrical usage of those meters. (2007)

No. 765
No-Fault Auto Insurance

We believe individual states should enact legislation embracing some of the concepts of "no fault" auto insurance. Such legislation should include the following:

(1) The features of the present system permit insurance companies in their rating structures to charge the high-risk driver a higher premium than the good driver. The basic features of any "no-fault" plan should retain the present methods of rating auto insurance, including territorial rating;

(2) Provisions should be retained to make the wrongdoer financially responsible for his acts;

(3) Disputes should be resolved by mandatory arbitration rather than litigation except that the provisions of "no-fault" legislation would not apply if the victim's losses exceeded a certain amount;

(4) The contingency fee should be controlled by statute, as should the limits of recovery for pain and suffering; and

(5) The automatic payment of medical expenses and loss of wages up to a specified amount would be set by statute.

We believe federal legislation and federal control of insurance would not be in our best interests. (Rev. 1990)

No. 766
Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility

To ensure proper compliance with the automobile financial responsibility law, insurance companies should be required to notify the California Department of Motor Vehicles of any cancellation or termination of an auto policy.

DMV shall not register any vehicle without proof of insurance. (1988)

No. 767
Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS)

Unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) should not fly so close to livestock, poultry, or other animal operations that animals or production there would be adversely affected.

We support:

(1) The use of UAS for agricultural purposes;

(2) The operator of the UAS having the written consent of the landowner and/or farm operator if the UAS will be flying for a non-agricultural purpose above private property;

(3) Allowing landlords and tenants to fly UAS over their fields for any reason without being considered commercial activity;

(4) The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) developing reasonable certification and safety training requirements for the operation of UAS; and

(5) The use of safety features to notify manned aircraft that a UAS is in the vicinity.

We oppose:

(1) Government agencies or third parties using UAS for the purpose of regulatory enforcement, litigation or inventorying natural resources without the written consent of the landowner and/or farm operator;

(2) FAA regulations classifying UAS as aircraft; and

(3) FAA regulations that require a pilot's license and third-class medical certification to operate a UAS. (2016)

No. 768
Disruption and Surveillance by Aircraft

Manned aircraft and lighter-than-air aircraft should not fly so close to livestock, poultry, or other animal operations that animals or production there would be adversely affected.

We support requiring the operator of manned aircraft to gain the written consent of the landowner and/or farm operator if the aircraft will be surveying or gathering data above private property.

We oppose government agencies or third parties using manned aircraft for the purposes of regulatory enforcement, litigation, or for inventorying natural resources without the written consent of the landowner and/or authorized agent. (2016)

Farm Bureau Policies 2023

TITLE INDEX

General — Policy No.

Definition of Agriculture . . . 1
Unity in Agriculture . . . 2
Programs for Agriculture . . . 3
Right-to-Farm . . . 4
Disparagement . . . 5
Government Restrictions on Farms . . . 6
Regulatory Reform . . . 7
Definition of "Rural" . . . 8
Status of Previous Resolutions . . . 9
Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG) Credits . . . 10

Commodities

Cotton . . . 101
Rice . . . 102
Sugar . . . 103
Dairy . . . 104
Forestry . . . 105
Honey and Apiculture . . . 106
Specialty Crops . . . 107
Commodity Credit Corporation Accounting . . . 108
Domestic Wine Commerce . . . 109
Aquaculture . . . 110
Horticulture . . . 111
"Equal-to" Meat Inspection Program . . . 112
Quality Inspection Programs . . . 113
Consumer Education . . . 114
Synthetic Food Production . . . 115
Labeling of Agricultural Products . . . 116
Labeling of Synthetic Food Products . . . 117
Animal Traceability . . . 118
Animal Care . . . 119
Livestock Health . . . 120
Rendering Facilities and Collection Points . . . 121
Crop Insurance . . . 122
Crop and Livestock Reporting Service . . . 123
Hay and Forage Standards . . . 124
Weather Reporting . . . 125
Agricultural Research . . . 126
Plant Variety Protection Act . . . 127
Biotechnology . . . 128
Sustainable Agriculture . . . 129
Organic Farming . . . 130
Organic Food Standards . . . 131
Disaster Assistance . . . 132
Warning Labels . . . 133
Food Safety . . . 134
Food Quality . . . 135
Industrial Hemp . . . 136

Marketing and Bargaining

Marketing Orders and Commissions . . . 201
Producer-Financed Programs . . . 202
Brand Advertising . . . 203
Producer's Rights . . . 204
Producer's Liens . . . 205
Cooperatives . . . 206
International Trade . . . 207
Concentration in Food Processing, Distribution, Marketing and Retail Industries . . . 208
Federally Inspected Meat Processing Facilities . . . 209
Contract Marketing . . . 210
Direct Marketing . . . 211

Predator, Pest and Pesticide

Pesticide Management . . . 251
California Pesticide Program . . . 252
Pesticide Mill Assessment . . . 253
Food Quality Protection Act . . . 254
Disposal of Toxic Chemicals . . . 255
Chemical Use . . . 256
Chemical Contaminants . . . 257
Laboratory Accreditation . . . 258
Bee Protection . . . 259
Karnal Bunt . . . 260
Weed Free Forage and Mulch . . . 261
Predator and Pest Programs . . . 262
Strengthening State and National Exclusion Programs . . 263
Rodenticides . . . 264
Game Management . . . 265
Wolf Management . . . 266
Livestock Depredation by Dogs . . . 267

Water

Water Resource Development . . . 301
Water for Food Supply . . . 302
Financing Water Project Development . . . 303
Water Pricing and Contracts . . . 304
State Ownership of the Central Valley Project (CVP) . . . 305
Local Agency Control of Federal and State Water Projects . . . 306
Water Rights . . . 307
Water Marketing and Transfers . . . 308
Management and Use of Groundwaters and Groundwater Basins of California . . . 309
Waste Water Reclamation . . . 310
Flood Prevention and Water Conservation . . . 311
River Deterioration Control . . . 312
Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 Exemption . . . 313
Navigable Streams . . . 314
Surface Mining Impacts on Groundwater . . . 315
Wild and Scenic Rivers . . . 316
Salinity Control . . . 317
Salton Sea . . . 318
Mexican Sewage Problems . . . 319
Nonpoint Source Pollution . . . 320
Watershed Planning . . . 321
Waste Discharge Permits . . . 322
Agricultural Representation on State and Regional Water Boards . . . 323

Natural Resources

Environmental Policy and Procedure . . . 351
Environmental Regulations . . . 352
Air Emission Offset Credits . . . 353
Environmental Carbon Incentives . . . 354
Compensation for Conservation . . . 355
Air Emission Control Strategies . . . 356
Air Quality Standards . . . 357
Agricultural Burning . . . 358
Waste Disposal . . . 359
Illegal Dumping . . . 360
Hazardous Materials . . . 361
Underground Fuel Tanks . . . 362
Agricultural By-products Recycling . . . 363
Wilderness Areas . . . 364
Hardwood Rangelands . . . 365
Vegetative Management and Wildfire Hazards . . . 366
Harmful Invasive Species . . . 367
Fertilizer Use . . . 368
Sewage Sludge Disposal . . . 369
Cannabis . . . 370
Pollinators . . . 371
Climate Change . . . 372

Property Rights and Land Use

Property Rights . . . 401
Governmental Access to Private Property . . . 402
Mineral Rights . . . 403
Intellectual Property Rights . . . 404
Swamp and Overflowed Lands . . . 405
Farmed Wetlands . . . 406
Wetland Restoration . . . 407
Mitigation . . . 408
Government-Owned Land . . . 409
Benefits of Livestock Grazing . . . 410
Government or Public Utility Purchases of Land in Fee or Easement by Eminent Domain . . . 411
Antiquities Act . . . 412
Protection of Archeological Sites . . . 413
Environmental Review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) . . . 414
California Coastal Commission . . . 415
Threatened and Endangered Species . . . 416
Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Compatibility . . . 417
Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans . . . 418
Management of Habitat and Conservation Lands . . . 419
Wildlife Corridors . . . 420
Planning and Zoning . . . 421
Coordination by State Agencies . . . 422
School Site Selection . . . 423
Bioregionalism . . . 424
Variances and Conditional Use Permits . . . 425
Conservation of Agricultural Land . . . 426
Growth Management . . . 427
New Towns . . . 428
Government Support of Development Rights Programs . . . 429
Land Use . . . 430
Viability in Agriculture . . . 431
Energy Development . . . 432
Historical Use of Rights-of-Way . . . 433
Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program . . . 434
Recreation . . . 435
Urban Open Space Preservation . . . 436
Motor Vehicles on Public Lands . . . 437
Trespass Laws . . . 438
Trespass Marijuana Grows . . . 439
Rural Crime . . . 440
Vandalism and Disruptive Activities on Public Facilities . . . 441
Structural Fire Insurance . . . 442
Firearms . . . 443
Minor Felons . . . 444
Wildfire Home Hardening and Defensible Space . . . 445

Labor

Agricultural Labor . . . 551
Employee Safety and Health and Accident Prevention . . . 552
Agricultural Labor Relations Board Access Rules . . . 553
Supplemental Agricultural Labor . . . 554
Immigration Reform . . . 555
Strikes and Labor Disputes . . . 556
Boycott of Agricultural Products . . . 557
Wrongful Discharge and Damages . . . 558
Public Employee Labor Relations . . . 559
Equal Pay for Equal Work . . . 560
Youth Employment . . . 561
Employee Housing . . . 562
Farm Labor Contractors . . . 563
Essential Services . . . 564

Health, Education and Public Assistance

Family Values . . . 601
Health Care and Health Insurance . . . 602
Valley Fever Vaccine . . . 603
Cooperative Extension . . . 604
Education . . . 605
Educational and Training Programs . . . 606
Fairs . . . 607
Public Assistance Programs . . . 608
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program . . . 609
World Hunger . . . 610

Philosophy of Government

Economic Productivity . . . 651
Political Action for Farmers . . . 652
Initiative and Referendum . . . 653
Legislation by Due Process . . . 654
Voter Registration Requirements . . . 655
Termination of Government Agencies . . . 656
Local vs. State Jurisdiction . . . 657
Litigation . . . 658
Public Hearings . . . 659
Freedom of Information Act . . . 660
State Legislative Districts . . . 661

Monetary and Tax

Government Finance . . . 701
Program Fees and Special Assessments . . . 702
Restoration . . . 703
Assured Funding of State-Mandated Programs . . . 704
Rural Fire Protection Funding . . . 705
Income Tax Liability . . . 706
State Personal and Corporate Income Taxes . . . 707
Fuel Tax Reporting . . . 708
Estate and Gift Taxes . . . 709
Owner-Financed Sales . . . 710
Possessory Interest . . . 711
Farm Machinery Tax . . . 712
Taxation of Cooperatives and Other Corporations . . . 713

Technology, Transportation, Energy and Utilities

Transportation . . . 751
Incentives to Meet Diesel Emission Regulations . . . 752
Junked Cars Littering County Roads . . . 753
Communication Services . . . 754
Rural Broadband . . . 755
Right to Repair . . . 756
Automation . . . 757
Energy Resources . . . 758
Renewable Energy and Fuels . . . 759
Electrical Power Generation . . . 760
Fuel Supplies . . . 761
Regulation of Utilities in California . . . 762
Electric Service for Agriculture . . . 763
Net Metering . . . 764
No-Fault Auto Insurance . . . 765
Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility . . . 766
Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) . . . 767
Disruption and Surveillance by Aircraft . . . 768